Aloysian Journals
of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https:// aijsseaf.com
Volume 2 Issue 3 (2026)

TEACHING STYLES OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN DISTRICT IV-A, SAN CARLOS CITY DIVISION

Donabelle C. Bautista [1]
Palaris Colleges, San Carlos City, Pangasinan[1]
donnabelle.bautista002@deped.gov.ph[1]

Publication Date: March 13, 2026

Abstract

This study assessed the extent of practice of teaching styles among public elementary school teachers in District IV-A, San Carlos City Division, for the School Year 2025–2026. Specifically, it examined the extent of practice in the areas of Expert, Delegator, Facilitator, Formal Authority, and Personal Model as perceived by teachers and school heads; determined whether a significant difference existed between their perceptions; identified the degree of seriousness of problems encountered by teachers in practicing these teaching styles; and proposed an action plan to strengthen their implementation. The study employed a descriptive-comparative research design involving 112 teachers and 7 school heads from seven public elementary schools selected through purposive sampling. Data were gathered using a validated structured questionnaire adapted from Grasha's Teaching Styles (2016) and were analyzed using Average Weighted Mean and independent samples t-test at the 0.05 level of significance. Findings revealed that the teaching styles were generally often practiced across the five areas. There was no significant difference between the perceptions of teachers and school heads regarding the extent of practice. The problems encountered by teachers were moderately serious, indicating manageable but notable challenges in implementation. Based on the results, an action plan was proposed to further strengthen the effective practice of teaching styles in public elementary schools.

Keywords: teaching styles, Expert, Delegator, Facilitator, Formal Authority, and Personal Model

Keywords: *play-based learning, academic emotion, student engagement, arousal modulation theory, elementary education, social studies education, araling panlipunan*

INTRODUCTION

Effective teaching styles are essential in promoting meaningful learning experiences and improving pupil achievement in public elementary schools. Teachers who skillfully apply varied teaching styles are better equipped to address learner diversity, sustain engagement, and foster active classroom participation. Grasha's framework highlights five major teaching styles—Expert, Formal Authority, Personal Model, Facilitator, and Delegator—which collectively support both teacher-centered and learner-centered instruction. However, in many school contexts, the consistent and balanced application of these styles remains a challenge due to factors such as large class sizes, limited instructional resources, time constraints,

and varying levels of teacher preparedness. Moreover, differences may exist between how teachers perceive their own classroom practices and how school heads observe them. In District IV-A, San Carlos City Division, there is limited localized evidence describing the current extent of teaching style practices and the challenges teachers face. This gap underscores the need for a systematic assessment to provide empirical basis for instructional support and policy enhancement. Hence, this study was conducted to determine the extent of practice of teaching styles, examine perceptual differences between teachers and school heads, identify the seriousness of implementation problems, and develop an action plan to strengthen teaching practices in public elementary

METHODS

Research Design

This study utilized a descriptive-comparative research design to describe the current teaching style practices and determine differences in perceptions between teachers and school heads.

Participants

The participants included a purposive sample of 112 public elementary school teachers and 7 school heads from seven identified schools in District IV-A, San Carlos City Division, during School Year 2025–2026.

Instruments

Data were collected using a validated Likert-scale questionnaire adapted from Grasha's Teaching Styles (2016). The instrument consisted of two parts: extent of practice of five teaching styles and degree of seriousness of problems encountered.

Procedure

Upon securing approval from the Schools Division Superintendent and school heads, the researcher personally administered the questionnaires. Respondents were informed of the study's purpose and assured of confidentiality. Completed questionnaires were retrieved, checked, tallied, and encoded for analysis.

Data Analysis

The study employed Average Weighted Mean to determine the extent of practice and degree of seriousness of problems. An independent samples t-test at 0.05 level of significance was used to test differences between teacher and school head perceptions. Data were processed using standard statistical procedures.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

EXTENT OF PRACTICE OF THE TEACHING STYLES ALONG WITH EXPERT AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS AND SCHOOL HEADS

Table 2 shows that the extent of practice of the Expert teaching style among public elementary school teachers is often practiced, as reflected by the overall Average Weighted Mean (AWM) of 3.91 with a descriptive equivalent of Often (O). Both teachers (3.90) and school heads (3.91) provided closely similar

ratings, indicating a shared perception that teachers consistently demonstrate strong subject mastery, provide detailed explanations, and maintain well-organized, content-rich lessons. This pattern suggests that the Expert role is a dominant and well-established teaching approach in District IV-A.

The high ratings across indicators further imply that teachers give strong emphasis to accuracy, clarity of content, and academic standards in classroom instruction. Practices such as demonstrating mastery of subject matter, organizing lessons systematically, and focusing on learners' competence in subject content contribute to effective knowledge transmission. The close agreement between teachers and school heads also strengthens the credibility of the findings, showing consistency between self-perception and supervisory observation.

The consistent "Often" rating indicates that teachers possess solid content knowledge and are generally effective in delivering structured instruction that supports learner understanding and academic rigor. However, since the overall mean has not reached the "Always" level, there remains room to further strengthen practices such as promoting deeper independent learning, sustaining precision-focused instruction, and maximizing the Expert role in varied classroom contexts. Enhancing professional learning opportunities and instructional coaching may help move the practice of the Expert teaching style toward a more consistently exemplary level.

Table 2. *Extent of Practice of the Teaching Styles along with Expert as perceived by Teachers and School Heads*

Expert	Teachers		School heads		Overall	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	AWM	DE
1. Demonstrate strong mastery of the subject matter in every lesson	4.18	O	4.19	O	4.19	O
2. Emphasize the importance of accuracy and precision in learning	3.58	O	3.61	O	3.60	O
3. Provide detailed explanations to ensure pupils understand the topic	3.56	O	3.58	O	3.57	O
4. Set high standards of academic performance in class	4.05	O	4.06	O	4.06	O
5. Encourage learners to acquire as much knowledge as possible	3.78	O	3.79	O	3.79	O
6. Focus on developing learners' competence in subject content	4.11	O	4.12	O	4.12	O
7. Clarify misconceptions and provide corrective feedback immediately	3.98	O	3.98	O	3.98	O
8. Expect learners to study and master concepts independently	4.01	O	4.02	O	4.02	O
9. Ensure that lessons are well-organized and content-rich	4.17	O	4.19	O	4.18	O
10. Consider self as a primary source of knowledge in the classroom	3.54	O	3.56	O	3.55	O
TOTAL	**3.90**	**O**	**3.91**	**O**	**3.91**	**O**

EXTENT OF PRACTICE OF THE TEACHING STYLES ALONG WITH DELEGATOR AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS AND SCHOOL HEADS

Table 3 shows that the extent of practice of the Delegator teaching style among public elementary school teachers is often practiced, as reflected by the overall Average Weighted Mean (AWM) of 3.57 with a descriptive equivalent of Often (O). Teachers (3.56) and school heads (3.57) reported very close ratings, indicating a common perception that teachers generally allow learners to assume responsibility for their

learning and provide opportunities for independent and collaborative work. This suggests that elements of learner autonomy are present in classroom practices within District IV-A.

The findings reveal that several delegator behaviors are frequently observed, particularly allowing learners to take responsibility for tasks, encouraging exploration of solutions, and providing opportunities for independent work. However, some indicators such as promoting learner autonomy, valuing learner initiative, providing minimal supervision, and believing that pupils learn best through ownership were rated only Sometimes Often (SO). This pattern indicates that while independence is encouraged, teachers may still maintain a moderate level of control and guidance during instruction.

Overall, the "Often" rating implies that the Delegator teaching style is practiced to a considerable extent, supporting the development of learner responsibility and collaborative skills. Nevertheless, the presence of several SO ratings and the overall mean of 3.57 indicate that the full potential of learner autonomy and self-directed learning has not yet been maximized. Strengthening practices that further empower pupils to take ownership of their learning may help enhance the consistent application of the Delegator role in classroom instruction.

Table 3. *Extent of Practice of the Teaching Styles along with Delegator as perceived by Teachers and School Heads*

Delegator	Teachers		School heads		Overall	
	Mean	**DE**	**Mean**	**DE**	**AWM**	**DE**
1. Allow learners to take responsibility for their own learning tasks	4.02	O	4.03	O	4.03	O
2. Assign group projects where learners make their own decisions	3.49	O	3.46	O	3.48	O
3. Give opportunities for pupils to work independently	4.02	O	4.02	O	4.02	O
4. Encourage learners to explore solutions without constant guidance	4.04	O	4.06	O	4.05	O
5. Design activities that promote learner autonomy	3.25	SO	3.26	SO	3.26	SO
6. Value learner initiative in classroom tasks	3.22	SO	3.25	SO	3.24	SO
7. Allow learners to demonstrate creativity through projects	3.98	O	3.98	O	3.98	O
8. Trust learners to manage their roles in group activities	3.32	SO	3.36	SO	3.34	SO
9. Provide minimal supervision to encourage independence	3.02	SO	3.04	SO	3.03	SO
10. Believe pupils learn best when they have ownership of learning	3.21	SO	3.24	SO	3.23	SO
TOTAL	**3.56**	**O**	**3.57**	**O**	**3.57**	**O**

EXTENT OF PRACTICE OF THE TEACHING STYLES ALONG WITH FACILITATOR AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS AND SCHOOL HEADS

Table 4 shows that the extent of practice of the Facilitator teaching style is often practiced, as reflected by the overall Average Weighted Mean (AWM) of 4.03 with a descriptive equivalent of Often (O). Teachers (4.02) and school heads (4.05) provided closely similar ratings, indicating consistency in perception. The high means across indicators such as encouraging pupils to ask questions, promoting collaboration, designing critical thinking activities, and guiding learners to discover knowledge suggest that teachers actively promote learner-centered instruction. The overall mean of 4.03 further implies that facilitative strategies are strongly embedded in classroom practice, supporting active participation and deeper understanding.

Aloysian Journals
of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https:// aijsseaf.com
Volume 2 Issue 3 (2026)

Table 4. *Extent of Practice of the Teaching Styles along with Facilitator as perceived by Teachers and School Heads*

Facilitator	Teachers		School Heads		Overall	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	AWM	DE
1. Encourage pupils to ask questions and express ideas during discussions	4.18	O	4.19	O	4.19	O
2. Guide learners to discover knowledge on their own	4.02	O	4.07	O	4.05	O
3. Design learning activities that promote critical thinking	4.09	O	4.11	O	4.10	O
4. Motivate learners to actively participate in class activities	3.89	O	3.92	O	3.91	O
5. Create opportunities for collaboration and group learning	4.12	O	4.14	O	4.13	O
6. Provide open-ended activities that allow multiple solutions	4.02	O	4.04	O	4.03	O
7. Assist learners in connecting knowledge to real-life experiences	3.78	O	3.79	O	3.79	O
8. Use questioning techniques to stimulate deeper understanding	4.11	O	4.12	O	4.12	O
9. Promote active learner participation rather than passive listening	3.99	O	4.01	O	4.00	O
10. Act as a guide who supports, rather than dictates, the learning process	4.02	O	4.07	O	4.05	O
TOTAL	**4.02**	**O**	**4.05**	**O**	**4.03**	**O**

EXTENT OF PRACTICE OF THE TEACHING STYLES ALONG WITH FORMAL AUTHORITY AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS AND SCHOOL HEADS

Table 5 reveals that the Formal Authority teaching style is also often practiced, with an overall AWM of 3.43 interpreted as Often (O). Teachers rated it 3.42 while school heads rated it 3.44, showing alignment in responses. Indicators such as providing structured lessons with clear instructions (4.19) and enforcing deadlines (3.43) received relatively higher ratings, while strictly following classroom rules and emphasizing discipline were rated Sometimes Often (SO). This indicates that while teachers maintain authority and structure in the classroom, they balance control with flexibility. The overall mean of 3.43 suggests that formal authority is present but not overly dominant in instructional practice.

Table 5. *Extent of Practice of the Teaching Styles along with Formal Authority as perceived by Teachers and School Heads*

Formal Authority	Teachers		School Heads		Overall	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	AWM	DE
1. Strictly follow classroom rules and regulations	3.01	SO	3.05	SO	3.03	SO
2. Emphasize discipline and order in the learning environment	3.12	SO	3.16	SO	3.14	SO
3. Expect learners to comply with set standards of behavior	3.79	O	3.79	O	3.79	O

4. Enforce deadlines and expect punctual submission of tasks	3.42	O	3.43	O	3.43	O
5. Ensure authority is respected inside the classroom	3.28	SO	3.29	SO	3.29	SO
6. Establish clear expectations of learner performance	3.01	SO	3.05	SO	3.03	SO
7. Emphasize the correct way of doing things	3.12	SO	3.16	SO	3.14	SO
8. Control the flow of class discussions and activities	3.79	O	3.79	O	3.79	O
9. Provide structured lessons with clear instructions	4.18	O	4.19	O	4.19	O
10. Maintain strong classroom management to minimize disruptions	3.47	O	3.48	O	3.48	O
TOTAL	**3.42**	**O**	**3.44**	**O**	**3.43**	**O**

EXTENT OF PRACTICE OF THE TEACHING STYLES ALONG WITH PERSONAL MODEL AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS AND SCHOOL HEADS

Table 6 indicates that the Personal Model teaching style is often practiced, with an overall AWM of 3.92. Teachers (3.91) and school heads (3.93) again showed consistent perceptions. High ratings in demonstrating tasks, modeling good study habits, and believing that learners benefit from observation reflect that teachers frequently use demonstration and modeling strategies. The overall mean of 3.92 implies that teachers commonly act as role models in both academic and behavioral aspects, reinforcing learning through example and guided practice.

Table 6. *Extent of Practice of the Teaching Styles along with Personal Model as perceived by Teachers and School Heads*

Personal Model	Teachers		School Heads		Overall	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	AWM	DE
1. Demonstrate tasks before asking learners to perform them	3.72	O	3.69	O	3.71	O
2. Show step-by-step examples to guide learners	3.96	O	3.98	O	3.97	O
3. Model good study habits and work ethics in class	3.91	O	4.01	O	3.96	O
4. Expect learners to imitate way of doing activities	4.01	O	4.02	O	4.02	O
5. Believe demonstrating is more effective than explaining	3.99	O	3.98	O	3.99	O
6. Act as a role model in discipline and behavior	3.91	O	4.01	O	3.96	O
7. Encourage learners to follow examples in problem-solving	3.98	O	4.02	O	4.00	O
8. Use demonstration as a primary method of teaching	3.77	O	3.78	O	3.78	O
9. Exhibit enthusiasm for learning to inspire learners	3.78	O	3.79	O	3.79	O
10. Believe pupils learn best through observation and imitation	4.05	O	4.05	O	4.05	O
TOTAL	**3.91**	**O**	**3.93**	**O**	**3.92**	**O**

SUMMARY OF THE EXTENT OF PRACTICE OF THE TEACHING STYLES AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS AND SCHOOL HEADS

Table 7 presents the summary of the extent of practice of the five teaching styles. All styles—Expert (3.91), Delegator (3.57), Facilitator (4.03), Formal Authority (3.43), and Personal Model (3.92)—were interpreted as Often practiced. The grand mean of 3.77 indicates that teaching styles in District IV-A are

generally practiced at a high level. Among the five, the Facilitator style obtained the highest mean (4.03), while Formal Authority had the lowest (3.43), suggesting a stronger inclination toward learner-centered approaches while still maintaining classroom structure.

Table 7. *Summary of the Extent of Practice of the Teaching Styles as Perceived by Teachers and School Heads*

	Teachers		School Heads		Overall	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	AWM	DE
1. Expert	3.90	O	3.91	O	3.91	O
2. Delegator	3.56	O	3.57	O	3.57	O
3. Facilitator	4.02	O	4.05	O	4.03	O
4. Formal Authority	3.42	O	3.44	O	3.43	O
5. Personal Model	3.91	O	3.93	O	3.92	O
TOTAL	**3.76**	**O**	**3.78**	**O**	**3.77**	**O**

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN THE EXTENT OF PRACTICE OF THE TEACHING STYLES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTION OF TEACHERS AND SCHOOL HEADS

Table 8 shows that the computed t-value of 0.0086 at 4 degrees of freedom is lower than the critical value of 2.776 at the 0.05 level of significance. Since the computed value is less than the critical value, the null hypothesis is accepted. This means that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of teachers and school heads regarding the extent of practice of the five teaching styles. The findings indicate strong agreement between both groups, reinforcing the reliability of the results.

Table 8. *Significant Differences in the Extent of Practice of the Teaching Styles between the Perception of Teachers and School Heads*

	Teachers		School Heads	
	Mean	**DE**	**Mean**	**DE**
1. Expert	3.90	O	3.91	O
2. Delegator	3.56	O	3.57	O
3. Facilitator	4.02	O	4.05	O
4. Formal Authority	3.42	O	3.44	O
5. Personal Model	3.91	O	3.93	O
Total	**3.76**	**O**	**3.78**	**O**

Computed t-value: *0.0086@ df 4*
Alpha: *@ 0.05 level of significance*
Critical Value: *2.776, df 4*
Decision: *accept the null hypothesis*
Interpretation: *No significant difference*

EXTENT OF SERIOUSNESS OF PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY TEACHERS

Table 9 reveals that the overall degree of seriousness of problems encountered by teachers is Moderately Serious (MS), with a total mean of 2.21. The most serious problem identified was low learner motivation and participation (2.59), followed by technological limitations (2.47) and insufficient training and professional development (2.42). Other concerns such as large class sizes, learner diversity, and resistance to shifting from traditional methods were rated moderately serious. The overall result suggests that while challenges exist, they are generally manageable but still require attention to further strengthen the effective implementation of varied teaching styles in public elementary schools.

Table 9. *Degree of Seriousness of Problems Encountered*

Indicators	Teachers		Rank
	Mean	DE	
1. Limited instructional resources hinder the effective application of different teaching styles.	2.39	S	3
2. Large class sizes make it difficult to implement individualized and group-centered approaches.	2.12	MS	7
3. Time constraints limit opportunities to adapt and vary teaching styles during lessons.	1.86	MS	9
4. Learner diversity in abilities, interests, and backgrounds challenges the suitability of a single teaching style.	2.16	MS	6
5. Insufficient training and professional development reduce teachers' confidence in using varied teaching styles.	2.42	S	2
6. Low learner motivation and participation affect the success of learner-centered approaches.	2.59	S	1
7. Maintaining classroom discipline becomes difficult when applying interactive or delegative teaching styles.	1.67	MS	10
8. Resistance to shifting from traditional teacher-centered methods hinders the adoption of new approaches.	2.31	MS	5
9. Technological limitations restrict the use of digital tools that support modern teaching styles.	2.47	S	4
10. Heavy workload and administrative tasks reduce teachers' focus on improving or experimenting with teaching styles.	1.98	MS	8
TOTAL	**2.21**	**MS**	

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that public elementary school teachers in District IV-A, San Carlos City Division, often practice the five teaching styles—Expert, Delegator, Facilitator, Formal Authority, and Personal Model—as reflected in the overall Average Weighted Mean of 3.77. Among the teaching styles, the Facilitator style was the most frequently applied, emphasizing learner-centered instruction, while Formal Authority was the least applied, indicating a balanced approach between structure and flexibility. Teachers and school heads

showed no significant differences in their perceptions, demonstrating a shared understanding of prevailing classroom practices.

Despite being often practiced, teachers encountered challenges in implementing these teaching styles, with low learner motivation, technological limitations, and insufficient professional development rated as the most serious. Other issues such as large class sizes, learner diversity, and resistance to adopting new teaching approaches were moderately serious. These findings suggest that while the teaching styles are consistently applied, there is still room to improve their effectiveness and adaptability in the classroom.

Overall, the study indicates that teachers in District IV-A frequently use varied teaching styles to enhance student learning. Addressing the identified challenges will help strengthen these practices, ensuring that the teaching styles are more effectively and consistently implemented, thereby promoting greater learner engagement, autonomy, and academic success in public elementary schools.

REFERENCES

Abadiano, H. R., & Oroceo, J. C. (2020). Teaching styles and academic performance of learners: Basis for intervention. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *11*(15), 45–52.

Adams, M. J. (2018). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. MIT Press.

Al-Balushi, S. M., & Al-Ani, W. T. (2017). The effect of teaching styles on learner achievement. *International Journal of Instruction*, *10*(2), 21–36.

Alexander, R. J. (2020). *Policy and practice in primary education: Local initiative, national agenda*. Routledge.

Alshumaimeri, Y. A. (2019). Teacher perceptions of teaching styles in EFL classrooms. *International Education Studies*, *12*(3), 134–143.

Anderson, R. C., & Pearson, P. D. (2019). A schema-theoretic view of basic processes in reading comprehension. In *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 255–291). Routledge.

Armstrong, T. (2021). *Multiple intelligences in the classroom* (5th ed.). ASCD.

Arslan, A. (2019). Investigating the relationship between teaching styles and learner motivation. *European Journal of Education Studies*, *6*(3), 101–118.

Benson, P. (2017). *Teaching and researching: Autonomy in language learning*. Routledge.

Borich, G. D. (2016). *Effective teaching methods: Research-based practice*. Pearson.

Brown, H. D. (2018). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (7th ed.). Pearson Education.

Cameron, L. (2020). *Teaching languages to young learners*. Cambridge University Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, *24*(2), 97–140.

Dembo, M. H., & Seli, H. (2019). *Motivation and learning strategies for college success: A focus on self-regulated learning*. Routledge.

Dornyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. Routledge.

Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (2017). *Teaching and learning STEM: A practical guide*. Jossey-Bass.

Felder, R. M., & Silverman, L. K. (2016). Learning and teaching styles in engineering education. *Engineering Education*, *78*(7), 674–681.

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2021). *Better learning through structured teaching: A framework for the gradual release of responsibility*. ASCD.

Fleming, N. D., & Mills, C. (2019). Not another inventory, rather a catalyst for reflection. *To Improve the Academy*, *11*(1), 137–155.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2019). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Gay, G. (2018). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.

Grasha, A. F. (2016). *Teaching with style: A practical guide to enhancing learning by understanding teaching and learning styles*. Alliance Publishers.

Harmer, J. (2015). *The practice of English language teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson.

Hattie, J. (2017). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge.

Howard, J. W. (2018). Learner-centered learning and teaching styles. *International Journal of Instruction*, *11*(4), 125–138.

Johnson, E. (2019). *Contextual teaching and learning: What it is and why it's here to stay*. Corwin Press.

Kolb, D. A. (2015). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2016). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2021). *How languages are learned* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Marzano, R. J. (2017). *The new art and science of teaching*. Solution Tree Press.

McLeod, S. A. (2019). *Constructivism as a learning theory*. Simply Psychology. https://www.simplypsychology.org/constructivism.html

Meyer, A., Rose, D. H., & Gordon, D. (2019). *Universal design for learning: Theory and practice*. CAST Professional Publishing.

Ormrod, J. E. (2020). *Human learning* (8th ed.). Pearson.

Pritchard, A. (2017). *Ways of learning: Learning theories for the classroom* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Reid, J. M. (2015). *Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom*. Heinle & Heinle.

Robinson, K. (2018). *Creative schools: The grassroots revolution that's transforming education*. Penguin.

Slavin, R. E. (2020). *Educational psychology: Theory and practice* (13th ed.). Pearson.

Snow, C. E. (2017). *Reading comprehension: Reading for meaning*. Guilford Press.

Sternberg, R. J., & Zhang, L. F. (2018). *Perspectives on thinking, learning, and cognitive styles*. Routledge.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2017). *How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms* (3rd ed.). ASCD.

Trilling, B., & Fadel, C. (2016). *21st century skills: Learning for life in our times*. Jossey-Bass.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Walberg, H. J. (2019). Educational productivity. In J. Hattie & E. Anderman (Eds.), *International guide to learner achievement* (pp. 28–30). Routledge.

Weimer, M. (2023). *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice*. Jossey-Bass.

Westwood, P. (2018). *What teachers need to know about teaching methods*. ACER Press.

Williams, M., & Burden, R. (2017). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Woolfolk, A. (2019). *Educational psychology* (14th ed.). Pearson.

Zhang, L. F., & Sternberg, R. J. (2016). *The nature of intellectual styles*. Routledge.