

Exploring the Self-Perceptions of Filipino Teachers on Their Community Engagement Competency

Patricia A. Santos^{1*}

¹University of the Philippines Integrated School, Philippines

*e-mail: psantos.research@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Community engagement (CE) is a necessary teacher competency. Given its importance, this research aims to assess the self-perceptions of Filipino teachers on their CE competency and see if there are significant differences in their assessment based on different factors. Using a researcher-made survey, teacher participants were asked to rate how well they demonstrated each action statement in the instruments based on their perception of their community engagement competency from the School Year 2019 – 2020. Comparisons on the total community engagement scores were then compared based on the school type, grade level assignment, and length of teaching service. Results showed that Filipino teacher survey respondents (n=31) perceived themselves to be able to demonstrate the identified CE behavioral indicators, and their identified highest and lowest-rated behavioral indicators may be used as a springboard for further training needs analyses for CE professional development inputs. Statistical analyses showed no significant differences in the CE scores of the respondents based on all the identified factor groupings. This study aims to contribute to measuring CE competency among Filipino teachers.

Keywords:

Community Engagement; Teacher Competency; Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers.

ABSTRAK

Keterlibatan masyarakat (PK) merupakan kompetensi guru yang penting. Mengingat pentingnya hal ini, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menilai persepsi diri guru Filipina terhadap kompetensi PK mereka dan melihat apakah ada perbedaan signifikan pada penilaian mereka berdasarkan berbagai faktor.

Dengan menggunakan survei yang dibuat oleh peneliti, peserta guru diminta untuk menilai seberapa baik mereka menunjukkan setiap pernyataan tindakan dalam instrumen berdasarkan persepsi mereka terhadap kompetensi keterlibatan masyarakat mereka sendiri dari Tahun Ajaran 2019 – 2020. Perbandingan pada total skor keterlibatan masyarakat kemudian dibandingkan berdasarkan jenis sekolah, penugasan tingkat kelas, dan lamanya layanan mengajar. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa responden survei guru Filipina (n=31) menganggap diri mereka mampu menunjukkan indikator perilaku PK yang teridentifikasi dan indikator perilaku dengan peringkat tertinggi dan terendah yang teridentifikasi dapat digunakan sebagai batu loncatan untuk analisis kebutuhan pelatihan lebih lanjut untuk masukan pengembangan profesional PK. Analisis statistik menunjukkan bahwa tidak ada perbedaan signifikan dalam skor PK responden berdasarkan semua pengelompokan faktor yang teridentifikasi. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk berkontribusi pada pengukuran kompetensi PK di antara guru Filipina.

Kata kunci:

Keterlibatan Masyarakat; Kompetensi Guru; Standar Profesional Guru Filipina.

1. Introduction

Teachers' engagement with the school community is evident in-home visits, school program coordination, and, more importantly, in building partnerships that enable students to bridge classroom learning genuinely enable students to bridge classroom learning to the broader community. The challenge of assessing competence in community engagement and professional linkages is more significant now than ever. Given the challenges presented by this new learning decade and the transition to the 'new normal,' collaboration and systemic planning are essential. This is where teachers' competence in community engagement and professional linkages may act as enabling conditions for their active participation in and co-creation of educational practices responsive to the school community's contextual learning and teaching needs. After all, teachers' CE competence is crucial in a school's overall responsiveness (Sanders & Galindo, 2014). It is also important to compare the different definitions of CE, as it is a type of teacher competence, and teacher competencies are multi-faceted": Added a comma and rephrased for clarity and smoothness (Borg, Clifford, & Htut, 2018).

In the Philippine context, the implementation of DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017, or the National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Standards for Teachers (PPST), set the motion for standardizing teachers' professional competencies across different career stages. CE is subsumed under its sixth domain. Domain 6: Community Linkages and Professional Engagement states that:

[Teachers need to] establish school-community partnerships to enrich the learning environment and the community's engagement in the educative process. They identify and

respond to opportunities that link teaching and learning in the classroom to the experiences, interests, and aspirations of the wider school community and other key stakeholders. They understand and fulfill their obligations in upholding professional ethics, accountability, and transparency to promote professional and harmonious relationships with learners, parents, schools and the wider community (DepEd, 2017, p. 5).

Table 1. Summary of CE competencies from the literature review

Miller, Mehta, and McCauley (2018)	Atilas, 2018	UNICEF, 2020	Srinivas, Meenan, Drogin, DePrince (2015)	Queensland Government (n.d.)
Factors for Community Engagement 1. Personal Development that includes improved problem-solving, decision-making, communication skills, and an increased sense of self-efficacy (Petray and Halbert, 2013) 2. Social Responsibility is the ability to feel concerned about the welfare of others and to act on those concerns (Olney and Grande, 1995).	Core Competencies: 1. Program planning and implementation 2. Communication skills 3. Leadership 4. Education and information technology 5. Diversity, pluralism, and multiculturalism 6. Professionalism 7. Extension and organizational management 8. Program evaluation and research 9. Technical expertise 10. Collaborative learning 11. Systems thinking	Common Minimum Standards: 1. Participation 2. Empowerment and ownership 3. Inclusion 4. Communication 5. Adaptability and localization 6. Building on local capacity	Dimensions of Measuring Community Organization Perceptions of Partnership Benefits and Costs 1. Overall experience 2. Social capital 3. Skills and competencies 4. Motivation and commitment 5. Personal growth and self-concept 6. Knowledge 7. Organizational operations 8. Organizational resources	Elements of Parent and Community Engagement Framework 1. Communication 2. Partnership with parents 3. Community collaboration 4. Decision-making 5. School culture

With these rationalizations for CE, it may be said that it is an essential teacher skill that must be measured and evaluated appropriately to develop it as a professional competency further. In terms of reviewing the literature regarding factors that affect teacher performance, there is a rich body of literature that covers comparisons of teacher performance using different measures. Among these are comparisons conducted to establish differences in teaching competencies among public and private school teachers and analyses examining how the length of teaching experience affects instructional

effectiveness. In the literature survey, it was observed that there is a lack of available data that directly measures the CE competencies of teachers and compares quantitative teaching performance using different factor groupings such as school type, grade level assignment, and length of service. This is particularly true in examining CE using the recently implemented PPST in the local setting. As such, related works that show comparisons of teacher performances using the factor groups of school type, grade level assignment, and length of teaching service are discussed in the context of how teaching performance affects student performance in these settings.

In a report to The World Bank, Lockheed and Jimenez (1995) discussed the robustness of public school education compared to its private counterpart regarding student achievement per unit cost in developing countries. It was noteworthy that despite this significant finding that indicates a statistical difference in student achievement on the student achievement of public and private school students, Lockheed and Jimenez (1995) found that the teacher, as an influencing variable, had little to no effect on the observed phenomenon. They further explained that:

Holding student background characteristics constant, few school, classroom, or teaching practice variables are statistically significant. After holding constant these variables, one would expect that some of the private school advantage would disappear. After all, these differences in teacher characteristics and teaching practice may account for a portion of that advantage. However, it does not disappear, indicating that there are unmeasured practices, teacher characteristics, or factors that motivate teacher performance that account for a residual impact (Lockheed & Jimenez, 1995, pp. 96 – 98).

On the other hand, Khan, Omar-Fauzee, and Daud (2016) uncovered that teacher performance is better in private schools than in government-run public schools in Pakistan. This apparent difference in conclusions between the broader study and the locally focused research showed that variability in terms of teacher performance may be demonstrated in public and private school settings.

In understanding the differences in teaching performances using grade-level teaching assignments as a comparison lens, it was noted that the available literature pointed to the differences between perceptions of self-efficacy and assessment strategies implemented by elementary and middle school teachers. Midgley, Anderman, and Hicks (1995) found out “that middle school teachers feel significantly less productive than elementary teachers do (p. 106), while Randall & Engelhard (2009) concluded that differences in grading practices among elementary and middle school teachers may be linked to context-specific student behavior and effort. Given these two data points that compare teaching performance using different measures, it may be argued that grade-level assignments somehow dictate the environment in which the teachers demonstrate their teaching competencies (Department of Education, 2017).

In terms of establishing how teaching experience affects teacher effectiveness, the literature showed divergent views, especially when instructional effectiveness, as measured by the effects of the length of teaching service to test results specific to an academic discipline, was focused on. Dial (2008) found that the length of teaching experience significantly affected student achievement in communication arts and math. This corroborated with an earlier study by Harris & Sass (2007) that focused on the teaching experiences of elementary and middle school teachers and its policy implications for teacher hiring and retention. They wrote that:

Our finding (and that of others) that experience greatly affects the productivity of elementary and middle school teachers early in their career indicates that policies to promote retention of young teachers can yield significant benefits over and above the cost of hiring new teachers (Harris & Sass, 2007, p. 31).

Despite the evidence supporting the effect of length of teaching on student achievement, Kini and Podolsky (2016) explained their research limitation in generalizing the observed trend. They wrote that:

Of course, there is a variation in teacher effectiveness at every stage of a teaching career, so not every inexperienced teacher is less effective, and not every experienced teacher is more effective. Our research does not indicate that the passage of time will make all teachers better or incompetent teachers effective. However, it does indicate that, for most teachers, experience increases effectiveness (Kini & Podolsky, 2016, p. 1).

Given this main limitation from the previous research, it is worth exploring if CE competency follows the same patterns demonstrated by teaching effectiveness or if teachers' self-perception of their ability to demonstrate CE competence will directly or indirectly correlate with demographic data groupings.

Having outlined the previous works that explained CE as a teacher competency and comparisons of teacher performances using different demographic criteria, it is argued that a research gap exists in line with understanding how the demographics affect the demonstration or perception of CE competency among teachers. Therefore, this research is focused on understanding how Filipino teachers assess their own CE competency and exploring demographic data grouping to determine if there are significant differences among the CE self-assessment scores based on school types, teaching assignments, and length of teaching services. Below are the main research questions:

1. How do teachers rate their community engagement (CE) competency based on their teaching experience during the School Year 2019- 2020?
 - a. Which action statements are rated the highest?
 - b. Which action statements are rated the lowest?
2. Are there significant differences in the self-rated CE scores of teachers when comparisons are done using school types, teaching assignments, and length of teaching services?
 - a. Is there a significant difference between the self-rated CE scores of teachers who teach in public and private schools?
 - b. Is there a significant difference between the self-rated CE scores of teachers based on their grade level teaching assignments?
 - c. Is there a significant difference between the self-rated CE scores of teachers based on their length of teaching service?

2. Methods

2.1. Procedure

To accomplish the objectives of the research, quantitative research strategies are employed in this study. A researcher-made instrument was used as the primary tool for data gathering. The instrument consisted of 21-action statements to measure the teachers' perceptions of their competency in CE which was developed following the procedures of exploratory factory analysis (Baş & Kubiato,

2016). Pilot testing of the instrument yielded a Cronbach alpha value of 0.94, which corresponded to a high internal consistency of the items within the survey (Wadkar, Singh, Chakravarty & Argade 2016).

The study was conducted with a diverse group of who voluntarily chose to be part of the sample ($n = 31$). Participants were recruited from an open call for survey respondents posted publicly on social media. Consequently, convenience sampling was used in this research. Informed consent was obtained from all participants for their involvement in the scale development study. Specific details on the purpose of the study, voluntary participation, data collection procedures, communication process, benefits and risks, confidentiality, and opt-out options were outlined in the first part of the survey, and agreement to these was a prerequisite before proceeding with the online survey. Each participant was free to complete the survey during the data collection period from August 3 to 14, 2020.

After the data collection period, the information gathered was exported to PSPP for data analysis. The program version used for this study was GNU pspp 1.4.1-g79ad47. To facilitate data processing in PSPP, the 21 items from the survey instrument were encoded as numeric variables with a scale measure. Descriptive statistics using frequencies were calculated to determine the mean and standard deviation for each of the 21 statements, which were then used to identify the highest and lowest-rated items. Demographic questions on school type, teaching assignments, and length of service were encoded as nominal variables and used as grouping and factor determinants in comparing the different means of the sample based on the second research question. Additionally, the T-Test for Independent Means and One-Way ANOVA were conducted to individually analyze the comparisons outlined in the second research question (Rojewski, Lee, & Gemici, 2012).

2.2 Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using appropriate statistical tools to answer the research questions. First, to determine how the teachers rated their own CE competency, descriptive statistics, including analyses of the mean scores for each item in the instrument and computations of standard deviations to determine the aggregate rating of the CE competency of the sample population and to identify which action statements are rated highly and lowly by the respondents.

Second, the next research question entailed using a mean comparison of the total community engagement scores based on the grouping categories of school type, grade level teaching assignment, and length of service. The total community engagement scores for each survey respondent were obtained by getting the sum of each item's scores in the instrument. For the first grouping category, a T-Test for Independent Means was done to determine if a significant difference occurs between public and private school teachers regarding how they rate their CE competency. As for the grouping categories for grade level teaching assignment and length of service, One-Way ANOVA was conducted for each sub-research question with its corresponding demographic grouping as factors. The statistical tests used in this study were benchmarked at the 0.05 significance level.

3. Results and Discussion

The main respondents of this study were teachers who were in active teaching service for the School Year 2019 – 2020. They were conveniently sampled through an online call for survey participants using social media platforms. Below are tables summarizing the demographics of the study respondents based on school type, teaching assignment, and length of service.

Table 2. Summary of respondent demographics based on school type

SCHOOL TYPE	Frequency	Percent
Private	11	35.50
Public	20	64.50
Total	31	100.00

Table 3. Summary of respondent demographics based on teaching assignment

TEACHING ASSIGNMENT FOR SY 2019 - 2020	Frequency	Percent
Elementary	12	38.70
Junior High School	8	25.80
Senior High School	11	35.5
Total	31	100.00

Table 4. Summary of respondent demographics based on length of teaching service

YEARS IN SERVICE (TEACHING)	Frequency	Percent
1 - 5 Years	16	15.80
6 – 10 Years	6	19.40
11 – 15 Years	5	16.10
More than 15 Years	3	9.70
Total	31	100.00

As a teacher competency, CE is a multi-faceted domain that may be operationalized using different behavioral indicators. Below is a table summarizing the mean, standard deviation, and corresponding verbal interpretations for each action statement in the survey.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistical Results for Each Action Statement in The Survey Instrument

Action Statement	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
1. I understand the context of my school community and its opportunities and social issues.	31	4.35	.75	Agree
2. I can positively contribute to the community by using my skills and applying my professional training as an educator.	31	4.48	.72	Agree

3. I build partnerships with diverse stakeholders (students, parents, businesses, NGOs, academics, etc.) in the community to rally them to work for educational goals	31	3.90	1.08	Agree
4. I communicate intentionally and clearly with different stakeholders.	31	3.87	.81	Agree
5. I have sufficient knowledge and training in managing a project	31	3.97	1.05	Agree
6. I participate in trainings that aim to develop community capabilities in community-based activities and projects for the school community.	31	3.97	.98	Agree
7. I abide by the professional code of ethics in fulfilling my responsibilities to the school community.	31	4.68	.48	Strongly Agree
8. I design lessons and do projects anchored on the community context.	31	4.32	.70	Agree
9. I can demonstrate my leadership skills by heading and participating in school community projects.	31	3.87	1.12	Agree
10. I involve community stakeholders in class or school activities or projects to develop students' sense of community.	31	4.00	1.06	Agree
11. I use different channels and mediums of communication to reach out to most, if not all, of the community stakeholders.	31	4.10	.87	Agree
12. I can effectively plan, execute, and evaluate a school community activity or project.	31	3.84	1.00	Agree
13. I plan for the sustainable community adaption of existing school or community projects.	31	3.52	1.15	Agree
14. I show respect to the people I work with despite having different opinions, perspectives, and backgrounds.	31	4.65	.55	Strongly Agree
15. I consider how different stakeholders may be positively or negatively affected by an action.	31	4.48	.68	Agree
16. I act accordingly to address the needs I observe in my school community.	31	4.16	.90	Agree
17. I take on and share responsibilities for a community project with teammates or stakeholders.	31	4.16	.90	Agree
18. I can solicit feedback and sustain communications with partners regarding community concerns and projects.	31	3.81	.91	Agree
19. I use strategies to secure funding and generate resources for a school community activity or project.	31	3.39	1.26	Neither Agree nor Disagree
20. I inspire other people to initiate and join in activities and projects for the school community.	31	3.77	.99	Agree
21. I am transparent and accountable for all my actions.	31	4.65	.61	Strongly Agree
AVERAGE	31	4.09	.36	Agree

3.1 Filipino Teachers' Self-Assessment of Their CE Competency

As observed from the results, the survey respondents perceived that they could demonstrate competency in CE as outlined by the behavioral indicators in the instrument. It may be inferred from the data that the participants understood the importance of CE in their role as educators. Further analysis revealed that the top-rated action statement abided by the professional code of ethics. Using

strategies to generate funding for a school community project had the lowest mean score. Below is a table summarizing the top highest and lowest-rated statements:

Table 6. Highest and lowest-rated CE action statements

HIGHEST RATED STATEMENTS			LOWEST RATED STATEMENTS		
Action Statement	n	Mean Rank	Action Statement	n	Mean Rank
7. I abide by the professional code of ethics in fulfilling my responsibilities to the school community.	31	4.68	1	19. I use strategies to secure funding and generate resources for a school community activity or project.	31 3.39 21
14. I show respect to the people I work with despite having different opinions, perspectives, and backgrounds.	31	4.65	2	13. I plan for the sustainable community adaption of existing school or community projects.	31 3.52 20
21. I am transparent and accountable for all my actions.	31	4.65	2	20. I inspire other people to initiate and join in activities and projects for the school community.	31 3.77 19
2. I can positively contribute to the community by using my skills and applying my professional training as an educator.	31	4.48	4		
15. I consider how different stakeholders may be positively or negatively affected by an action.	31	4.48	4		

Overall, the teacher respondents (n=31) generally agree (mean = 4.09 SD = .36) that they can demonstrate CE competence based on the statements listed on the tool. This shows that they perceive themselves as being generally able to do CE in the context of their school communities.

In examining the behavioral indicators listed above, it is noted that the top-rated statements are those explicitly outlined in the PPST domain of community linkages and professional engagement, such as abiding by the professional code of ethics and being transparent and accountable for one's actions. On the other hand, the lowest-rated statements pertain to skills highly related to project management (Department of Education, 2019). Going back to the literature review, it may be noted that the national policy outlined by the PPST contributes greatly to how Filipino teachers understand what CE entails. They may, by default, assess themselves based on the different sub-indicators under its CE domain. However, the other facets of CE as a competency, as outlined by Miller, Mehta, and McCauley (2018), Atilas (2018), and Srinivas, Meenan, Drogin, DePrince (2015) seem to be the least familiar to the survey respondents. This observation may show that Filipino teachers understand the PPST domain that subsumes CE, and they can identify and demonstrate which actions align with the policy implementation, which, in effect, may also directly affect their performance evaluations. However, as much as PPST is the general standard to be used in assessing teacher competence in the Philippines, the number of low-rated action statements from other reputable sources also poses a concern on how the dominance of the national policy in the shaping process of the self-perceptions

of teachers, especially on demonstrating CE, may be limiting and discouraging for teachers to explore facets of community-based project management that may be beneficial to the students and the wider school community (Department of Education, 2020).

3.2 Demographic Comparisons of CE Self-Assessment Scores

In the comparative analyses of the CE perceptions of the respondents based on the demographic groupings, there were no significant differences in CE perceptions among teachers based on their school type, grade level assignment, and length of teaching service.

A two-tailed T-Test for Independent Samples was done to evaluate if there was a significant difference between the CE scores of public and private school teachers. The data gathered from the sample population showed no significant difference in the CE scores of public and private school teachers, $t(29) = 1.25$, $p = .220$. This is like the finding of Lockheed and Jimenez (1995), where no significant difference was established between teacher characteristics of public and private schools. As such, it may be said that the public and private school participants perceived their CE competency independently of the school type they were teaching.

Table 7. Summary of descriptive statistics based on school type

	School Type	n	Mean	Std. Deviation
Community Engagement Score	Public	20	88.2	13.28
	Private	11	81.82	14.06

A One-Way ANOVA was done to determine if a significant difference exists between the CE scores of the sample population of teachers grouped based on their teaching assignment last school year (Group 1: Elementary; Group 2: Junior High School; Group 3: Senior High School). Analysis showed that there was no statistically significant difference at $p < .05$ level in the CE scores of the three groups [$F(30) = 0.46$, $p = .633$]. Analyzing the data further using Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference as a post-hoc test, given that equal variances among the groups were assumed, there were still no significant differences among comparisons between the three groups.

Table 8. Summary of descriptive statistics based on school type

	Teaching Assignment Last School Year	n	Mean	Std. Deviation
Community Engagement Score	Elementary	12	87.67	13.17
	Junior High School	8	81.88	13.58
	Senior High School	11	87.00	14.97

To know if there was a significant difference between the CE scores of teachers based on their length of teaching service, a One-Way ANOVA was done. The respondents' data were grouped into four based on their length of teaching service (Group 1: 1 -5 Years; Group 2: 6-10 Years; Group 3: 11-15 Years; Group 4: More than 15 Years). There was no significant difference in the CE score means of the four groups at $p < .05$ level [$F(30) = 0.32$, $p = .810$]. Corresponding post-hoc

comparisons using Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference also showed no significant differences among the comparisons between the four groups. This result showed a contrast from the findings of Dial (2008), Harris & Sass (2007), and Kini and Podolsky (2016) that teaching experience had a positive effect on student achievement. With this, it may be said that early career teachers and those seasoned in the teaching service may perceive their CE competency to be at the same level at a particular time.

Table 9. Summary of descriptive statistics based on school type

	Length of Teaching Service	n	Mean	Std. Deviation
Community Engagement Score	1 - 5 Years	17	85.53	14.95
	6 - 10 Years	6	85.17	5.85
	11 - 15 Years	5	83.8	17.71
	More than 15 Years	3	93.33	14.57

Given the results of the statistical analyses that showed no significant differences among the three demographic groups, it may be argued that CE is a type of competency that may not be solely observed from a classroom data-gathering standpoint, such as test and observation scores, which are similarly used to measure teacher effectiveness. While the Classroom Observation Tool (DepEd, 2019), which is default tool developed by the Philippine National Center for Teacher Quality may reveal teachers' classroom performance (Fayo & Hilario, 2023), it only focuses on content knowledge, pedagogy, learning environment, management of learner diversity, curriculum planning, and assessment. A study on pre-service practicum experience of aspiring teachers also showed bias on developing classroom management strategies, lesson planning and execution, building teaching confidence, and effectively using teaching resources (Ulla, 2016).

CE may also be a competency developed by teachers from different experiences and inputs that may largely contrast from the curriculum-oriented pre-service training that concentrates mostly on classroom-bound competency development such as content knowledge, pedagogy, and assessment. This may be supported further by literature findings by Espiritu (2021, p. 83), where the only domain that had an interpretation of "moderate awareness" in terms of pre-service teachers' self-evaluation on how well they know the PPST domains is Domain 6: Community Linkages and Professional Engagement while other domains all got a "full awareness interpretations." It is worth exploring if pre-service or in-service teacher engagement and performance with CE-focused activities such as integrating reflective questions on CE for teacher community activities (Vangrieken et al., 2017), participating in service learning projects as part of the pre-service curriculum (Keller, 2019) (Sanders, 2004), forming more meaningful linkages with the local communities during pre-service training (Adshead & Quillinan, 2016) (Sanders, 2004), adapting the lesson study framework for general education courses (Villaluz et al., 2019) or practical training and mentorship of master teachers to teacher trainees (Gadušová & Predanociová, 2018) may prove to be better-discriminating factors in understanding the differences in how Filipino teachers rate their CE competence. Policy-wise, the direction for further improving professional development of Filipino teachers in CE is solidly intact with the inclusion of all four PPST Domain 6 indicators be included as a priority as articulated in

DepEd Memorandum No. 50, s. 2020 where the professional development priorities among teachers and school leaders are articulated (DepEd, 2020). But to fully achieve a more robust understanding of how CE should be developed, we must acknowledge the barriers to its full integration in the tertiary education which are the prioritization of academic and research norms in the profession, misaligned incentives and rewards for CE engagements, funding, and sustainability (O'Meara & Jaeger, 2006).

4. Conclusion

The importance of community engagement as a teacher competency has been established well in several studies. It is a multi-faceted domain that may be operationalized using behavioral indicators to measure perceptions of how well an individual demonstrates it. The study found that the survey respondents (n=31), composed of teachers from different backgrounds, perceived themselves to be able to demonstrate the identified CE behavioral indicators. These CE scores may be further corroborated with portfolio assessment. A correlation study with scores from the actual performance evaluation tools may be done to validate how well the self-perception CE scores match the actual observed performances of teachers.

However, the literature review showed a gap in the studies on how the CE competency of teachers is affected by their demographic backgrounds. As such, comparisons of the CE scores were made based on school type, grade level teaching assignments, and length of teaching service. Statistical analyses showed no significant differences in the CE scores of the respondents based on all the identified factor groupings. As such, it can be said that CE may be a competency that teachers develop from inputs that differ from traditional pre-service training that concentrates mostly on classroom-bound competency development. With this, the following recommendations are put forward: Given the thin literature on which these results can be compared and the conveniently sampled population, the generalizability of this study is limited only to the study's participants. As such, it is recommended that this study be done again for a larger and more targeted population. Explanatory analyses using qualitative methods may be done to better ground the reasons for the insignificant differences among the demographic groupings. Quantitative and qualitative analyses to see if pre-service or in-service teacher engagement and performance with CE-focused activities are better-discriminating factors in understanding the differences in how Filipino teachers rate their CE competence.

5. References

- Atilas, J. (2018). Cooperative Extension Competencies for the Community Engagement Professional. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 23(1), 107-127. Retrieved December 1, 2020, from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1212491.pdf>.
- Adshead, M., & Quillinan, B. (2016). Having it all? Transferring community-oriented research principles to teaching and learning to develop better university engagement. *Educational Action Research*, 25(1), 35-55. Retrieved June 10, 2024 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2015.1124044>.

- Baş, Gökhan & Kubiátko, Milan & Sünbül, Ali. (2016). Teachers' perceptions towards ICTs in teaching-learning process: Scale validity and reliability study. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 61. Retrieved November 25, 2020, from 176-185. 10.1016/j.chb.2016.03.022.
- Borg, S., Clifford, I., & Htut, K. (2018). Having an EfECT: Professional development for teacher Educators in Myanmar. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 72, 75 – 86. Retrieved November 25, 2020 from, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.02.010>.
- Department of Education. (2017). National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017). Retrieved March 15, 2019, from https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/DO_s2017_042-1.pdf.
- Department of Education. (2019). Classroom Observation Tool. Retrieved June 10, 2024, from <https://rctq.ph/files/COT.pdf>.
- Department of Education. (2020). DepEd Professional Development Priorities for Teachers and School Leaders for School Year 2020 – 2023 (DepEd Memo No. 50 s, 2020). Retrieved December 10, 2020, from https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/DM_s2020_050.pdf.
- Dial, J. (2008). The Effect of Teacher Experience and Teacher Degree Levels on Student Achievement in Mathematics and Communication Arts. [Doctoral dissertation, School of Education, Baker University]. Retrieved December 1, 2020, from https://www.bakeru.edu/images/pdf/SOE/EdD_Theses/Dial_Jaime.pdf.
- Espiritu, R. (2021). Awareness And Competency Of Pre-Service Teachers On The Philippine Professional Standards For Teachers (PPST): A Basis For Training Program. *Journal NX - A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal*, 7(11), Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://repo.journalnx.com/index.php/nx/article/view/3720>.
- Fayo, C., & Hilario, C. (2023). Effectiveness of Classroom Observation on Teachers' Performance. *Industry & Academic Research Review*, 4, 472-478. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from https://iiari.org/conference_article/effectiveness-of-classroom-observation-on-teachers-performance/.
- Gadušová, Z. & Predanocyová, L. (2018). Competence of planning educational process in pre-service teacher training. *Nauki O Wychowaniu. Studia Interdyscyplinarne*, 1(6), 161 – 179. Retrieved December 1, 2020 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329723606_Competence_of_planning_educational_process_in_pre-service_teacher_training/fulltext/5d4b1ae992851cd046a6f480/Competence-of-planning-educational-process-in-pre-service-teacher-training.pdf.
- Harris, D. & Sass, T. (2007). Teacher Training, Teacher Quality, and Student Achievement National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research. WP 3, March 2007. Retrieved December 1, 2020, from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED509656.pdf>.
- Khan, F., Omar-Fauzee, M.S., & Daud, Y. (2016). Qualitative Analysis of Teacher's Performance in Private and Public Sector Schools: A Developing Country's Experience. *Education Research International*, 5(4), 34-39. Retrieved December 1, 2020, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322100196_Qualitative_Analysis_Of_The_Teacher's_Performance_In_Private_And_Public_Sector_Schools_A_Developing_Country's_Experience.

- Keller, D. (2019). Requisite Community Engagement for Teacher Education: A Different Take on Service Learning. *Athens Journal of Education*, 6(2), 93-110. Retrieved December 1, 2020 from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1208356.pdf>.
- Kini, T. & Podolsky, A. (2016). Does Teaching Experience Increase Teacher Effectiveness Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved December 1, 2020, from https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Teaching_Experience_Report_June_2016.pdf.
- Lockheed, E. & Jimenex, M. (1995). Public and Private Secondary Education in Developing Countries. World Bank Discussion Papers. 309. Retrieved December 1, 2020, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/44820470_Public_and_Private_Secondary_Education_in_Developing_Countries_A_Comparative_Study/link/546f48cc0cf216f8cfa9d1d4/download.
- Midgley, C., Anderman, E. & Hicks, L. (1995). Differences Between Elementary and Middle School Teachers and Students: A Goal Theory Approach. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 15(1), Retrieved December 1, 2020, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/43118261_Differences_between_Elementary_and_Middle_School_Teachers_and_Students_A_Goal_Theory_Approach/link/0c960527bc8fe2e6ea000000/download.
- Miller, L., Mehta, S., and McCauley, D. (2018). The BACE Scale: A New Measure for Assessing the Benefits of Community Engagement. *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement*, 6(1), 1-14. Retrieved December 1, 2020, from <https://ijrslce.scholasticahq.com/article/6982-measuring-the-impact-of-community-engagementdevelopment-of-the-bace-scale>.
- O'Meara, K. & Jaeger, A. (2016). Preparing Future Faculty for Community Engagement: Barriers, Facilitators, Models, and Recommendations. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 20(1), 127-150. Retrieved November 25, 2020, from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1097224.pdf>.
- Queensland Government. (nd). Advancing Partnerships – Parent and Community Engagement Framework. Retrieved from: <https://education.qld.gov.au/parents/community-engagement/Documents/pace-framework.pdf>.
- Randall, J. & Engelhard, G. (2009). Differences Between Teachers' Grading Practices in Elementary and Middle Schools. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 102(3), Retrieved December 1, 2020, from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.3200/JOER.102.3.175-186?needAccess=true&journalCode=vjer20>.
- Rojewski, J. Lee, I., & Gemici, S. (2012). Use of t-test and ANOVA in Career-Technical Education Research. *Association for Career and Technical Education Research*, 3(13), 263-275. Retrieved November 25, 2020, from <https://doi.org/10.5328/cter37.3.263>.
- Sanders, M. & Galindo, C. (2014). Communities, Schools, and Teachers. Martin, L., Kragler, S., Quatroche, D. & Bauserman, K. (eds.). *Handbook of Professional Development in Education*. (pp. 103 – 124). London, New York: The Guilford Press.
- Sanders, M. (2004). Community Involvement in Schools From Concept to Practice. *Education and Urban Society*, 35(2), Retrieved December 1, 2020, from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ674013>.

- Srinivas, T., Meenan, C., Drogin., and De Prince, A. (2015) Development of the Community Impact Scale Measuring Community Organization Perceptions of Partnership Benefits and Cost. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*. Spring 2015. 5-12. Retrieved December 1, 2020, from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1116298>.
- Ulla, M. (2016). Pre-service Teacher Training Programs in the Philippines: The Student-teachers Practicum Teaching Experience. *EFL Journal*, 1(3), 235-250. Retrieved June 10, 2024, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311104841_Pre-service_Teacher_Training_Programs_in_the_Philippines_The_Student-teachers_Practicum_Teaching_Experience.
- UNICEF. (2020). Minimum Quality Standards for Community Engagement. Retrieved December 1, 2020, from https://www.unicef.org/mena/sites/unicef.org.mena/files/2020-04/19218_MinimumQuality-Report_v07_RC_002.pdf.
- Vangrieken, K., Meredith, C., Packer, T., & Kyndt, E. (2017) Teacher communities as a context for professional development: A systematic review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 61, 47 – 59. Retrieved November 10, 2020 from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.10.001>.
- Villaluz, G., Malonjao, M., Trinidad, C., & Bojos, M. (2018). Community engagement in teaching-learning: A pathway to quality education. *ASEAN Journal of Community Engagement*, 2(2), 239 – 263. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://doi.org/10.7454/ajce.v2i2.133>.
- Wadkar, S., Singh, K., Chakravarty, R., & Argade, S. (2016). Assessing the Reliability of Attitude Scale by Cronbach's Alpha. *Journal of Global Communication*, 9(2), 113-117. Retrieved November 25, 2020, from <https://doi.org/10.5328/cter37.3.263>.