

Pedagogical Approaches, Instructional Practices, and Challenges in Teaching Literature among Senior High School Teachers

Sharime V. Columna

Osmeña Colleges, City of Masbate, Philippines

Publication history: Received: July 4, 2026; Revised: August 01, 2026; Accepted: August 05, 2026

Email of Corresponding Author: sharime.columna@deped.gov.ph

Abstract

This study examined the pedagogical approaches, instructional practices, self-assessed utilization, influencing factors, and challenges in teaching literature among Senior High School teachers in Cluster 3, Division of Masbate Province. It was anchored in Constructivist, Behaviorist, and Connectivist Learning Theories and used a systems-based conceptual framework. A mixed-method design combined descriptive quantitative research with a phenomenological qualitative approach. Forty-four literature teachers from seventeen public secondary schools participated through complete enumeration, while fifteen teachers were purposively selected for interviews. Data were gathered using an adapted survey questionnaire, open-ended questions, and semi-structured interviews and were analyzed through frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, standard deviations, and thematic analysis. Findings showed that the Information-Based Approach was used most frequently ($M = 4.89$, $SD = 0.32$), followed by the Personal-Response Approach ($M = 4.77$, $SD = 0.42$). Teachers reported Proficient-to-Expert utilization across lesson stages, with the Moral-Philosophical Approach obtaining the highest overall self-assessment ($M = 3.53$, $SD = 0.43$). Retelling literary texts, checking comprehension, incorporating moral values, and identifying values from texts were practiced by all respondents. Approach selection was influenced by learner characteristics, curriculum requirements, instructional resources, professional experience, pedagogical beliefs, and sociocultural relevance. Major challenges included literacy and comprehension difficulties, low motivation and engagement, limited instructional time, large classes, inadequate resources, technology constraints, and insufficient professional preparation. The study concluded that literature instruction was competent and multifaceted but required a more coherent integration of approaches across lesson stages. It recommended adopting the Integrated Literature Instructional Guide anchored on the DepEd ILAW Framework, strengthening teacher training, and improving contextualized and multimedia resources. The study primarily supports SDG 4—Quality Education and also contributes to SDGs 9, 10, and 17 by promoting instructional innovation, equitable access to learning resources, and institutional collaboration. Its sustainability impact lies in strengthening inclusive, culturally responsive, technologically supported, and institutionally sustainable literature education.

Keywords: DepEd ILAW Framework, Instructional Practices, Literature Instruction, Pedagogical Approaches, Teacher Competence, Teaching Challenges

1. Introduction

Literature instruction is a central component of secondary education because it develops critical literacy, language competence, cultural understanding, ethical reflection, and the capacity to interpret varied human experiences. Contemporary literature classrooms increasingly combine text-centered instruction with learner-centered, collaborative, differentiated, multimodal, and technology-supported practices. However, the effectiveness of these approaches depends on teacher competence, learner readiness, available resources, institutional support, and the local conditions in which instruction occurs. The present study therefore examines the pedagogical approaches, instructional practices, self-assessed competence, influencing factors, and challenges of Senior High School literature teachers in Cluster 3, Division of Masbate Province, as a basis for a context-responsive instructional guide or module.

Literary engagement develops critical thinking, ethical reasoning, empathy, intercultural understanding, and the ability to interpret social realities (Rosenblatt, 1978; Nussbaum, 2010). It also strengthens engagement and multiple-perspective thinking in culturally diverse classrooms (Kumaran, 2018; Hämäläinen & Vesisenaho, 2020), while supporting intrinsic motivation and sustained reading (Ryan and Deci, 2017). Literature therefore functions both as an art reflecting social values and human experience (Eagleton, 2016) and as a resource for reflective citizenship. Literature further provides historical, cultural, linguistic, and imaginative value. It connects readers with past lives and cultures (Austin, 2022), develops imagination, empathy, and self-awareness (Wright, 2019), and promotes cross-cultural understanding and language growth (Sage, 1987; Povey, 1979; Collie & Slatter, 1990; Lazar, 1993). Its contribution to holistic development and authentic language learning is also affirmed by Kamarudin (1988), Maley (1989), Moody (1971) and Collie & Slater

(2001). Despite declining interest in sustained reading, literature remains relevant for understanding life, language, politics, contemporary realities, and possible futures (Tan, 2014; Low, 2014; Padhi, 2018). These benefits are reinforced by studies on imagination, empathy, critical thinking, linguistic experience, cultural understanding, and holistic learning (Wright, 2019; Sage, 1987; Povey, 1979; Austin, 2022; Febriani, Rukmini, Sofwan, and Yuliasri, 2018; Stern, 1991; Kamarudin, 1988; Mukherjee, 1976; Maley, 1989; Nesamalar et al., 1995). Effective literature instruction must address learner-, teacher-, and system-related challenges (Alvermann and Phelps, 2017), including language proficiency for communication, analysis, and argumentation (Hulstijn, 2015; Conley, 2015). Learner engagement involves behavioral, emotional, and cognitive participation (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, and Paris, 2004), while multimodal literacy requires meaning-making across linguistic, visual, auditory, and spatial modes (Kress, 2010). Inclusive instruction must also recognize cultural diversity (Banks, 2016) and multilingual learners' full linguistic repertoires (García and Wei, 2014). Senior High School covers Grades 11 and 12 under the K–12 curriculum (DepEd, 2013).

Literature instruction has shifted from lecture-recitation toward learner-centered, constructivist, interactive, and critical approaches. Sociocultural and constructivist theories emphasize active inquiry and collaborative meaning-making (Vygotsky, 1978; Bruner, 1996), while discussion, inquiry-based learning, and performance tasks strengthen interpretation and critical literacy (Ghosn, 2019; McRae, 2020). Pedagogy, the theory and practice of teaching (Twinkl, 2025), may involve constructivist, collaborative, integrative, inquiry-based, and reflective orientations. Critical literature pedagogy also encourages learners to examine assumptions, cultural norms, and power relations (Durante, 2025), supporting a more emancipatory and student-centered curriculum (Palbusa, 2021). Approach selection is influenced by examinations, learner proficiency, text choice, and instructional objectives (Hwang and Embi, 2007). Major frameworks include cultural, language, and personal-growth models (Carter and Long, 1991), with approaches serving as guides for instructional decisions (Moody, 1983; Whitehead, 1968). These include information-based instruction emphasizing factual and contextual knowledge (Savvidou, 2004), language-based instruction developing linguistic and communicative competence (Lazar, 2009), personal response grounded in reader-text interaction (Rosenblatt, 1978), paraphrastic instruction supporting comprehension through simplification (Maley, 2001), and moral-philosophical instruction promoting ethical reflection (Nussbaum, 2010). Pedagogical approaches reflect teachers' beliefs, knowledge, and practices (Freeman and Johnson, 1998), while their implementation involves questioning, scaffolding, assessment, and feedback (Richards and Lockhart, 2018). Contemporary instruction extends these approaches through reader-response (Van, 2009; Hirvela, 1996), integrated and multimodal learning (Baba, 2008; Timucin, 2001), and technology-supported strategies (Samat & Aziz, 2020). Literature circles, dramatization, creative writing, digital storytelling (Lazar, 2009¹⁵; Burke, 2013; Beach & Marshall, 2021), role-playing, affective strategies, and collaboration (Tooman, 2000; Verner, 2018) improve comprehension, motivation, and cultural awareness (Ma, Ismail, & Saharudin, 2023; Arias-Flores et al., 2022). Digital and multimodal resources expand access and engagement (Jewitt, 2013; Leu et al., 2015; Akbar & Muliati, 2022), while differentiated instruction responds to learner readiness, interests, and learning profiles (Tomlinson, 2014; Freeman & Johnson, 2018). These developments confirm the value of reader-response, multimodal, technology-infused, interactive, and reflective pedagogy (Van, 2009; Hirvela, 1996; Baba, 2008; Timucin, 2001; Samat & Aziz, 2020; Tooman, 2000; Verner, 2018; Durante, 2025; Palbusa Jr., 2021). Implementation nevertheless depends on pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987), class size, resources, and institutional support (Richards & Farrell, 2018; Avila & Miguel, 2020). Low motivation, weak reading habits, varied proficiency (Alvermann, 2017; Tupas, 2015), heavy workloads, inadequate preparation, limited materials (UNESCO, 2015; Chua, 2016), and contextual disparities remain major barriers (Bernardo, 2010; Cabanilla, 2020; Gonzales, 2021). International studies similarly report diverse approaches alongside challenges involving proficiency, training, technology, and resources (Nawawi and Mohd Kamil, 2023; Shamshul et al., 2024). Instructional organization and engagement are associated with reading performance (Language Testing in Asia, 2023), while critical-thinking instruction, production-oriented learning, reading attitudes, self-regulation, and technology influence comprehension and engagement (Sinaga et al., 2023; Liu & Xu, 2025; Fiel & Limpot, 2024). Limited preparation may also keep instruction focused on vocabulary and grammar rather than deeper literary analysis (Liu, 2022), underscoring the importance of critical thinking, cognition, and technology (Sinaga, Kadaryanto, & Aulia, 2023; Liu & Xu, 2025; Fiel & Limpot, 2024). In the Philippines, curriculum reform depends on teachers' ability to translate policy into meaningful practice (Alsubaie, 2016). Literature teachers are expected to facilitate holistic development, adapt to learner differences, and integrate motivation, curriculum knowledge, and varied techniques (Dotong, 2014; Balansag, 2018; Barberos et al., 2022). Effective instruction should address cognitive, affective, and psychomotor development (Aquino, 2003), combine appropriate strategies (Nanquil, 2020; Salandanan, 2005), and use scaffolding, modeling, local literature, visuals, and multimedia resources (Aquino, 2003; Florentino, 2014; Torrano, 2019). Collectively, these studies support adaptive, learner-centered, and technology-responsive teaching (Dotong, 2014; Balansag, 2018; Barberos, Gozalo, & Padayogdog, 2022; Nanquil, 2020; Aquino, 2003; Salandanan, 2005; Florentino, 2014; Torrano, 2019). Local evidence indicates teacher competence and flexible strategy use but also continuing needs for professional development, technology integration, resources, and greater use of underutilized approaches (Bustamante, 2022; Salaguinto, 2022; Lorenzo, 2022; Buque, 2022; Parojenog, 2020).

Globally, literature education is valued for textual comprehension, language development, empathy, intercultural communication, and critical citizenship. Yet the international literature consistently shows a gap between pedagogical possibilities and actual classroom implementation because approach selection is conditioned by student proficiency, motivation, class size, teacher expertise, resources, and technological readiness. Nationally, literature is a core element of the Philippine K–12 Senior High School curriculum, particularly in the Humanities and Social Sciences strand. The Department of Education (DepEd, 2016) identifies critical literacy, cultural awareness, and communicative competence as central outcomes. Philippine scholarship further associates literature instruction with national identity, social consciousness, and holistic development (Lumbera, 2016; San Juan, 2017; Bautista, 2019), as well as interpretive, analytical, and creative skills (Cruz, 2019; Macayan, 2021). Nevertheless, heterogeneous readiness, limited resources, and inadequate professional development remain persistent concerns (Ramos, 2018; Dizon, 2020). Uneven training, resource distribution, and curriculum enactment are also documented (DepEd, 2020), while pedagogical choices are shaped by learner characteristics, institutional support, curriculum demands, and teacher competence (Borg, 2015; Galang, 2018; Estacio, 2021). Locally, the study covers public secondary schools in Cluster 3, Division of Masbate Province, across Mobo, Balud, and Milagros. These coastal municipalities serve learners from varied rural and semi-urban socioeconomic conditions and with differing access to educational resources. Mobo, for example, relies substantially on agriculture, fishing, small-scale trade, and emerging public services (PhilAtlas, n.d.). The setting therefore provides an appropriate context for examining how provincial Senior High School literature teachers adapt pedagogical approaches to learner diversity, infrastructure, resource limitations, and institutional conditions.

The study is anchored in Constructivist Learning Theory by Jean Piaget (1972), Behaviorism Learning Theory by Burrhus Frederic Skinner (1953), and Connectivism Learning Theory by George Siemens (2005). Constructivism views learning as the active construction of knowledge through experience and reflection (Gray, 1997), drawing on Piaget (1977) and Kelly (1991). Learning builds on prior knowledge and involves revising ideas and creating meaning (Twomey, 1989) through assimilation, accommodation, and cognitive equilibrium (Piaget, 1977), while personal constructs influence how experiences are interpreted (Kelly, 1991). In literature instruction, this supports inquiry, discussion, interpretation, reflection, and teacher facilitation. Behaviorism emphasizes stimulus, repetition, feedback, and reinforcement in shaping learning responses (Skinner, 1953), while Connectivism highlights learning through technology, information networks, collaboration, and learner decision-making (Siemens, 2005). The conceptual framework follows a systems approach involving input, process, output, and feedback. Inputs include pedagogical approaches, instructional practices, teachers' self-assessed utilization across lesson stages, factors influencing approach selection, and instructional challenges. The process covers the collection, organization, analysis, and interpretation of quantitative and qualitative data. The intended output is an instructional guide or module refined through feedback and responsive to the needs of Senior High School literature teachers.

Existing research establishes the value of literature and identifies a wide range of traditional, learner-centered, critical, multimodal, and technology-supported approaches. However, much of the international evidence comes from ESL/EFL or non-Philippine contexts, and it does not fully explain how critical-thinking instruction, technology, learner dispositions, teacher competence, and contextual constraints interact in Philippine Senior High School classrooms. Although foreign studies foreground critical thinking, cognitive development, and technology (Sinaga, Kadaryanto, & Aulia, 2023; Liu & Xu, 2025; Fiel & Limpot, 2024), direct evidence on their school-based implementation in the Philippine setting remains limited. Local studies identify varied strategies and generally positive teacher self-perceptions, but they also reveal underuse of moral-philosophical, paraphrastic, and reflective approaches; limited technology integration; and weak linkage between teacher strategy use and student outcomes (Lorenzo, 2022; Buque, 2022; Parojenog, 2020). Challenges involving literacy and comprehension, motivation, instructional time, digital access, resources, and professional preparation also remain insufficiently examined as interacting influences on teacher decisions. The central gap is the limited systematic, context-specific research that simultaneously examines pedagogical approaches, instructional practices, self-assessed competence and usage across lesson stages, factors influencing approach selection, and challenges among literature teachers in provincial public schools. Addressing these dimensions in Cluster 3, Division of Masbate Province provides evidence for teacher development, curriculum support, resource allocation, and the preparation of an instructional guide grounded in actual classroom conditions.

The study aligns most directly with SDG 4 – Quality Education because it investigates how teaching approaches, teacher competence, learning resources, and context-responsive instructional support can strengthen inclusive and effective literature education. Its attention to learner diversity, language proficiency, engagement, and access also supports the equity dimension of quality education. The study also relates to SDG 9 – Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure through its examination of multimodal, digital, and technology-supported instruction and the resource conditions required to implement them. Its focus on differing access to devices, connectivity, materials, and school support further connects with SDG 10 – Reduced Inequalities by identifying instructional disparities that affect learners and teachers in provincial settings. The proposed instructional guide and the involvement of teachers, school leaders, DepEd, policymakers, and

researchers also support SDG 17 – Partnerships for the Goals through coordinated professional development, resource provision, curriculum support, and knowledge sharing.

The study contributes to educational sustainability by identifying approaches and support systems that can make literature teaching more consistent, inclusive, and responsive over time. It supports cultural sustainability because literature enables learners to engage with Philippine and global texts, identities, histories, values, and lived experiences. It also advances technological and digital sustainability by examining when multimedia and networked tools improve access and engagement and what resource or competence barriers limit their responsible use. Its relevance extends to socio-economic and community sustainability because provincial schools serve learners with unequal access to educational resources; context-sensitive teaching materials and strategic allocation can reduce avoidable instructional disadvantages. At the institutional and policy levels, evidence on teacher needs, training gaps, curriculum implementation, and resource constraints can guide professional development, school leadership, DepEd support, and localized material development. The study is therefore multidisciplinary in linking literature, language education, technology, culture, teacher development, community context, and educational governance.

The study investigates the pedagogical approaches employed by Senior High School literature teachers, the instructional practices used to implement them, teachers' self-assessed level of usage across lesson stages, the factors influencing approach selection, the challenges encountered, and the instructional guide or module that may be developed from the findings. It covers forty-four teachers from seventeen public secondary schools in Cluster 3, Division of Masbate Province. The inquiry is context-specific and based on self-reported questionnaires, open-ended responses, and interviews; it does not include classroom observation, external evaluation, student achievement measures, or broader policy analysis. Its conclusions are therefore intended to inform the participating context rather than to be generalized automatically to other divisions or regions.

2. Material and methods

2.1 Research Design

The study used a mixed-method research design to integrate quantitative descriptions of instructional practices with qualitative accounts of teachers' experiences. Mixed-method research combines quantitative and qualitative data to understand a research problem (Creswell, 2012) by drawing on their complementary strengths and non-overlapping weaknesses (Johnson, R.B., & Turner, L.A., 2003). The descriptive quantitative component examined the frequency of literature-teaching approaches, strategies used, and utilization across the motivation, lesson proper, generalization, and assessment stages. Descriptive research objectively examines existing conditions and provides facts for scientific judgment (Garcia, 2010; Calmorin and Calmorin, 2005). Data were gathered using questionnaires adapted from Rashid, Vethamani, & Abdul Rahman (2010) and Parojenog, R. C. (2020). The phenomenological qualitative component explored the factors influencing teachers' pedagogical choices and the challenges encountered in literature instruction. Phenomenology enables participants to describe lived experiences (Ohman, 2005; Moustakas, 1994) and examines how these experiences are interpreted and transformed into awareness (Finlay, 2012; Finlay, 2012, p. 12). It also identifies the nature and shared meaning of an experience (Creswell, 2013). Qualitative data were collected through open-ended questions and interviews and analyzed using Thematic Analysis.

2.2 Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in seventeen public secondary schools offering Senior High School programs in Cluster 3, Division of Masbate Province, across the coastal municipalities of Mobo, Balud, and Milagros. Mobo is a semi-rural municipality supported mainly by agriculture, fishing, small-scale trade, and public services, with many households relying on subsistence livelihoods (PhilAtlas, n.d.). Five participating schools were located in Mobo: Cristeta Bagano Memorial High School, Marintoc National High School, Mobo National High School, Polot Integrated School, and Tugbo Integrated School. Balud, with a 2020 population of 40,155 and a land area of 231.00 square kilometers, included six participating schools: Balud National High School, Briccio A. Aninang Sr. Memorial High School, Liberty P. Tacurda Sr. High School, Pedro C. Sese Sr. Memorial High School, Quinayang National High School, and Saldivar Arollado Sr. Memorial High School. Milagros, with a population of 57,538 and a land area of 565.30 square kilometers, also included six schools: Jamorawon National High School, Mary Perpetua E. Brioso Memorial High School, Masbate School of Fisheries, Melchor B. Burlaos Memorial High School, Milagros National High School, and Serafin C. Rosero Memorial High School.

2.3 Respondents of the Study

The respondents were forty-four (44) Senior High School teachers who taught literature in the seventeen participating public secondary schools. Nineteen teachers came from Balud: five from Balud National High School, two from Briccio A. Aninang Sr. Memorial High School, two from Liberty P. Tacurda Sr. High School, three from Pedro C. Sese Sr. Memorial High School, three from Quinayang National High School, and four from Saldivar Arollado Sr. Memorial High School. Fifteen teachers came from Milagros: two from Jamorawon National High School, three from Mary Perpetua E.

Brioso Memorial High School, two from Masbate School of Fisheries, two from Melchor B. Burlaos Memorial High School, three from Milagros National High School, and three from Serafin C. Rosero Memorial High School. Ten teachers came from Mobo: one from Cristeta Bagano Memorial High School, one from Marintoc National High School, two from Mobo National High School, two from Polot Integrated School, and four from Tugbo Integrated School. Fifteen of the forty-four teachers were selected for the qualitative interviews.

2.4 Sample and Sampling Procedure

Complete enumeration sampling was used for the quantitative component because all available and qualified Senior High School literature teachers in the seventeen participating schools were included. Complete enumeration examines the elements of a finite population and is appropriate when the population is sufficiently small to permit comprehensive inclusion (Ganapati et. al., 2010). It also permits an exact examination based on the complete distribution of the relevant statistic (Danius, Takis, Michaelides, 1997). For the qualitative component, fifteen (15) teachers were selected through purposive sampling. This technique is commonly used in qualitative research to identify information-rich participants capable of contributing meaningful insights into the research problem (Palinkas et al., 2015). Interview participants were required to have taught literature for at least five years and to have attended relevant literature-related training, seminars, or similar professional-development activities. To protect their identities, the participants were assigned codes beginning with P1 for Participant 1, P2 for Participant 2, and continuing in the same manner.

2.5 Research Instrument

The study used a four-part survey questionnaire adapted from Rashid, Vethamani, & Abdul Rahman (2010) and Parojenog, R. C. (2020). The first part measured the frequency of five literature-teaching approaches—language-based, paraphrastic, information-based, personal-response, and moral-philosophical—using a five-point scale from “Never” to “Always.” The second part identified the instructional strategies used under each approach and was adapted from Rashid, Vethamani, & Abdul Rahman (2010). The third part, adapted from Parojenog, R. C. (2020), assessed utilization across the motivation, lesson proper, generalization, and assessment stages using ratings from “Novice” to “Expert,” with “N/A” for inapplicable practices. The fourth part contained two open-ended questions on factors influencing approach selection and challenges in teaching literature, supplemented by interviews with selected participants.

2.6 Data Gathering Procedure

The study was developed from observations during a School Learning Action Cell session and was refined through adviser review, thesis defense, and panel recommendations. Formal approval was obtained from the appropriate Graduate School and DepEd Masbate Province authorities before surveys and interviews were conducted. Participants were informed of the study’s purpose, privacy protections, and right to withdraw, and informed consent was secured in accordance with Kumar (2005). Interviews lasted approximately 15–20 minutes and were audio-recorded with permission for verbatim transcription. Recordings were securely stored and coded to protect anonymity and confidentiality, while a reflective journal documented observations, non-verbal cues, and potential researcher bias.

2.7 Data Analysis Techniques

The study used mixed data analysis by integrating quantitative and qualitative techniques (Onwuegbuzie and Combs, 2011). Quantitative analysis summarized the data numerically (Babbie, 2010, p. 422) using frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, and standard deviations. Frequency and percentage described the occurrence and proportion of teaching approaches and strategies, while weighted mean determined average utilization ratings across lesson stages (Bluman, 2009). Standard deviation measured the dispersion of responses around the mean (Whitley E, Ball J., 2002; Vetter T.R., 2007; Wissing DR, Timm D., 2012). Qualitative responses were examined through Thematic Analysis to identify recurring patterns (Boyatzis, 1998; Elliott, 2018; Thomas, 2006), while minimizing researcher preconceptions (Morse & Mitcham, 2002; Patton, 2015). Audio recordings and transcripts were repeatedly reviewed, coded according to the research questions, and organized into themes and subthemes. The transcripts, codes, and interpretations were then rechecked to verify the findings (Sarantakos, 1998).

2.8 Ethical Considerations

The study followed the ethical standards stipulated in CHED Memorandum Order No. 15, s. 2019, otherwise known as the Policies, Standards, and Guidelines for Graduate School Programs, and Republic Act 10173, or the Data Privacy Act of 2012. Participants received information about the purpose and procedures of the study before providing informed consent. Participation was voluntary, and respondents retained the right to withdraw without penalty. Anonymity was maintained through participant codes, while audio recordings, transcripts, and personal information were securely stored and accessed only for research purposes. Interview recording was conducted only with permission, and the handling of all research data was designed to protect participants’ privacy and confidentiality.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Pedagogical Approaches Employed in Teaching Literature

3.1.1 Frequency and Pattern of Approach Utilization

Teachers frequently used all five pedagogical approaches, with means ranging from 4.11 to 4.89 and standard deviations from 0.32 to 0.49. The Information-Based Approach ranked highest ($M = 4.89$, $SD = 0.32$), followed by the Personal-Response ($M = 4.77$, $SD = 0.42$), Moral-Philosophical ($M = 4.66$, $SD = 0.48$), and Language-Based Approaches ($M = 4.64$, $SD = 0.49$), all interpreted as “Always.” The Paraphrastic Approach ranked lowest but was still used “Often” ($M = 4.11$, $SD = 0.32$). The low standard deviations indicate consistent practices across schools. The dominance of the Information-Based Approach reflects teachers’ preference for structured and practical instruction, consistent with Parojenog (2020), Hwang and Embi (2007), and Lorenzo (2022). The lower use of paraphrasing suggests that simplification is applied mainly to difficult texts without limiting deeper interpretation (Lorenzo, 2022; Liu, 2022). High use of the Personal-Response and Moral-Philosophical Approaches shows emphasis on personal interpretation, empathy, ethical reflection, and values formation (Carter and Long, 1991; Wright, 2019; Aquino, 2003), although this contrasts with Parojenog (2020). The Language-Based Approach also supported vocabulary, grammar, communication, and literary-language awareness (Sage, 1987; Povey, 1979; Collie and Slater, 1990; Lazar, 1993; Maley, 1989; Moody, 1971). Overall, teachers balanced content knowledge, language development, personal interpretation, and values education.

3.2 Instructional Practices Used in Teaching Literature

3.2.1 Language-Based Instructional Practices

Prediction was the most frequently reported language-based practice, used by 41 teachers or 93.18%. It was followed by guiding students to infer meanings from textual clues, reported by 38 teachers or 86.36%, and conducting simple language activities, reported by 32 teachers or 72.73%. Guiding students to read between the lines was reported by 29 teachers or 65.91%, while generating language practice from the text was reported by 27 teachers or 61.36%. Guiding students to express opinions and using literature primarily for language development were the least frequent practices, each reported by 25 teachers or 56.82%. The prominence of prediction and inference indicates that language-based instruction concentrates on active comprehension and analytical engagement. These results support Wright's (2019) claim that literature stimulates imagination and engagement with different perspectives. Aquino (2003) likewise identified prediction as an important cognitive strategy, while Nanquil (2020) emphasized the use of varied and engaging practices. The use of language activities also supports Collie and Slater (1990) and Lazar (1993), who described literature as a source of authentic and meaningful language input. The lower use of opinion sharing indicates that some instruction may remain teacher-directed, consistent with Lorenzo's (2022) observation regarding the continued prevalence of direct instruction. This differs from the reader-response orientation discussed by Carter and Long (1991) and Hirvela (1996), which emphasizes learners’ personal interpretations. The limited use of literature solely for language development may also mean that teachers view literary texts as resources for broader cultural, ethical, and critical learning. This interpretation supports Austin (2022) and Sage (1987), who emphasized literature’s contribution to cultural awareness, empathy, and human understanding.

3.2.2 Paraphrastic Instructional Practices

All 44 teachers or 100% reported retelling literary texts to aid comprehension. Providing written paraphrased versions was reported by 43 teachers or 97.73%, while 41 teachers or 93.18% guided students in producing their own paraphrases. Teaching from a paraphrased version was used by 39 teachers or 88.64%, and explaining stories through simple terms was reported by 37 teachers or 84.09%. Explaining figurative and ambiguous language in simple words was least frequent, although it was still practiced by 34 teachers or 77.27%. The universal use of retelling reflects teachers’ awareness that students differ in reading comprehension and language proficiency. This supports Nanquil's (2020) view that teaching practices should be adapted to learners’ capacities. Povey (1979) similarly noted the linguistic complexity of literature, while Hwang and Embi (2007) found that learner proficiency and comprehension needs influence approach selection. Providing supplementary paraphrases also represents instructional scaffolding consistent with Aquino (2003). The frequent involvement of students in paraphrasing shows that simplification is not limited to direct teacher explanation but is also used as an active comprehension exercise. However, the lower frequency of simplifying figurative language may reflect the difficulty of preserving literary quality while making complex expressions accessible. This finding relates to Liu (2022), who identified difficulty in moving from surface comprehension toward deeper analysis, and Lorenzo (2022), who observed that teachers balance traditional comprehension support with analytical and interpretive instruction.

3.2.3 Information-Based Instructional Practices

All 44 teachers or 100% guided students in identifying informative textual extracts and asked questions to check comprehension. Eliciting information from learners was reported by 43 teachers or 97.73%, while 42 teachers or 95.45% provided details about literary elements. Directly explaining the main content was practiced by 38 teachers or 86.36%. Providing background information concerning the author, culture, history, or setting was least frequent, reported by 31 teachers or 70.45%. The results confirm a strong emphasis on close reading, comprehension monitoring, recall, and the identification of literary details. These findings support Parojenog's (2020) conclusion that the information-based approach

is widely used because it is practical and structured. They also align with Hwang and Embi (2007), who related instructional choice to comprehension needs and teaching convenience, and Aquino (2003), who emphasized questioning as a strategy for developing cognitive skills. Eliciting information from students demonstrates that information-based instruction is not exclusively teacher-dominated but also permits learner participation. This corresponds with the constructivist perspective discussed by Twinkl (2025). The focus on literary elements supports Carter and Long (1991), who explained that literature teaching involves understanding textual content and structure. However, the relatively limited provision of background information contrasts with Austin's (2022) emphasis on historical and cultural learning and Sage (1987), who highlighted literature's capacity to expose readers to varied cultural experiences.

3.2.4 Personal-Response Instructional Practices

Encouraging students to express their feelings about issues in literary texts was the most common personal-response practice, reported by 40 teachers or 90.91%. Eliciting learners' personal responses was reported by 39 teachers or 88.64%, while relating themes to personal experiences was practiced by 36 teachers or 81.82%. Comparing a literary text with previously read works was least frequent, although it was still reported by 33 teachers or 75%. The strong emphasis on emotional expression indicates that teachers recognize literature as a medium for empathy, reflection, and personal meaning-making. This result aligns with Wright (2019), who noted that literature exposes readers to varied lives and perspectives, and with Carter and Long's (1991) Personal Growth Model. Aquino (2003) similarly emphasized the affective dimension of learning. Connecting themes with lived experience reflects constructivist learning because learners integrate textual ideas with prior knowledge and personal realities. Wright (2019) likewise emphasized the value of connecting experiences with texts. Comparative literary analysis was less prominent, possibly because teachers prioritized immediate emotional engagement over more demanding cross-textual analysis. This pattern aligns with Lorenzo (2022), who observed that interactive and experiential practices are used more often than independent analytical activities.

3.2.5 Moral-Philosophical Instructional Practices

All 44 teachers or 100% incorporated moral values into literature lessons and asked students to identify the values they learned from texts. Raising awareness of textual values was reported by 40 teachers or 90.91%, while guiding students to independently search for moral values was practiced by 37 teachers or 84.09%. Directly telling students the moral values presented in a text was least frequent, reported by 30 teachers or 68.18%. The universal integration of values indicates that literature teaching is strongly connected to character formation and ethical reflection. This supports Aquino (2003), who argued that education should address cognitive, emotional, and moral development. It also aligns with Sage (1987), who emphasized literature's contribution to understanding human behavior and ethical and cultural concerns. The lower use of direct moral explanation suggests a preference for discovery-oriented and reflective instruction. Teachers more frequently encouraged students to identify and internalize values rather than simply receive prescribed interpretations. This pattern supports Lorenzo (2022), who noted the increasing preference for interactive and experiential strategies over exclusively direct teaching. Literature consequently functions not only as a linguistic or comprehension resource but also as a means of developing moral reasoning and reflective judgment.

3.3 Teachers' Self-Assessed Utilization Across Lesson Stages

3.3.1 Language-Based Approach

Teachers rated themselves as "Expert" overall in using the Language-Based Approach ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 0.47$). Assessment received the highest rating ($M = 3.55$, $SD = 0.50$, Expert), followed by generalization ($M = 3.34$, $SD = 0.48$, Expert). Motivation was rated "Proficient" ($M = 3.18$, $SD = 0.39$), while the lesson proper received the lowest rating ($M = 2.98$, $SD = 0.51$, Proficient). The greatest variation appeared during the lesson proper, suggesting less consistent implementation of language analysis and inference during the central instructional phase. The strong assessment and generalization ratings indicate confidence in evaluating language interpretation and eliciting insights about textual language choices. Wright (2019) emphasized that literature develops imagination and language awareness, while Sage (1987) and Povey (1979) highlighted its rich linguistic input. Nanquil (2020) also advocated flexible strategies for meaningful language learning. However, the lower lesson-proper rating supports Lorenzo (2022), who found that Filipino teachers often depend on structured and direct instructional practices, indicating room for more consistent facilitation of deeper linguistic analysis.

3.3.2 Paraphrastic Approach

Teachers assessed themselves as "Proficient" overall in applying the Paraphrastic Approach ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 0.57$). Assessment received the highest mean ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 0.65$), followed by motivation ($M = 3.16$, $SD = 0.64$), generalization ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.48$), and the lesson proper ($M = 2.98$, $SD = 0.51$). All lesson stages were rated "Proficient," although the relatively high standard deviations in assessment and motivation indicate differences in how teachers simplify texts and evaluate paraphrasing skills. These findings show that teachers are capable of applying paraphrastic instruction but do not use it with the same confidence or consistency as other approaches. Nanquil (2020) emphasized adapting instruction and simplifying content according to learner needs, while Povey (1979) noted that difficult literary language often requires clarification. Aquino (2003) likewise highlighted scaffolding and modeling. The findings also align with Lorenzo (2022),

who observed that strategies requiring deeper cognitive restructuring, including paraphrasing, are less consistently applied than direct instructional practices.

3.3.3 Information-Based Approach

Teachers rated themselves as “Expert” overall in using the Information-Based Approach ($M = 3.35$, $SD = 0.51$). Assessment received the highest rating ($M = 3.66$, $SD = 0.48$, Expert). The lesson proper and generalization were equally rated ($M = 3.30$, $SD = 0.46$, Expert), while motivation had the lowest mean ($M = 3.16$, $SD = 0.64$, Proficient). The larger variability in motivation indicates that teachers differ in how consistently they provide information about authors, settings, and historical or cultural contexts. The high assessment rating reflects confidence in evaluating factual recall and textual comprehension, consistent with Aquino (2003). The strong lesson-proper and generalization ratings also support Carter and Long (1991), who stressed knowledge of content and structure, and Salandanan (2005), who emphasized combining strategies to facilitate comprehension and synthesis. Variability in contextual introductions is consistent with Hwang and Embi (2007), who identified resource availability, learner proficiency, and examination demands as influences on teaching choices. Austin (2022) highlighted the value of cultural and historical context, while Lorenzo (2022) documented the dominance of structured teaching in Philippine classrooms. The overall finding also supports Parojenog (2020), who identified the information-based approach as the most practical and frequently used.

3.3.4 Personal-Response Approach

All stages of the Personal-Response Approach received “Expert” ratings, producing a composite mean of 3.41 ($SD = 0.49$). The lesson proper obtained the highest rating ($M = 3.52$, $SD = 0.51$), followed by assessment ($M = 3.48$, $SD = 0.51$), generalization ($M = 3.36$, $SD = 0.49$), and motivation ($M = 3.30$, $SD = 0.46$). The closely grouped standard deviations indicate consistent implementation across classrooms. The prominence of the lesson proper demonstrates that personal interpretation, emotional expression, and discussion are most strongly facilitated during direct engagement with literary texts. Assessment also requires learners to support personal responses with textual evidence, balancing subjective interpretation with critical analysis. This aligns with Carter and Long (1991), particularly their Personal Growth Model. Relating literary lessons to life during generalization reflects constructivist principles and is supported by Wright (2019). The overall pattern further supports Wright (2019) and Carter and Long (1991), who emphasized empathy, imagination, and personal involvement in literary understanding.

3.3.5 Moral-Philosophical Approach

The Moral-Philosophical Approach obtained the highest overall self-assessment among the approaches ($M = 3.53$, $SD = 0.43$, Expert). Generalization received the highest individual rating ($M = 3.89$, $SD = 0.32$, Expert), followed by assessment ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 0.50$, Expert) and the lesson proper ($M = 3.41$, $SD = 0.50$, Expert). Motivation was rated “Proficient” ($M = 3.23$, $SD = 0.42$). The particularly low standard deviation for generalization indicates strong agreement that teachers effectively guide value reflection and the synthesis of moral lessons. The results show that moral-philosophical teaching is concentrated in reflection, ethical interpretation, and life application. This aligns with Aquino (2003), who emphasized cognitive, affective, and moral development, and Sage (1987), who connected literature with ethical and cultural awareness. Aquino (2003) and Barberos et al. (2022) further support the integration of holistic development, while Kamarudin (1988) and Maley (1989), as cited in your review, emphasized literature’s contribution to whole-person formation. The prominence of reflection also supports Salandanan (2005), who advocated the integration of multiple strategies, and Wright (2019), who associated literature with empathy and understanding of humanity. In the Philippine context, Nanquil (2020) emphasized varied approaches for holistic learning, while Dotong (2014) and Balansag (2018) described the teacher as a guide in the development of values and critical thinking.

3.3.6 Cross-Approach Pattern Across Lesson Stages

The combined findings reveal phase-dependent instructional strengths. Assessment received the highest rating under the structured Language-Based, Paraphrastic, and Information-Based Approaches. The lesson proper was strongest under the Personal-Response Approach, while generalization was most prominent under the Moral-Philosophical Approach. Thus, teachers’ competence was not distributed uniformly across lesson stages but varied according to the instructional purpose of each approach. The pattern indicates that structured approaches naturally culminate in checks of comprehension, language knowledge, paraphrasing, and factual understanding. Personal-response instruction is strongest during interactive meaning-making, whereas moral-philosophical instruction is strongest when learners synthesize ethical lessons and apply them to life. This pattern aligns with Carter and Long (1991), who distinguished language, cultural, and personal-growth purposes in literature teaching. It also supports Salandanan (2005), who argued that strategies should correspond with lesson functions and intended outcomes. Lorenzo (2022) similarly observed that structured comprehension tends to dominate traditional approaches, while experiential and reflective strategies are used for interpretive depth.

3.4 Factors Influencing the Selection and Use of Pedagogical Approaches

3.4.1 Learner-Centered Factors

Teachers identified learner characteristics as the most direct influence on instructional choices. They considered reading ability (T1), language proficiency (T21), interests and personal backgrounds (T2), emotional and social development (T34), different learning styles (T33), and students' responses and engagement during discussions (T40). These responses show that teachers modify their approaches according to learners' cognitive readiness, experiences, participation, and classroom behavior. The findings reflect a learner-responsive orientation. Barberos et al. (2022) emphasized that effective teaching recognizes individual differences and requires continuing adjustment of instructional strategies. Dotong (2014) and Balansag (2018) similarly described teachers as facilitators who respond to learner needs rather than merely deliver information. Wright (2019) supports this learner-centered approach by emphasizing that literary engagement involves varied perspectives and experiences.

3.4.2 Contextual and Environmental Conditions

Teachers reported that limited instructional materials (T5), access to technology (T7), available class time (T10), classroom environment and class size (T31), and school support and resources (T42) influenced the approaches they could implement. Even when teachers preferred innovative or interactive methods, practical conditions affected the breadth, pace, and format of instruction. These findings support Hwang and Embi (2007), who identified resources, class size, and teaching conditions as determinants of pedagogical choice. Lorenzo (2022) similarly found that technology integration and resource access remain concerns for Filipino teachers. Shamshul et al. (2024) further explained that access to digital tools does not guarantee effective implementation because institutional readiness and teacher capability are also necessary.

3.4.3 Curricular and Institutional Mandates

Teachers selected approaches that corresponded with required learning competencies (T3), school policies and curriculum standards (T23), assessment requirements (T14), and objectives involving literary analysis, appreciation, or interpretation (T30). Curriculum expectations therefore established the instructional outcomes and assessment demands within which teachers adapted their methods. This pattern is consistent with Carter and Long (1991), who explained that literature-teaching approaches are shaped by educational and curricular objectives. Salandanan (2005) emphasized that instructional strategies must correspond with learning goals. Hwang and Embi (2007) likewise identified examination orientation and curriculum requirements as significant influences on classroom practices.

3.4.4 Teacher Professional Profile and Philosophy

Teachers' personal beliefs and professional backgrounds also shaped their instructional decisions. Student-centered teaching philosophies encouraged interactive activities (T4), while seminars and training influenced approach selection (T9). Professional-development opportunities expanded teachers' pedagogical knowledge (T38), and previous classroom experience helped them determine effective approaches (T17). Student feedback encouraged reflective adjustment (T28), while exposure to contemporary practices promoted technology integration (T36). These findings show that approach selection develops through professional experience, reflection, and continuing learning. Nanquil (2020) emphasized ongoing professional growth in literature pedagogy. Lorenzo (2022) found that exposure to contemporary practices broadens teachers' strategy repertoires, while Salaguinto (2022) highlighted the contribution of training and experience to instructional competence.

3.4.5 Pedagogical Values and Learning Goals

Teachers chose approaches that promoted critical thinking and interpretation (T6), independent literary inquiry (T24), personal insight and emotional expression (T11), comprehension and communication skills (T22), creativity and imagination (T27), empathy and understanding of diverse perspectives (T39), and the long-term development of lifelong readers and critical thinkers (T44). Their choices therefore extended beyond content coverage to cognitive, affective, communicative, and creative outcomes. These priorities align with Wright (2019), who emphasized empathy and imagination, and Sage (1987), who discussed intercultural understanding. Aquino (2003) supported the holistic development of learners, while Carter and Long (1991) emphasized meaningful, learner-centered approaches. The findings indicate that teachers understand literature as a multidisciplinary resource for intellectual, emotional, ethical, and communicative growth.

3.4.6 Textual and Sociocultural Relevance

Teachers considered whether literary instruction would support discussion and collaborative learning (T13), cooperative participation (T32), cultural relevance (T16), and connections with learners' daily experiences (T37). They also selected creative practices such as role-playing and dramatization (T18) and used contextualized instruction (T29). Text complexity influenced approach selection (T19), while teachers balanced traditional and contemporary methods according to learner needs (T43). These findings indicate that teachers adjust their methods to the content, difficulty, cultural setting, and experiential relevance of literary works. Florentino (2014) emphasized contextualized and visually supported instruction, while Torrano (2019) highlighted multimedia and experiential teaching. Bustamante (2022) found that teachers use varied literary lenses to bridge understanding, and Lorenzo (2022) noted the prevalence of interactive and experiential practices in Philippine literature classrooms.

3.5 Instructional Challenges in Teaching Literature

3.5.1 Student Literacy and Comprehension Deficits

Teachers identified difficulty understanding figurative and complex language (T2), analyzing themes and symbolism (T7), and managing limited vocabulary (T13). Differences in reading-comprehension levels affected participation (T5), while some texts exceeded students' reading ability (T21) or made literary analysis appear abstract and difficult (T33). Language barriers reduced appreciation of classical works (T10), and some students depended on summaries instead of reading original texts (T24). These difficulties restrict learners' ability to move from literal comprehension to interpretation and analysis. The findings align with Liu (2022), who observed that limited language skills can prevent discourse-level engagement. Collie & Slater (2001) and Maley (1989) likewise explained that literature's linguistic value depends on learner readiness. Lorenzo (2022) also recognized persistent comprehension problems when literary texts exceed students' language capacity.

3.5.2 Student Motivation, Engagement, and Behavioral Barriers

Teachers encountered difficulty sustaining engagement with lengthy literary texts (T1), while some learners perceived literature as boring or irrelevant (T4). Preference for digital entertainment reduced interest in reading (T9). Teachers also experienced difficulty encouraging discussion participation (T11), sustaining enthusiasm (T43), obtaining personal responses from hesitant learners (T18), managing classroom distractions (T27), and redirecting students who prioritized grades over literary appreciation (T20). These findings indicate a gap between students' contemporary interests and conventional literary learning. Tan (2014) and Low (2014) observed that modern learners may regard literature as less relevant despite its educational value. Barberos et al. (2022) emphasized that motivation substantially affects learning and requires varied instructional strategies. Wright (2019) similarly argued that meaningful literary engagement depends on emotional and imaginative participation.

3.5.3 System and Time-Management Constraints

Teachers reported that limited class time restricted thorough literary discussion (T3), while balancing curriculum requirements with meaningful interpretation remained difficult (T19). Time limitations reduced opportunities for role-playing and dramatization (T25), pressure to complete competencies constrained literary appreciation (T34), and preparing engaging lessons required substantial effort and time (T37). These findings show that curriculum breadth and pacing can displace depth, creativity, and reflection. They are consistent with Hwang and Embi (2007), who related literature instruction to curriculum pacing and examination demands. Salandanan (2005) noted that time-bound lesson structures can restrict instructional flexibility. Lorenzo (2022) likewise identified curriculum pressure as a barrier to deeper and more reflective literature teaching.

3.5.4 Pedagogical, Assessment, and Institutional Demands

Teachers found it difficult to address multiple learning styles within one classroom (T8) and simultaneously support high-performing and struggling learners (T44). Assessing personal interpretations was perceived as subjective (T12), while evaluating creativity and interpretation fairly was also challenging (T41). Large class sizes hindered interactive activities (T17), and limited professional preparation in literature pedagogy affected instructional effectiveness (T32). These results indicate that effective literature teaching requires differentiated instruction, manageable class conditions, clear assessment standards, and continuing professional development. Nanquil (2020) emphasized the importance of professional learning in addressing instructional challenges. Salaguinto (2022) connected teacher competence with instructional effectiveness, while Lorenzo (2022) found that large classes and insufficient training restrict the implementation of interactive approaches.

3.5.5 Contextual, Cultural, and Resource Limitations

Teachers reported insufficient instructional materials (T6), limited books and references (T14), and difficulty integrating technology where resources were inadequate (T23). Students struggled to relate to older or foreign works (T26) and to understand unfamiliar cultural contexts (T42). Their varied cultural backgrounds also produced different textual interpretations (T31). Limited parental support affected reading interest (T35), while some learners were intimidated by poetry and complex literary forms (T29). These findings demonstrate that accessibility involves not only the physical availability of materials but also the cultural and emotional accessibility of texts. Florentino (2014) highlighted the importance of contextualized and culturally relevant teaching. Torrano (2019) noted that technological support can improve comprehension when learners face language or cultural difficulties. Bustamante (2022) similarly explained that teachers adapt literary perspectives to bridge cultural gaps. The challenges are therefore interconnected and require adaptable pedagogy, appropriate resources, effective classroom support, and coordinated institutional action.

3.6 Proposed Instructional Guide for Senior High School Literature

3.6.1 Rationale and General Goal of the ILIG–ILAW Module

The findings provided the basis for the Integrated Literature Instructional Guide anchored on the DepEd ILAW Framework, referred to as the ILIG–ILAW Module. The proposal responds to teachers' strong use of the Information-Based Approach ($M = 4.89$, Always) and Personal-Response Approach ($M = 4.77$, Always), together with the phase-dependent pattern in which assessment was strongest in structured approaches, the lesson proper was strongest in personal-response instruction, and generalization was strongest in moral-philosophical instruction. Its general goal is to improve Senior High School literature instruction through a balanced integration of comprehension, interpretation, evaluation, and reflection across lesson phases. The module addresses the finding that teachers are competent in multiple approaches but do not always integrate them into one coherent instructional flow. The term "ILIG," meaning Integrated Literature Instructional Guide, also draws from the local concept of *ilig*, which refers to cleansing, washing, or refining. It represents the refinement of fragmented practices into a unified and flexible literature-instruction system aligned with the DepEd framework.

3.6.2 Instructional Structure of the Module

The proposed module organizes instruction through Intentions, Learning Experiences, Assessment, and Ways Forward. Intentions combine knowledge outcomes involving literary information, language, and structure with affective and evaluative outcomes involving personal connections, moral insights, and philosophical judgments. Learning experiences proceed from textual exploration through the Language-Based and Paraphrastic Approaches, to contextual analysis through the Information-Based Approach, and then to human connection through the Personal-Response and Moral-Philosophical Approaches. Suggested practices include stylistic analysis, vocabulary mapping, close-reading paraphrasing, author and historical-context activities, literary-element analysis, reader-response journals, moral-dilemma analysis, and philosophical discussions. Assessment balances formative content checks, such as character mapping and plot sequencing, with authentic tasks that evaluate empathy, critical judgment, personal meaning, and philosophical insight. Ways Forward extends generalization through metacognitive reflection, contemporary social application, personal development, and community-oriented activities. This structure directly responds to the phase-dependent pattern by connecting each approach to the stage in which it can contribute most effectively while maintaining continuity across the entire lesson.

3.6.3 Instructional Contribution and Theoretical Grounding

The central innovation of the ILIG–ILAW Module is the systematic alignment of pedagogical approaches with lesson stages while balancing linguistic and factual learning with analytical, personal, and ethical interpretation. It embeds assessment throughout instruction and allows extensions to be adapted to diverse learner needs. Its intended outcomes include stronger alignment between approaches and lesson stages, improved comprehension and interpretation, increased engagement, reduced instructional imbalance, greater responsiveness to learner differences, and more reflective teaching. The module is grounded in the DepEd ILAW Framework and in Carter and Long (1991) – Models of literature teaching. It also draws on Salandanan (2005) – Multi-strategy instructional design, Lorenzo (2022) – Documented need for integrated literature instruction, and Barberos et al. (2022) – Principles of learner-centered pedagogy. The proposed model therefore translates the empirical results into a coherent instructional cycle intended to make literature teaching more integrated, adaptive, and learner-centered.

4. Conclusion & Recommendations

Senior High School literature teachers in Cluster 3, Division of Masbate Province demonstrated high utilization and Proficient-to-Expert self-assessments across multiple pedagogical approaches, with the Information-Based and Personal-Response Approaches used most frequently and the Moral-Philosophical and Personal-Response Approaches showing particularly strong implementation. Their practices emphasized comprehension checking, paraphrasing, interpretation, and value formation; however, approach utilization varied across lesson phases, with Information-Based instruction dominant in assessment, Personal-Response instruction in the lesson proper, and Moral-Philosophical instruction in generalization. Teachers' decisions were shaped by learner characteristics, curriculum requirements, resources, teaching experience, pedagogical beliefs, and sociocultural relevance, while persistent difficulties involved limited literacy and comprehension, low motivation and engagement, insufficient instructional time, institutional demands, and inadequate resources. Literature instruction was therefore competent and multifaceted but required a more integrated framework to ensure the coherent and balanced application of pedagogical approaches throughout instruction.

Senior High School literature teachers should adopt the Integrated Literature Instructional Guide anchored on the DepEd ILAW Framework (ILIG–ILAW Module) to integrate pedagogical approaches across lesson phases, strengthen instructional coherence, and address diverse learner needs. Schools should provide continuous training on the balanced use of literature-teaching approaches, particularly paraphrastic, language-based, and learner-centered strategies, while curriculum planners should develop simplified and paraphrased texts, culturally relevant and contextualized materials, and multimedia resources. Teachers should incorporate vocabulary scaffolding, guided reading, paraphrasing, comprehension support, collaborative activities, personal-response discussions, and real-life textual connections. School leaders should

ensure adequate instructional resources and institutional support for structured instructional frameworks, while future studies should evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the ILIG–ILAW Module, examine its influence on student learning outcomes, and conduct comparative investigations across regions, school contexts, and learner groups.

The study was limited to forty-four Senior High School literature teachers from seventeen public secondary schools in Cluster 3, Division of Masbate Province; therefore, its findings are context-specific and should not be generalized automatically to other municipalities, divisions, or regions. The data were derived from teachers' self-reported questionnaires, open-ended responses, and interviews without classroom observations or external evaluations and consequently represent perceived and reported practices rather than direct observational evidence. The investigation also excluded student achievement, learning outcomes, classroom-interaction patterns, and broader institutional and policy-level factors that may affect literature instruction.

Compliance with ethical standards

The study complied with applicable institutional ethical standards, CHED Memorandum Order No. 15, s. 2019, and Republic Act No. 10173. Ethical permission was obtained from the appropriate institutional and DepEd authorities. Participation was voluntary, informed consent was secured, and participants could withdraw without penalty. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained through coded identities and secure data storage. The researcher declares no conflict of interest, assumes responsibility for the accuracy and integrity of the work, appropriately acknowledges all contributions, and retains copyright ownership subject to institutional policies.

REFERENCES

- Abdul Samat, M. S., & Abdul Aziz, A. (2020). The effectiveness of multimedia learning in enhancing reading comprehension among Indigenous pupils. *Arab World English Journal*, 11(2), 290–302. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no2.20>
- Akbar, R., & Muliati, S. (2021). Multimodal approaches in literature teaching: Integrating digital and visual texts. *Journal of Language and Literature Education*, 7(2), 67–81.
- Alsubaie, M. A. (2016). Curriculum development: Teacher involvement in curriculum development. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(9), 106–107. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1095725.pdf>
- Alvermann, D. E., & Phelps, S. F. (2017). *Content reading and literacy: Succeeding in today's diverse classrooms* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Aquino, G. V. (2003). *Effective teaching*. National Book Store.
- Arias-Flores, L., Valverde, J., & Torres, M. (2022). Digital storytelling to improve reading comprehension in rural Ecuadorian learners. *International Journal of Educational Technology*, 9(3), 101–115.
- Austin, S. (2022). *The importance of literature in modern society*. Findcourses.co.uk. <https://www.findcourses.co.uk/inspiration/hobby-fun-leisure-articles/the-importance-of-literature-in-modern-society-17411>
- Baba, W. K. (2008). *An investigation into teachers' and students' attitudes towards literature and its use in ESL classrooms: A case study at a matriculation centre in Malaysia* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Leicester].
- Babbie, E. (2010). *The practice of social research* (12th ed.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Balansag, S. (2018). *Improvement of the teaching style: From traditional teacher-centered to student-centered teaching style*. GRIN Publishing. <https://www.grin.com/document/496335>
- Banks, J. A. (2016). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- Barberos, M. T., Gozalo, A., & Padayogdog, E. (n.d.). *The effect of the teacher's teaching style on students' motivation*. NYU Steinhardt. <https://steinhardt.nyu.edu/departments/teaching-and-learning/research/practitioner-action-research/effect-teachers-teaching>
- Bautista, M. (2019). Senior high school literature and student analytical skills. *Education and Society*, 37(1), 101–120.
- Beach, R., & Marshall, J. (2021). Approaches to literature teaching: Engaging learners through discussion and performance. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 60(5), 482–501. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2021.1928792>
- Bernardo, A. B. I. (2010). Class size and instructional outcomes in the Philippines. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 9(2), 123–136. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-010-9067-5>
- Bluman, A. G. (2009). *Elementary statistics: A step by step approach*. McGraw-Hill.
- Borg, S. (2015). Factors influencing teachers' selection of pedagogical approaches. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(3), 341–364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814541726>
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Sage.
- Bruner, J. S. (1996). *The culture of education*. Harvard University Press.
- Buque, J. S. (2022). Online learning strategies of senior high school students in reading 21st-century short stories. *Asian Journal on Perspectives in Education*, 3(1), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.63529/ajpe.v3i1.7661>
- Burke, A. (2013). *Literature, literacy, and language education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- Bustamante, J. A. (2022). The teaching of literature: Voices and lenses. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 21(4), 205–219. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.21.4.12>
- Cabanilla, L. (2020). Contextual constraints in Philippine literature teaching. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 35(2), 88–102.
- Calmorin, L. P., & Calmorin, M. A. (2005). *Methods of research and thesis writing*. Rex Book Store.
- Carter, R., & Long, M. N. (1991). *Teaching literature*. Longman.
- Chua, R. (2016). Professional development challenges in Southeast Asian literature classrooms. *Asian Education Studies*, 5(3), 120–136.
- Collie, J., & Slater, S. (1990). *Literature in the language classroom: A resource book of ideas and activities*. Cambridge University Press.
- Commission on Higher Education. (2019). *CHED Memorandum Order No. 15, s. 2019: Policies, standards, and guidelines for graduate programs*.
- Conley, D. T. (2015). A new era for educational assessment. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 23(8), 1–41. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v23.1983>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Department of Education. (2013). *K to 12 basic education program: Senior high school guide*.
- Department of Education. (2016). *K to 12 English curriculum guide*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/English-CG.pdf>
- Durante, P. G. C. (2025). Advancing critical literacy through critical literature pedagogy-based principles of literary education. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 83(2), 196–205. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1472539.pdf>
- Elliott, V. (2018). Thinking about the coding process in qualitative data analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(11), 2850–2861. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2018.3560>
- Fiel, Q. G. O., & Limpot, M. Y. (2024). Reading attitude, self-regulation, and technology-based instruction for effective reading: A structural relationship model in students' intercultural communicative competence. *Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies*, 7(2), 344–357.
- Finlay, L. (2012). Unfolding the phenomenological research process: Iterative stages of “seeing afresh.” *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 53(2), 172–201. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022167812453877>
- Florentino, L. O. (2014). Integrating local literature in teaching English to first graders under K–12 curriculum. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(7), 1344–1351. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.7.1344-1351>
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59–109. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
- Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(3), 397–417. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588114>
- Garcia, C. D., & Reganit, A. R. (2010). *Developing competencies in research and thesis writing*. Books Atbp. Publishing.
- García, O., & Li Wei. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gray, A. J. (1997). *Constructivist teaching and learning* (SSTA Research Centre Report No. 97-07). Saskatchewan School Trustees Association. <https://saskschoolboards.ca/wp-content/uploads/97-07.htm>
- Hirvela, A. (1996). Reader-response theory and ELT. *ELT Journal*, 50(2), 127–134. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/50.2.127>
- Ho, E. S. C., & Gan, L. (2023). Instructional practices and students' reading performance: A comparative study of 10 top-performing regions in PISA 2018. *Language Testing in Asia*, 13, Article 48. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-023-00261-1>
- Hulstijn, J. H. (2015). *Language proficiency in native and non-native speakers: Theory and research*. John Benjamins.
- Hwang, D., & Embi, M. A. (2007). Approaches employed by secondary school teachers to teaching the literature component in English. *Jurnal Pendidik dan Pendidikan*, 22, 1–23.
- Jewitt, C. (2013). *Multimodal literacy*. Routledge.
- Johnson, R. B., & Turner, L. A. (2003). Data collection strategies in mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp. 297–319). Sage.
- Kamarudin, H. H. (1988). *Kaedah pengajaran kesusasteraan*. Penerbit Fajar Bakti.
- Kelly, G. A. (1991). *The psychology of personal constructs: Vol. 1. A theory of personality*. Routledge. (Original work published 1955)
- Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. Routledge.
- Kumar, R. (2005). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Lazar, G. (1993). *Literature and language teaching: A guide for teachers and trainers*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511733048>
- Lazar, G. (2009). *Literature and language teaching: A guide for teachers and trainers*. Cambridge University Press.

- Leu, D. J., Forzani, E., Rhoads, C., Maykel, C., Kennedy, C., & Timbrell, N. (2015). The new literacies of online research and comprehension: Rethinking the reading achievement gap. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 50(1), 37–59. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.85>
- Liu, X., & Xu, L. (2025). Applying the Production-Oriented Approach to extended reading in senior high school English. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 8(9), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2025.8.9.1>
- Liu, Y. (2022). A literature review of English discourse teaching in senior high school. *International Journal of Education and Humanities*, 4(1), 26–29. <https://doi.org/10.54097/ijeh.v4i1.1155>
- Lorenzo, A. A. (2022). Strategies in teaching 21st century literature: Results from a systematic review of literature. *E-DAWA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.56901/SEEN3426>
- Ma, L., Ismail, L., & Saharuddin, N. (2023). Effectiveness of literature circles in developing English language reading ability: A systematic review. *English Language Teaching*, 16(7), 47–58. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v16n7p47>
- Maley, A. (2001). Literature in the language classroom. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 180–185). Cambridge University Press.
- Maley, A., & Duff, A. (1990). *Literature*. Oxford University Press.
- Michaelides, D. T. (1997). *Exact tests via complete enumeration: A distributed computing approach* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Southampton].
- Moody, H. L. B. (1971). *The teaching of literature*. Longman.
- Moody, H. L. B. (1983). Approaches to the study of literature: A practitioner's view. In C. J. Brumfit (Ed.), *Teaching literature overseas: Language-based approaches* (pp. 17–36). Pergamon Press.
- Morse, J. M., & Mitcham, C. (2002). Exploring qualitatively-derived concepts: Inductive–deductive pitfalls. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 1(4), 28–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690200100404>
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Sage.
- Nanquil, L. M. (2020). Perspectives, practices, and insights on the teaching of literature: A reflective narrative. *MEXTESOL Journal*, 44(3), 1–10. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1311054>
- Nawawi, N. N., & Mohd Kamil, F. (2023). The teacher's approaches in teaching English literature component: A systematic literature review. *Jurnal Evolusi*, 4(1), 20–41. <https://doi.org/10.61688/jev.v4i1.59>
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2010). *Not for profit: Why democracy needs the humanities*. Princeton University Press.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Combs, J. P. (2011). Data analysis in mixed research: A primer. *International Journal of Education*, 3(1), Article E13. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ije.v3i1.618>
- Padhi, P. K. (2018). The relevance of reading literature in the 21st century. *International Journal of Management, Technology and Engineering*, 8(9), 2089–2094. <https://ijamtes.org/gallery/264.%20sept%20ijmte%20-%201059.pdf>
- Palbusa, M. Y., Jr. (2021). Senior high school as critical pedagogy. *Asian Journal of Contemporary Education*, 5(1), 34–44. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1351547.pdf>
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42(5), 533–544. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y>
- Parojenog, R. C. (2020). Approaches in teaching literature employed by senior high school teachers. *IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 2(2), 52–58. <https://doi.org/10.54476/iiimrj366>
- Patil, G. P., Gore, S. D., & Taillie, C. (2011). *Composite sampling: A novel method to accomplish observational economy in environmental studies*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-7628-4>
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Sage.
- PhilAtlas. (n.d.). *Mobo, Province of Masbate*. <https://www.philatlas.com/luzon/bicol/masbate/mobo.html>
- Piaget, J. (1977). *The development of thought: Equilibration of cognitive structures* (A. Rosin, Trans.). Viking Press.
- Povey, J. F. (1979). The teaching of literature in advanced ESL classes. In M. Celce-Murcia & L. McIntosh (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 162–186). Newbury House.
- Rashid, R. A., Vethamani, M. E., & Abdul Rahman, S. B. (2010). Approaches employed by teachers in teaching literature to less proficient students in Form 1 and Form 2. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 87–99. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v3n4p87>
- Republic Act No. 10173. (2012). *Data Privacy Act of 2012* (Phil.).
- Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers: Strategies for teacher learning*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667237>
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. Guilford Press.

- Sage, H. (1987). *Incorporating literature in ESL instruction* (Language in Education: Theory and Practice No. 66). Prentice Hall.
- Salaguinto, R. J. (2024). Teacher's competence in teaching 21st century literature: Basis for faculty development program. *Studies in Technology and Education*, 2(2), 52–58. <https://doi.org/10.55687/ste.v2i2.57>
- Salandanan, G. G. (2005). *Teaching and the teacher*. Lorimar Publishing.
- Sarantakos, S. (1998). *Social research* (2nd ed.). Macmillan.
- Savvidou, C. (2004). An integrated approach to teaching literature in the EFL classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 10(12). <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Savvidou-Literature.html>
- Shamshul, I. S. M., Ismail, H. H., & Nordin, N. M. (2024). Using digital technologies in teaching and learning of literature in ESL classrooms: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 23(4), 180–194. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.4.10>
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.57.1.j463w79r56455411>
- Siemens, G. (2005). Connectivism: A learning theory for the digital age. *International Journal of Instructional Technology & Distance Learning*, 2(1), 3–10. https://www.itdl.org/Journal/Jan_05/article01.htm
- Sinaga, T., Kadaryanto, B., & Aulia, N. (2023). Indonesian high school students' critical thinking and literary text comprehension. *ELE Reviews: English Language Education Reviews*, 3(2), 155–171. <https://doi.org/10.22515/elereviews.v3i2.7621>
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. Macmillan.
- Thomas, D. R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27(2), 237–246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214005283748>
- Timucin, M. (2001). Gaining insights into alternative teaching approaches employed in an EFL literature class. *CAUCE*, 24, 269–293.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners* (2nd ed.). ASCD.
- Tooman, T. (n.d.). *Affective learning: Activities to promote values comprehension*. Soulstice Training. <https://www.soulsticetraining.com/commentary/affective-learning-activities-to-promote-values-comprehension/>
- Torrano, L. (2019). Use of audio-video recordings to enhance teaching of Philippine literature to Grade 7 students of Rosario National High School. *Ascendens Asia Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Abstracts*, 3(2K). <https://ojs.aaresearchindex.com/index.php/AAJMRA/article/view/7583>
- Twinkl. (2025). *What are the five pedagogical approaches?* <https://www.twinkl.com/ph/teaching-wiki/five-pedagogical-approaches>
- Twomey Fosnot, C. (1989). *Enquiring teachers, enquiring learners: A constructivist approach for teaching*. Teachers College Press.
- UNESCO. (2015). *Education for all 2000–2015: Achievements and challenges*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000232205>
- Van, T. T. M. (2009). The relevance of literary analysis to teaching literature in the EFL classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 47(3), 2–9. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ923454>
- Verner, S. (n.d.). *Today a reader, tomorrow a leader: Strategies for teaching literature in the ESL classroom*. BusyTeacher. <https://busyteacher.org/6504-strategies-teachingliteratureesl-classroom.html>
- Vetter, T. R. (2017). Descriptive statistics: Reporting the answers to the 5 basic questions of who, what, why, when, where, and a sixth, so what? *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, 125(5), 1797–1802. <https://doi.org/10.1213/ANE.0000000000002471>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Whitehead, R. (1968). *Children's literature: Strategies of teaching*. Prentice-Hall.
- Whitley, E., & Ball, J. (2002). Statistics review 1: Presenting and summarising data. *Critical Care*, 6(1), 66–71. <https://doi.org/10.1186/cc1455>
- Wissing, D. R., & Timm, D. (2012). Statistics for the nonstatistician: Part I. *Southern Medical Journal*, 105(3), 126–130. <https://doi.org/10.1097/SMJ.0b013e3182498ad5>
- Wright, D. (2019). *Why read literature?* Memoria Press. <https://www.memoriapress.com/articles/why-read-literature/>
- Öhman, A. (2005). Qualitative methodology for rehabilitation research. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine*, 37(5), 273–280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16501970510040056>