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ABSTRACT

The study intended to determine the personality types and teaching styles of the Social Science teachers at the University of Bohol, Tagbilaran City, for the Academic Year 2018-2019. This study utilized a quantitative research method using a descriptive-correlational pattern from standard questionnaires adapted and modified from The Big Five Inventory (BFI) by Goldberg and Teaching Style Inventory (TSI) by Dunn and Dunn. The data gathered were treated, analyzed, and interpreted. The result showed that the respondents had very high agreeableness, high conscientiousness, high openness to experience, high extraversion, and low neuroticism. Their teaching style used in the significant elements of teaching was generally somewhat individualized. It was found out that there was an essential relationship between teachers’ personality types and their teaching styles. This study concluded that University of Bohol Social Science teachers were easily distracted and could be somewhat careless, and tend to be disorganized most of the time. However, they were reliable workers, did a thorough job, and persevered until the task was completed all the time. The respondents could be cold and aloof and tend to find fault with others.
most of the time and sometimes rude to others, and could start quarrels with others all the time. However, they had a forgiving nature and were considerate and kind to almost everyone. They could be tense most of the time and could be moody at certain times. However, they never felt depressed and were relaxed, and could handle stress well at certain times. The study results would serve as a basis and recommendation for any intervention program for the benefit of the University of Bohol Social Science teachers.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Teaching is an essential aspect of human connection. An individual’s personal characteristics also influence it. These characteristics include an individual’s personality preferences and styles and learning and teaching styles (Kothari and Pingle, 2015). According to Tamban and Banasihan (2017), teachers play a critical role in educating society’s future members through their work in schools.

Furthermore, professors in higher education institutions, technical training colleges, and centers of lifelong learning and recurrent education are vital to the growth of economic and technological development and the maintenance of societal well-being.

As a result, the factors influencing teachers’ levels of commitment in schools and broader education systems must be the focus of a significant field of research leading to the implementation of reform and change in classrooms, lecture halls, schools, institutions, and learning centers, as well as national educational systems.

During the schooling time, it is widely believed that teachers have a significant impact on the level of information that students eventually acquire (Cabrillana and Mayan, 2015). An environment that is more conducive to learning can be created by the teachers using the psychological type information. People learn most effectively, especially when approaching new or difficult topics when they are given opportunities to use their most effective learning style. Although it is essential to teach and learn from a variety of psychological types, it is essential to recognize how individuals learn best (Mueller, 2005).
There are plenty of data to back up the idea that a teacher’s personality is a big factor in their success at teaching. That teacher effectiveness is seen to exist as a result of a teacher’s personal attributes (Arif, Rashid, Tahira, and Akhter, 2012). There are several reasons for placing such a high value on a teacher’s personality. The first and most important factor is how a teacher’s personality affects their interactions with students (Arif et al., 2012).

Research on teacher’s personalities is based on the assumption that the teacher is a significant figure in the teaching-learning process. Nature influences the teacher’s behavior in diverse ways, such as in interaction with students, teaching methods selected, and learning experiences are chosen. In conducting educational activities, it is critical to make good use of a teacher’s personality. Even if there is no formal connection between the student and the teacher, they learn through the teacher’s character. The desired teaching personality is one in which the teacher’s personality contributes to creating and maintaining a classroom, a learning environment in which students feel at ease and are driven to study (Arif et al., 2012).

**Theories.** Lewis Goldberg proposed a five-dimension personality model nicknamed the Big Five Model, or also known as FFM or “Five-Factor Model.” He cited that FFM has received widespread support and has gained approval as the trait personality model to provide the desired personality variable consistency. Othman (2009) noted that many personality psychologists have agreed that the “Five-Factor Model” is necessary and competent to describe the basic dimensions of personality. It contains significant aspects of nature, which include conscientiousness which is the tendency to be organized, careful, and disciplined against being disorganized, careless, and impulsive. Extraversion is the tendency to be sociable, fun-loving, and affectionate against retiring, somber, and reserved. Agreeableness is the tendency to be soft-hearted and agreeable. All significant aspects of openness to experience are the tendency to be imaginative, independent, and interested in variety against being practical, conforming, and involved routine.

These five traits are not interdependent. In other words, knowing someone’s score on extraversion would not give any information about scores on the different four dimensions, allowing for a tremendous amount of variety in personality descriptions. Definite personality constructs (e.g., the Big Five Personality factors) have repeatedly been shown, in meta-
analysis studies, to be valid predictors of job performance. Some studies have proved the predictive validity of the FFM (Five-Factor Model) in occupational settings (Othman, 2009).

The Big Five personality dimensions have been studied extensively and have been associated with various work attitudes and behavior. These five personality dimensions are broad dimensions that are theorized to subsume most narrowly focused personality traits. The breadth of these dimensions is a benefit in that it distills many personality traits into a parsimonious set of aspects for use in research (Othman, 2009).

Anchored on the theory that teacher’s teaching style directly affects learning, Rita Dunn and Kenneth J. Dunn formulated a teaching style model. It is greatly provoked by the concept of individualized student-centered instruction rather than the traditional teacher-centered approach (Koukel, 2005).

According to Rita Dunn and Kenneth J. Dunn’s (1977) Teaching Style Model, there are five types of teaching styles which include the highly individualized (which refers to an instructional system wherein the characteristic of each student plays a crucial role in the selection of objectives, sequence of study, choice of materials, and procedures making it a student-centered approach in teaching), somewhat individualized (when the teacher exposes the students to independent study techniques and availed grouping techniques by pairs), transitional (when the teachers tend to be prescriptive and showed concern on how students learn), somewhat traditional (when the teacher employs a schedule), and the traditional (when the teacher engages in whole class lessons and hold on to lectures, teacher demonstration, and class discussion methods of teaching).

**Related Studies.** Arif et al. (2012), in their study on personality and teaching, an investigation into perspective teacher’s personality, indicated the quality of teacher education programs regarding their capability to develop teacher personality. The study enabled researchers to suggest some strategies for the developing teacher’s personalities to be part of teacher education programs.

According to Kothari and Pingle (2015), in their study on personality traits and teaching style of management teachers, results showed that there was a significant difference between the different demographic variables and personality traits as well as teaching styles.
Othman (2009), in his study on personality that influences teaching effectiveness, shows that there is a significant relationship between extrovert, agreeableness, and conscientiousness with teaching effectiveness, while neuroticism and openness have no meaningful association. Even there is a relationship between personality and teaching effectiveness. Still the other results show that personality only has a negligible effect on teaching effectiveness which means that there are several other factors that influence teaching effectiveness.

Cabaguing (2016), in her study on teaching and learning styles in Social Science, the Samar State University Experience, revealed that students perceived teacher’s instructional strategies and personalities to be factors that contributed to their learning. Faculty who are non-education graduates are perceived to use the lecture approach, while the majority of the faculty who are education graduates are engaging students in more activities. It also showed that students learn better in Social Science subjects if they are actively involved in the classroom, and they learn from teachers who are open and friendly even though their boundaries are established. The teachers should continuously discover the learning styles of the students so that they can adjust and modify their teaching styles to accommodate and address students learning styles. Hence, it can result in improved attitudes towards learning and an increased number of students performing better in Social Sciences subjects.

Zeeb (2004) indicated that aligning of the student’s learning styles with the teaching styles of instructors could lead to an improvement in academic performance. A consistent learning style with the teaching style of a course instructor enables the students to retain the information much longer, apply it more efficiently and effectively, and have a more positive attitude toward the subject than their counterparts who experience teaching/learning styles mismatches (Cabaguing, 2016).

**Related Studies.** As cited by Ferrer (2015) in his study on teaching styles in teaching the second language, studies showed that matching teaching styles to learning can significantly enhance academic achievement, student attitudes, and student behavior at the primary and secondary level.

Koukel (2005), in her study on teaching style and computer use in family, a survey of university faculty in Texas, results indicated that one teaching style variable, evaluation techniques, was found to have a relationship to computer use in the classroom. The result revealed no
differences between classroom computer use and university faculty’s years of experience using computers or the number of attended computer-related learning activities. The current study did show that type of access to computers influenced faculty to use in the classroom. The university faculty who taught in computer labs showed a higher level of computer use than those with other types of computer access. Likewise, the study found increased classroom computer use among those faculty members who perceived their level of computer and technology skills to be above average.

The study of Koukel (2005) was helpful in the current research of the researcher since both emphasize and utilize the role of the major teaching elements in determining the teaching styles. However, the researcher’s study mainly focuses on the relationship between the Social Science teachers’ personality types and their teaching styles.

Khandaghi and Farasat (2011), in their study on the effect of teacher’s teaching style on students’ adjustment which investigated the impact of two types of teaching style, i.e. teacher-oriented and learner-oriented ones on adjustment of students in three emotional, social and educational domains indicated that the mean scores of emotional, educational and social adjustments of students whose teachers use an energetic teaching style are more than students that their teachers use an inactive teaching style. Also, there is a significant difference between the emotional and educational adjustments among the students who have two different kinds of active and passive teaching styles. But its effect on social adjustment was not significantly different.

This study of Khandaghi and Farasat (2011) would help to analyze the different teaching styles. The findings of their study would serve as the basis of the current research of the researcher in determining the different teaching styles of the Social Science teachers in the University of Bohol, which sought to find its relationship towards their personality types.

Galvez and Sison (2018), in their study on assessing the teaching styles of college instructors of La Consolacion University Philippines, its implications for professional development, aimed to discover the teaching styles of College instructors of La Consolacion University Philippines using the Staffordshire Evaluation of Teaching Styles (SETS). Results showed that most college instructors fall under the sixth type of teaching style, which is the “one-off teacher.” Recommendations and ideas for differentiation are also provided in this study.
The study of Galvez and Sison (2018) was relevant in the current research of the researcher since both aimed to discover the teaching styles of the teachers. However, the researcher utilized different tools in determining the teaching styles of the teachers.

Statement of the Problem

The main thrust of this study is to determine the personality types and teaching styles of the Social Science teachers at the University of Bohol, Tagbilaran City, for the Academic Year 2018-2019. Specifically, this sought to assess the personality types based on the Big Five Model (openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism); their teaching styles based on the major elements of teaching according to Dunn and Dunn (instructional planning, teaching methods, teaching environment, and evaluation techniques); the significant degree of correlation between the teacher’s personality types and their teaching styles; the significant degree of variance among the personality types and the teaching styles; and the significant degree of relationship between the teachers’ profile and their personality types and teaching styles.

METHODOLOGY

This study utilized a quantitative research method using a descriptive-correlational pattern from standard questionnaires adapted and modified from The Big Five Inventory (BFI) by Goldberg and Teaching Style Inventory (TSI) by Dunn and Dunn.

The respondents of the study were the 24 Social Science teachers of the University of Bohol during the A.Y. 2018-2019.

The study used three sets of descriptive questionnaires. The first part, a self-structured questionnaire, was used to assess the profile of the Social Science teachers base on their sex, highest educational attainment, number of hours of relevant training and seminars attended, and number of years of teaching experience.

The second part, an adopted and modified “The Big Five Inventory (BFI)” by Goldberg, was used to determine the personality types of the teachers. The questionnaire contains a 44-item inventory that will measure an individual based on the dimensions of the Big Five Factors. Respondents are asked to rate themselves on the given statements by a given scale of 1 if “strongly disagree” (when the situation is never felt); 2
if “slightly disagree” (when the situation is deemed at certain times); 3 if “slightly agree” (when the situation is deemed most of the time); and 4 if “strongly agree” (when the situation is deemed all the time).

The third part, another adopted and modified “Teaching Style Inventory (TSI)” by Dunn and Dunn, was used to determine the teaching styles of the Social Science teachers. It contains a 44-item inventory from some selected teaching elements, according to Dunn and Dunn (1977), which include: instructional planning, teaching methods, teaching environment, and evaluation techniques. Respondents are asked to rate their mode of utilization or preferences among the given teaching elements to assess their preferred teaching styles in the classroom by a given scale of 1 if “Never” (when the teacher never uses the style); 2 if “Rarely” (when the teacher uses the style at certain times); 3 if “Frequently” (when the teacher uses the style most of the time); and 4 if “Always” (when the teacher uses the style all the time).

The research study had undergone review by the University of Bohol Research Ethics Committee to ensure the principles of good research practice and be enlightened from the consequences of the research study and the participants’ interests.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Personality Types of the Teachers. Table 1 reveals that the respondents had very high agreeableness with the highest composite mean of 3.38 among Goldberg’s five-dimension personality model. It also shows that the respondents had high conscientiousness with a composite mean of 3.14 followed by high openness to experience with a composite mean of 3.13, high extraversion with a composite mean of 2.94, and lastly, very low neuroticism with a composite mean of 2.02.

Table 1. Personality Types of Teachers Summary (N=24)

| Personality Types          | Composite Mean | DV                  | Rank      |
|----------------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------|
| 1. Openness to experience  | 3.13           | Felt most of the time | 3 (High) |
| 2. Conscientiousness       | 3.14           | Felt most of the time | 2 (High) |
| 3. Extraversion            | 2.94           | Felt most of the time | 4 (High) |
| 4. Agreeableness           | 3.38           | Felt all the time    | 1 (Very High) |
| 5. Neuroticism             | 2.02           | Felt at certain times | 5 (Very Low) |
This infers that the Social Science teachers of the University of Bohol were generally agreeable. Agreeableness is associated with altruism, friendliness, and modesty, while low agreeableness includes antagonism, impression management, and selfishness (Othman, 2009). High scores tended to be friendly, compassionate, and cooperative. This indicates one trusting and helpful nature, and whether one is well-tempered. However, it may also indicate that the Social Science teachers of University of Bohol were generally tended to be calm, emotionally stable, and free from persistent negative feelings.

**Teaching Styles of the Teachers.** The result shows that generally, in terms of instructional planning, the respondents’ teaching styles were somewhat individualized based on the composite mean of 3.13., in terms of teaching methods, their teaching styles were somewhat individualized based on the composite mean of 3.14, in terms of teaching environment based on student groupings, their teaching styles were somewhat individualized based on the composite mean of 2.97, in terms of teaching environment based on room design, their teaching styles were somewhat individualized based on the composite mean of 2.83, in terms of teaching environment based on learning environment, their teaching styles were somewhat individualized based on the composite mean of 3.02, and in terms of evaluation techniques, their teaching styles were somewhat individualized based on the composite mean of 3.07. Therefore, the UB Social Science teachers’ teaching styles used in the major elements of teaching is generally somewhat individualized.

| Teaching Styles          | Composite Mean | DV                      | DV                        |
|-------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Instructional planning | 3.13           | Somewhat individualized | Frequently (Most of the time) |
| 2. Teaching Methods     | 3.14           | Somewhat individualized | Frequently (Most of the time) |
| 3. Teaching environment |                |                         |                           |
| 3.1. Student groupings  | 2.97           | Somewhat individualized | Frequently (Most of the time) |
| 3.2. Room design        | 2.83           | Somewhat individualized | Frequently (Most of the time) |
| 3.3. Learning environment | 3.02         | Somewhat individualized | Frequently (Most of the time) |
| 4. Evaluation techniques | 3.08           | Somewhat individualized | Frequently (Most of the time) |

It shows a significant relationship between teacher’s personality types and their teaching styles since the computed chi-square of 13.1988 is greater than the critical value of 11.07. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected.
The teaching styles of the University of Bohol Social Science teachers are dependent from their personality types.

This affirms to what Cabaguing (2016) claimed in her study in teaching and learning styles in Social Science in Samar State University that students perceived teacher’s instructional strategies and personality to be factors that contributed to their learning. The findings of her study suggest that teachers should continuously discover the learning styles of the students so they can adjust and modify their teaching styles to accommodate and address students' learning styles. Hence, it can result in improved attitudes towards learning and increased number of students who will be performing better in Social Sciences subjects since Ahmed and Maryam (2016) claimed that students had less information about social sciences because their teachers, parents, and peers did not tell about those subjects and their worth in our society.

Table 3. Relationship between Teachers’ Personality Types and Teaching Styles (N = 24)

| Teaching Style Personality type | Highly Individualized | Slightly Individualized | Transitional | Traditional | TOTAL |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------|-------------|-------|
| Extraversion                   | 0.1667 1 4.1655       | 0.8333 0 0.8333         | 0.0000 0    | 0.0000 0.0000 0 0.0000 | 1     |
| Agreeableness                  | 1.8333 0 1.8333       | 9.1667 11 0.3667        | 0.0000 0    | 0.0000 0.0000 0 0.0000 | 11    |
| Conscientiousness              | 0.3333 1 1.336        | 1.6667 1 0.2667         | 0.0000 0    | 0.0000 0.0000 0 0.0000 | 2     |
| Neuroticism                    | 0.1667 0 0.167        | 0.8333 1 0.0333         | 0.0000 0    | 0.0000 0.0000 0 0.0000 | 1     |
| Openness                       | 0.6667 2 2.6664       | 3.3333 2 0.5333         | 0.0000 0    | 0.0000 0.0000 0 0.0000 | 4     |
| Agreeableness & Conscientiousness | 0.8333 0 0.8333 | 4.1667 5 0.1667 0.0000 0 0.0000 0.0000 0 0.0000 | 5     |
| TOTAL                          | 4                    | 20                      | 0            | 0 24         |

Chi-square = 13.1988  
critical value of chi-square at 5df, 0.05 level of significance = 11.07  
Result : Significant  
H₀ : Rejected

CONCLUSION

Generally, the teachers had very high agreeableness but very low neuroticism. This means that in the Big Five Model or the Five-Factor Model by Lewis Goldberg, they had a tendency to be friendly, compassionate, and cooperative and had the tendency to be calm, emotionally stable, and free from persistent negative feelings.
As to the teaching styles of the respondents, in terms of instructional planning, the University of Bohol Social Science teachers utilized task cards or games and diagnosis and prescription for each student most of the time. However, brainstorming and collaborative learning were utilized all the time. In terms of teaching methods, the University of Bohol Social Science teachers utilized media like films, tapes, etc., individualized diagnosis and prescription for each student, and teacher demonstration most of the time. However, a Socratic method was utilized all the time, and small groupings was utilized most of the time. In terms of teaching environment based on student groupings, the University of Bohol Social Science teachers utilized pairing of 2 students, one-to-one interactions with the teacher, and two or more of the groupings at one time most of the time. However, several small groups, independent study assignments, and one large group were utilized most of the time. In terms of teaching environment based on room design, the University of Bohol Social Science teachers utilized individual and small groups, learning stations, and three or more of the above arrangement at the same time most of the time. However, rows of desks, small groups of 3-8 students, and various areas were utilized most of the time. In terms of teaching environment based on learning environment, the University of Bohol Social Science teachers utilized varied schedules for individuals, many multisensory sources available in the classroom for use by individuals and groups, and various instructional provided in the school for different simultaneous activities most of the time. However, instructional areas designed for different groups that need to talk and interact, students’ permission to choose where they will sit/work were utilized all the time, and instructional materials available for all students as needed were utilized most of the time. In terms of evaluation techniques, the University of Bohol Social Science teachers utilized student self-assessment tests, criterion-referenced achievement test based on individual student’s potential, and criterion-referenced achievement tests based on student self-selected individual objectives most of the time. However, teacher-made tests, performance tests, and observation by moving from group to group and among individuals were utilized all the time.

Generally, the teaching styles of the teachers using the major elements of the teaching style model according to Dunn and Dunn is somewhat individualized. This means that the teachers expose the students to independent study techniques and availed grouping techniques by pairs.
This teaching style is considered as individualized technique making it a student-centered approach in teaching.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the results and findings of the study, here are the recommendations and suggestions created.

**For CHED and DepEd:**
1. The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) and the Department of Education (DepEd) may provide educational intervention programs to address Social Science teacher’s personality development to increase professional efficacy.

**For the University of Bohol:**
1. The University of Bohol Social Science Department may provide activities that will develop the social and interpersonal relationships (i.e., retreats, recollections, teambuilding activities, regular fellowship).
2. The University of Bohol Social Science Department may provide activities to be included in the faculty development program of the university, which may enhance their work ethics because these traits need to be addressed for these may affect their quality of teaching (i.e., regular physical and mental alertness exercises, etc.).
3. The University of Bohol Social Science teachers may undergo mindfulness and stress management to address their traits like being moody, excessive worriers, and overanxious.

**For the Teachers and Students:**
1. The University of Bohol Social Science teachers should pursue higher education by earning advanced studies preferably vertical to their field of specialization since 45% did not have any master’s degree.
2. The University of Bohol Social Science teachers should attend training and seminars since over 60% had only attended at least 72 hours or equivalent to 3 days only.
3. The University of Bohol Social Science teachers should regularly
conduct student self-assessment tests to measure the students’ learning capacity (i.e., writing self-reflection, reaction paper, narrative reports, and essays) to enable the teachers to determine the level of students’ understanding.

4. The University of Bohol Social Science teachers are encouraged to engage more in intellectual and professional activities that will give them an opportunity to express their feelings and opinions (i.e., lecturers, resource speakers, etc.).

5. The University of Bohol Social Science teachers are encouraged to undergo training, workshops, seminars, symposiums, and other related activities that will provide opportunities in enhancing their artistic interests, which may be helpful in teaching the Social Sciences effectively.

6. It is emphasized that in delivering information, it should be varied from each other (i.e., formative assessment and summative assessment) considering the individual differences and learning styles.

7. The University of Bohol Social Science teachers should utilize multimedia (i.e., films, tapes, and PowerPoint presentation) as learning resources in delivering information, so keep abreast with the latest teaching styles and strategies in the teaching-learning process.

8. In terms of teaching environment based on student groupings, the University of Bohol Social Science teachers should utilize pairing of two students when it is necessary, like having peer tutorials and peer interviews.

9. In terms of teaching environment based on room design, the University of Bohol Social Science teachers may apply different classroom management styles to make the environment more conducive to learning (i.e., rearrange, redesign, remodify, and any as it may deem proper for the teaching-learning process).

10. In terms of teaching environment based on learning environment, it is suggested that the University of Bohol Social Science teachers and Social Science students should set fixed time schedules for individuals to address students’ academic needs and concerns to mobilize more the teaching-learning process (i.e., daily or weekly consultation with the learners).
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