ABSTRACT

The focal objective of this study was to examine the various teaching styles, learning styles, as well as the level of competencies of children with special needs in the Secondary Public schools of Zone IV, Division of Zambales during School Year 2018-2019. The aforesaid study applied quantitative descriptive research design with questionnaire as the main instrument in gathering from teacher and students with special needs. Moreover, the study revealed that the Special Education (SPED) teacher is typically female, in her early adulthood, married, master’s degree holders with almost a decade in the teaching service and few numbers of attendance to seminars and training. The Special Education (SPED) student learning style was “visual learning”. There is substantial difference on competence level when congre-gated conferring to grade level, and age. There is significant difference on the learning styles of SPED students when grouped according to grade level, and age profile. There is significant difference on the teaching styles when clustered according to sex, age, highest educational attainment, length of years in service and number of trainings. Finally, the researcher recommended that if budget warrants, the school administrators should prioritize sending teachers handling SPED class for training and seminars to keep abreast on the new trends in teaching physically handicap students; hiring legitimate and experts in SPED program should be hired for better implementation of the program is strongly encourage; to administer/conduct a parallel or similar study in order to validate and confirm the findings attained in the study.
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Background
Past perceptions of Special Education probed the capability of those children with severe disabilities to acquire learning (Blatt, 1981). Existing perspectives classically support the notion that all individuals with disability have the capacity to learn (Downing, 2008). Learners with severe disabilities can learn to independently eat, dress themselves, do basic laundry tasks, they can increase their communication skills, they can improve their social or communal skills, they can improve their safety skills and they can acquire academic skills/competencies which includes reading, writing and mathematics (Browder et al., 2009).

Likewise, research also indicates that Early Intervention (EI) has strong probability to improve children's quality of life by augmenting and improving development and preventing additional developmental delays and/or disabling conditions (Barnett, 1995). Studies direct that emotional intelligence (EI) is most likely to be operational when it is based on family priorities and ensues within the framework or context of every family routines and activities (Bruder, 2000).

Since special needs child exhibit large extent of delays in their developmental milestones especially in attention, focusing, sensory perception, fine motor, gross motor, visual perception, auditory perception, language and thinking, they develop a problem in the acquisition of their skills/competencies.

With these problems/issues, the researcher eagerly decided to conduct a research study to assess and evaluate the efficiency of a remedial program for the enhancement of prerequisite skills which can help late or those who entered school very late in the development of their literacy in written expression, reading and functional mathematics.

Significance of the Study
Basically, (SE) Special Education is the practice and application of educating children with special needs in a manner that addresses their individual distinct needs and differences.
This study is particularly important today since even there are research subsidiary well-planned and effective interventions, no one can precisely know or surely predict what children with special needs will complete/accomplish and become in the future. Besides, "there is no single intervention or program that is effective, there is no “best” or “correct” way to teach individuals with learning disabilities (Garguilo et al., 2004).

It is hoped that this study may provide the basis for enhancement of prerequisite skills toward the improvement of special child's academic and life competencies as well as in benefiting the following groups:

Department of Education (DepEd) Officials/SPED Supervisor. They could develop training/seminar programs within the Schools Division of Zambales in their challenging effort to improve the quality of Special Education (SPED) curriculum and instruction for teachers. They could also develop undertakings or efficient activities to learners based on their learning styles and further enhance their academic performance/level of competencies.

School Principal/Administrator. This would aid in managing the school especially the Special Education (SPED) students and teachers. They have the authority to review instructional materials as well as to supervise their teachers effectively in the use of different teaching methods, strategies, and styles of teaching. They could also propose an in-house training or coaching/mentoring program for teachers as well as students for an improved academic performance.

SPED Teachers and other Teachers. This would help them to be equipped to understand better their pupil's mental/developmental delays and help them handle effectively those delays in reconciling/augmenting it with their chronological age.

To create lessons and instructional materials that cater to the learning styles of their students. They would be able to assess their own teaching styles, their strengths and weaknesses and investigate possible adjustments based on the learning styles of their SPED students. They should also apprehend their learner's individual differences through the survey of their learning styles.
Pupils. This would help them identify and recognize the development process that forms the uniqueness of their own style of learning which gives them the most enjoyable & beneficial way to acquire learning. They would benefit by improving their academic performance through effective teaching as a result.

Parents. They would become conscious of what kind of learner is their son/daughter. This would help them offer the necessary support, motivation, and assistance to their children based on their respective learning styles. They will be encouraged to cooperate/collaborate with the school and teachers for the improvement of their child’s scholastic performance as well as, they will be greatly involved with their own child’s program not only in school but mostly at home.

Statement of the Problem

The primarily, this study gives premium emphasis to the various teacher’s teaching styles, student’s learning styles and level of competencies of children with special needs in the Secondary Public schools of Zone IV, Division of Zambales during SY 2018-2019.

Specifically, the research study sought answers the following specific questions:

1. What is the profile description of the teacher-respondents in terms of:
   1.1 age;
   1.2 sex;
   1.3 civil status;
   1.4 educational attainment;
   1.5 length of service; and
   1.6 Number of seminars/trainings attended

2. What is the profile of the Special Education (SPED) student-respondents in terms of:
   2.1 age;
   2.2 sex;
   2.3 grade category;
   2.4 grade level; and
   2.5 exceptionalities?

3. What is the level of competencies of SPED students?

4. How is the learning styles of SPED students be described?

5. How is the Special Education (SPED) teachers’ teaching styles be described?

6. Is there substantial difference on the level of competencies when grouped or clustered according to SPED student profile variables?

7. Is there significant difference on the learning styles of SPED students when clustered according to profile variables?

8. Is there significant difference on the SPED teacher teaching styles when grouped according to profile variables?

9. Is there significant relationship between the SPED student level of competencies and the learning styles?

Scopes and Limitations

This study dealt on the teacher’s teaching styles, student’s learning styles and level of competencies of children with special needs in the Secondary public schools of Zone IV, Division of Zambales during SY 2018-2019.

The study was conducted in two (2) months involving ninety-four (94) Special Education (SPED) pupils with disabilities. These children are among those who entered school late by their chronological age and display low level of functioning on their basic skills or that their deficits need urgent intervention.

The continuing interest and cooperation of the respondents and respondent’s parents will be an essential element in the completion of the study. For this reason, the researcher must limit the number of participants.

Furthermore, increasing the number of subjects to more than one hundred (100) is impractical by the limited potential of the subjects/respondents for development which will require one – on one laborious, tiring and time-consuming interviews, observation and teaching – learning process. In addition, this study requires careful activity planning, instructional materials preparation for each of the participants, close monitoring and recording of their progress in their area of deficits (attention, memory, generalization).

This study involved the assessment of learning styles of Special Education (SPED) children with physical and learning disabilities and their teachers’ teaching styles.

The study was tried out to all public secondary schools offering Special Education
(SPED) program within Zone IV of the Division of Zambales. Twenty-six (26) student-respondents from San Marcelino District who are studying from San Guillermo National High school and sixty-eight (68) SPED students coming from Subic National High School- Subic District. Furthermore, this study also covers various cases such as two (2) selected students with autism spectrum disorder (ASD), seven (7) Intellectual Disability (ID) and Learning Disability (LD), ten (10) students with hearing impaired, three (3) cases of speech defect, three (3) cases of visual impairment, four cases of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), four (4) with Emotional and Behavioural Disorder (EBD) and one (1) special case of chronic health problem enrolled at SPED Non-Graded class. The locale of the study were the Secondary Public Schools of Zone 4, Schools Division of Zambales offering SPED Curriculum classes namely, Subic National High School- Subic District, and San Guillermo National High School from San Marcelino District.

The independent variables would be the Special Education (SPED) teachers’ teaching styles and students’ learning styles. The dependent variable was the students’ level of competencies in their final general percentile average for the graded (inclusion) category and an Individualized Education Program (IEP) for the non-graded and transition category in setting reasonable learning goals and functional performance for a child. The target clientele of this study would be the SPED secondary students of Zone 4, Division of Zambales enrolled for the School Year 2018-2019. All private secondary schools of Zone 4, Division of Zambales was not included since the researcher limit his study on the performance of the public schools’ Special Education (SPED) teachers and learners as respondents to survey teaching styles and learning styles.

The questionnaire-checklists were used to collect data from the Special Education (SPED) teachers and student-respondents which was later entered through the internet for analysis as instructed by the author Neil Fleming’s questionnaire.

**Methods**

**Research Design**

The research method that was used in the study is descriptive method through correlational survey technique. Ormston, Ritchie, Lewis (2013) discoursed that by utilizing the descriptive method, the researcher will be able to observe a large mass of target population and create substantial required conclusions about the variables. Furthermore, the collected information from various data responses of can be statistically presented in this type of research method for the easy evaluation of the report users.

The purpose of the descriptive type of research is to distinguish, delineate, describe, and explore facets of a situation/ study (Polit & Hungler, 1995).

Descriptive means that surveys are made in order to determine some aspects of teacher’s teaching style and the word survey denotes an investigative examination of a field to discover the typical condition is obtaining (Barberos et al., 2018).

This study has two – fold goals: the primary goal is that to determine the various Styles of learning of students enrolled in the Special Education (SPED) class, while the secondary goal is to evaluate whether the teaching strategies being utilized by the SPED teacher is effective to address the specific learning styles of the child with special needs in improving its level of competencies.

Descriptive information in this study is obtained using correlation-survey. Since the aim of the aforesaid research study is primary to find out correlations of Special Education (SPED) teachers’ teaching styles and students’ learning styles with their level of competencies among the Secondary Public schools of Zone 4, Schools Division of Zambales for the School Year 2018-2019.

**Respondents and Location**

The respondents of the study would be the Special Education (SPED) teachers and students of the Public Secondary schools of Zone 4, Division of Zambales. The seventy-five (75) teacher-respondents are either classified as
SPET (Special Education Teacher) or an ordinary DepEd teacher whose teaching from mainstream regular classes but with special trainings in dealing with SPED students. The teachers that would be selected should be all full-time, regular and teaches different subjects while the students are officially enrolled either from Inclusion graded class or SPED Non-graded Program during the School Year 2018-2019. Table 1 presents the distribution of respondents per school.

Table 1. Frequency Distribution of the Subject of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAN MARCELINO DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Guillermo National High School</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBIC DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subic National High School</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study was conducted among secondary public schools of Zone 4, Division of Zambales. These include the following schools: Subic National High School- Subic District and San Guillermo National High School- San Marcelino District. Shown in Figure 2 are the locations of these schools.

![Figure 1. Map of Zambales Showing the Location of the Study](image)

Zambales is a province in the Philippines located in the Central Luzon region. Its capital town is Iba. Zambales borders Pangasinan to the north, Tarlac and Pampanga to the east, and Bataan to the south. The province lies between the South China Sea and the Zambales Mountains. With a land area of 3,700 km, Zambales is the second largest among the seven provinces of Central Luzon. It has a population density of 170 people per square kilometer, one of the lowest in the country. It is subdivided into four zones and is compose of...
13 towns from Subic District to Sta Cruz. The researcher conducted her study to all public secondary schools of Zone 4 in the towns of Subic, and San Marcelino.

**Instruments**

Because human development is based in sound research examination and experimental data collected from education psychology, child development, clinical psychology, and special education literature (Gresham & Elliot, 1990), checklist and rating scales will be going to use to gather data on the respondent’s profile. The questionnaire and checklists for both teacher-respondents and student-respondents, which were the major instrument in collecting data for this study, were constructed from different sources such as journals, references and unpublished materials from the Internet. The researcher also adapted the two instruments using the standardized test of Grasha-Reichmann teaching style survey and the VARK Learning Styles standardized tool by Neil Fleming. Both were retrieved from the Internet. To determine the child’s progress in academic competency, progress report checklist or (IDP) Individualized Development Plan is most likely to be the most applicable scale for this study.

For teacher-respondents, it comprised of two portions. The First part is on the individual Profile such as the name of the respondents, school, age, sex, educational attainment, civil status, and length of service. Part II questions are related to Grasha-Reichman five predominant styles: personal model, facilitator, expert, formal authority, and delegator.

The following five Teaching styles as description of predominant features of teacher’s presence in the classroom are:

1. **Expert** possesses know-how and experiential skill that students need. Endeavor to uphold the stature as an expert among students by displaying detailed informational evidence/knowledge and by challenging learners to build on their competence level. Also, concerned with conveying knowledge and ensuring that students are well equipped. Its primary advantage is the knowledge, and skills such individuals have but if overused, the display of knowledge can be unapproachable or intimidating to less knowledgeable students.

2. **Formal Authority** holds position among students because of the role and knowledge and role as a faculty member. Concerned with founding learning goals, providing positive and negative learner’s feedback, and rules of conduct for students. Moreover, it is concerned with the precise, suitable and standard ways to do things and with providing learners with the apt learning structure they need to acquire. Its benefits focus on strong potentials and adequate ways of doing things.

3. **Personal Model** gives emphasis on the very idea that “teaching by personal example” matters. It also establishes a prototype for how to deliberately reason and behave. The student may perceive and emulate the instructor’s style. A greater weight is given on direct observation and following a role model. Many educators see this approach as an ideal method upon directing/leading some students to feel inadequate if they cannot live up to such expectations and societal ideals.

4. **Facilitator** gives highpoints to the individual nature of teacher-student interactive communication & learning. Leads students by reasoning and asking pertinent questions, exploring an array of options, suggesting some better alternatives, and giving inspirational lesson to develop criteria to make informed life choices. Overall, the aim of facilitator is to push progress to student’s capacity for self-governing action, self-accountability, ingenuity. It if flexible in nature and focus on students’ ultimate goals and individual needs.

5. **Delegator** primarily deals with the progression of learner’s aptitude to function & work in an self-directed fashion. Student’s work self-reliantly on various projects or as part of self-directed, autonomous teams. Moreover, the teacher is available at the request of students as a resource person. Helps students to recognize themselves as autonomous learners. However, this may misinterpret students’ willingness for independent work.
The scale composed of forty (40) statements that provided the SPED teacher-respondents the opportunity to express their opinion. Each option has choices using 5-point scale as follow 5= strongly agree, 4= moderately agree, 3= undecided, 2= moderately disagree and 1= strongly disagree. The teaching style with the highest weighted mean is considered to be his dominant teaching style.

For the student-respondents, fourteen (14) statements were given to assess if they are visual, aural (auditory), reader or kinesthetic learners in multiple type of choice. This is a standard instrument based on VARK Learning Style Inventory developed by Neil Fleming in 1987 that can be downloaded free on the internet.

Neil Fleming’s VARK Learning Style Assessment Tool does not overlap Gardner’s Multiple Intelligences, or KOLB’s Theory, rather the VARK Model delivers a diverse standpoint for explaining and understanding a person’s preferred or dominant thinking and learning style and strengths.

The teaching style instrument was adapted from a standardized instrument of Tony Grasha, Ph.D, posted for public to use in the Internet. He is a Cognitive and Social Psychologist, and Professor of Psychology in University of Cincinnati.

Data Collection
The researcher sought the help of his thesis research adviser to check the construct of the instrument and waited for the go signal to administer the instruments.

The researcher requested an endorsement from the Office of the Superintendent in the Division Office to allow his conduct of his study among the public secondary schools in Zone 4, Schools Division of Zambales. In coordination with the District Supervisor and cooperation of respective principals of the different schools, the list of respondents was prepared.

The researcher also obtained permission from the parent or guardian for the target children to participate in the research.

Access to the Grade 7 to Grade 10 students’ Academic performance / level of competence was based on the records of the principal’s office for the student’s profile. The consent of the principal to access such records was also sought from the principal. After that, he sought permission to allow him to administer the instrument intended for the SPED teachers and for the randomly selected students enrolled in the SPED Curriculum. The researcher also sought the help of SPED teachers to administer the instruments and help him during the individual interviews to the visually impaired, deaf and mute students. Since the administration was done personally by the researcher, about 100% of the total instruments were retrieved and were considered for data analysis.

Informal observation and unstructured interview were done randomly among SPED teachers and students to verify doubtful information that reflect in the answers in the instruments.

Data Analysis
Descriptive Statistics were used in analysing the data of this research study. The following formula were used:

Percentage (%)
This was used to identify the percentage distribution and the frequency responses in the personal variables of the respondents such as on age, gender, civil status, year level, etc.

Formula: \[ \% = \left( \frac{F}{N} \right) \times 100 \]
Where: \% = Percentage
\[ F = \text{Frequency of a given category} \]
\[ N = \text{Total Number of Cases} \]

Mean (X)
This was used to get the average scores in the distribution especially on the age and length of service of the teachers and average grade of the students, among others.

Formula: \[ X = \frac{\sum x}{N} \]
Where: \( X = \text{Mean} \)
\[ \sum = \text{Summation} \]
\[ N = \text{Number of Scores} \]

Weighted Mean (WX)
This was used to get the average responses with regards to the assessment of the teachers-respondents per item in the instrument of teaching style and assessment of student-respondents on learning styles using the Likert scale.

Formula:  \[ WX = \frac{\sum fx}{N} \]
Where:  
- \( WX \) = Weighted Mean  
- \( f \) = frequency  
- \( x \) = assigned value/scale  
- \( N \) = Number of Cases

**Pearson Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation or Pearson-r**

Pearson r is an inferential statistic used to determine significant relationships between two variables. It is used as the comparative measures of association.

The coefficient of correlation values could be (+) positive or negative (-).

The positive value is when the compared variables are directly proportional which denotes that as the \( x \) variables increases (↑) so with \( y \) variable increases (↑).

The positive coefficient of correlation value is when compared variables are inversely proportional which denotes that as the \( x \) variables increases (↓), \( y \) variable decreases (↓) or as the \( x \) variables decreases, the \( y \) variable increases.

**Formula:**  
\[ r = \frac{\Sigma xy - \Sigma x \Sigma y}{\sqrt{[n\Sigma x^2-(\Sigma x)^2][n\Sigma y^2-(\Sigma y)^2]}} \]

Where:  
- \( r \) = the pearson product moment coefficient of correlation  
- \( f \) = frequency  
- \( \Sigma xy \) = the sum of the product of \( x \) and \( y \)  
- \( \Sigma x \Sigma y \) = the product of the sum of \( \Sigma x \) and the sum of \( \Sigma y \)  
- \( \Sigma x^2 \) = sum of squares of \( x \)  
- \( \Sigma y^2 \) = sum of squares of \( y \)

**Decision Rule**

**Correlation Coefficient Value (C) Interpretation**
- An \( r \) from ± 0.00 to ± 0.20 denotes negligible correlation.
- An \( r \) from ± 0.21 to ± 0.40 denotes low or slight correlation.
- An \( r \) from ± 0.41 to ± 0.70 denotes marked or moderate relationship.
- An \( r \) from ± 0.71 to ± 0.90 denotes high relationship.
- An \( r \) from ± 0.91 to ± 0.99 denotes very high relationship.
- An \( r \) from ± 1.00 to denotes perfect correlation.

The level of significance (\( \alpha = 0.05 \)) used is 0.05 or the level of confidence of 95%. The computed value is compared to the tabular value with the decision rule of accepting the null hypothesis if the computed value is less than the tabular value and rejecting the null hypothesis if the computed value is higher than the tabular value.

**Table 2. Descriptive Numerical Grade Rating/Level of Competence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Scale</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81 – 85</td>
<td>Improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 – 80</td>
<td>Moderately Improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 – 75</td>
<td>Grade Retained / Minimal Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Result and Discussion**

This chapter presents the gathered and processed data in a tabular form, analysed and provided interpretation in order to give a clear and better understanding on the problems asked in earlier Chapter 1.

**Test of Differences on SPED Students Level of Competencies when clustered or grouped according to profile variables**

Table 3 shows the Analysis of Variance to test differences on the SPED student’s academic performance when grouped according to profile variable.

There is no significant difference on the level of competence manifested on the computed \( P \) or significant Value of 0.511 which is higher than (> ) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is accepted. On the other hand, the computed Significant or \( P \)
values of 0.0013 and 0.026 which are lower than (<) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is rejected hence there is significant difference on the level of competence of SPED students when grouped according to grade level and age profile variables.

Table 3. Analysis of Variance to test differences on the SPED students Level of Competence when grouped according to profile variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Variations</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.744</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td>3.302</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>Reject Ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>12.069</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.813</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.513</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>3.953</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>Reject Ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>14.300</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.813</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>Accept Ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>16.654</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.813</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is enough to conclude that the SPED students have different degree level of competence. It is expected that an individual attains higher grade level and becoming older have better experience and improved the level of academic competence. (Barberos et al., 2018) says that at adolescent stage, the human brain is completely developed and can intricately assimilate complex as well as abstract thinking. Enough to say, that the younger students tend to be more focused on their academic pursuits than the older ones.

Test of Differences on Learning Styles when grouped according to SPED student profile variables

Table 4 shows the Analysis of Variance to test differences on the SPED student learning styles when grouped according to profile variable of grade level, age and sex respectively.

Table 4. Analysis of Variance to test differences on the SPED Student Learning Styles when grouped according to profile variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Variations</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>61.863</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.373</td>
<td>21.110</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Reject Ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>24.616</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86.479</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>19.842</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.921</td>
<td>6.699</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>Reject Ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>66.637</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86.479</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.322</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.322</td>
<td>1.838</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>Accept Ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>83.157</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86.479</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no significant difference on the learning styles of SPED students level of competence manifested on the computed P or significant Value of 0.182 which is higher than (> 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is thereby accepted. On the other hand, the computed Significant or P values of 0.000 and 0.003 which are lower than (< 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is rejected hence there is significant difference on the SPED student learning styles when grouped according to grade level and age profile variables respectively.

(Kharb et al., 2013) The students distinguish their preferred learning styles, which can aid them by means of appropriate learning strategies and as a result, they are more likely to become lifelong self-directed learners and maximized their optimum learning potential.

Table 3 shows the Analysis of Variance to test differences on the SPED teachers’ Teaching styles when group according to profile variables.

On the other hand, the computed Significant or P values of 0.020, 0.000, 0.10, and 0.001 which are lower than (< 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is rejected hence there is significant difference on the SPED teachers teaching styles when grouped according to age, length of years in the service highest educational attainment, and number of training and seminars attended.

(Woods, 1995) stated that learning is the acquisition and internalization of knowledge and skill. The Teacher is the facilitator of learning. The teaching and learning are a share responsibility of teacher and learner. There is more learning as learners work cooperatively and a good student-teacher interaction.

Test of Differences on Teaching styles when grouped according to SPED teachers’ profile variables

Table 3 shows the Analysis of Variance to test differences on the SPED teachers’ Teaching styles when group according to profile variables. There is no substantial difference when clustered/grouped according to sex manifested on the computed P or significant Value of 0.363 which is higher than 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is accepted.

Test of Relationship between learning styles and level of competence

Table 6 shows the Pearson r to determine relationship between the learning styles and the level of competence.
There is little relationship between the learning styles and the SPED student level of competence manifested on the computed r-value of 0.355**. The computed P or Significant Value of 0.000 which is lower than 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is rejected, hence there is significant relationship.

Table 6. Pearson r to determine relationship between the SPED student learning styles and level of competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Correlations</th>
<th>Learning Style</th>
<th>Level of Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Style</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.355**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Competence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.355**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study found out that there is a need for teachers to prepare well for these special needs children. Failure to do so will result in poor adjustments by the child and surrounding classmates. Moreover, it is also the accountability of all stakeholders in the field of education to modify & readjust the educational systems such that children with special needs can fit & appropriately catered well. Finally, it has been reiterated & given weight that the mainstream schools should not assume children with special needs to adjust to their programme. Instead, the opposite should occur (Machin, 2004).

**Conclusion and Recommendation**

**Summary**

This chapter presents the summary of the investigations conducted, the conclusions arrived at and the recommendations formulated by the researcher based on salient findings obtained in the study.

1. Test of Differences on SPED student Level of Competence when clustered or grouped according to profile variables.

There is no significant difference on the level of competence manifested on the computed P or significant Value of 0.511 which is higher than (> ) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is accepted. On the other hand, the computed Significant or P values of 0.0013 and 0.026 which are lower than (<) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is rejected hence there is substantial difference on the level of competence of SPED students when grouped according to grade level and age profile variables.

2. Test of Differences on Learning styles when grouped according to SPED student profile variables.

There is no significant difference on the learning styles of SPED students level of competence manifested on the computed P or significant Value of 0.182 which is higher than (> ) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is accepted. On the other hand, the computed Significant or P values of 0.000 and 0.003 which are lower than (<) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is rejected hence there is significant difference on the SPED student learning styles when grouped according to grade level and age profile variables respectively.

3. Test of Differences on Teaching styles when grouped according to SPED teachers profile variables.

There is no significant difference when grouped according to sex manifested on the computed P or significant Value of 0.363 which is higher than (> ) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is accepted. On the other hand, the computed Significant or P values of 0.020, 0.000, 0.10, and 0.001 which are lower than (<) 0.05 Alpha Level of
Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is rejected hence there is significant difference on the SPED teachers teaching styles when grouped according to age, highest educational attainment, length of years in the service and number of training and seminars attended.

4. Test of Relationship between the learning styles and the level of competence. There is little relationship between the learning styles and the SPED student level of competence manifested on the computed r-value of 0.355**. The computed P or Significant Value of 0.000 which is lower than (<) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is rejected, hence there is significant relationship.

Conclusion
Based on the summary of the investigations conducted, the researcher has concluded that:
1. The Special Education teacher (SPED) is a typical female, in her early adulthood, married, masters’ degree holders with almost a decade in the teaching service and few numbers of attendance to seminars and training.
2. The Special Education (SPED) student is a typical a Grade 9 male young teenager.
3. The level of competence for SPED student was “moderately improved”
4. The learning styles for SPED student was “visual learning”.
5. The teacher use “formal authority” teaching styles.
6. There is significant difference on the level of competence for SPED students when grouped according to grade level, and age profile variables.
7. There is significant difference on the learning styles of SPED students when grouped according to grade level, and age profile variables.
8. There is significant difference on the teaching styles when grouped according to sex, age, highest educational attainment, length of years in service and number of trainings.
9. There is little relationship between the SPED student level of competence and the learning styles.

Recommendations
The following recommendations are hereby given:
1. If budget warrants, Administrators of the schools should prioritize sending teachers handling SPED class for further training and seminars to keep them abreast on the new trends in teaching physically and mentally handicap students.
2. May hire legitimate and experts teachers in Special Education (SPED) program for better implementation of the program.
3. The SPED classroom shall be provided with adequate facilities and equipment for better and meaningful learning process.
4. The SPED teachers are encouraged to increase awareness and knowledge through advance readings on the nature of individual student disability for proper action and methodology of teaching.
5. To conduct a parallel or similar study in lined with LSENs in order to authenticate and confirm the findings obtained in this study.
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