EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management
Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0414 |ISI I.F Value: 0.815|SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.752 ISSN: 2348 – 814X
Volume: 13 | Issue:10 | October 2026 -Peer Reviewed Journal

CHANGE RESPONSIVENESS AND DIDACTIC COMPETENCE OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN LAAK NORTH DISTRICT

Mary Grace M. Abot

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between change responsiveness and didactic competence among public elementary school teachers in Laak North District during school year 2025–2026. Using a descriptive-correlational design, the researcher gathered survey data from 80 teachers. Change responsiveness covered awareness, desire, knowledge, ability, and reinforcement; didactic competence covered student engagement, instructional strategies, classroom management, instructional competence, and socio-personal competence. Means, standard deviations, Pearson correlation, and multiple regression were used to analyze the data. Both change responsiveness ($M = 3.65$, $SD = 0.55$) and didactic competence ($M = 3.63$, $SD = 0.49$) were rated high. The variables were positively related, $r = .66$, $p < .001$. The five-domain regression model was significant, $F(5, 74) = 11.71$, $p < .001$, with $R^2 = .44$ and adjusted $R^2 = .40$. The source manuscript did not report coefficients for the individual domains, so their separate contributions could not be established. The findings support further attention to both instructional development and teachers' responses to change, while the correlational design does not establish causation.

KEYWORDS: *Change Responsiveness, Didactic Competence, Elementary Teachers, Professional Development, Philippines*

INTRODUCTION

Educational changes require teachers to interpret new expectations and adapt their instruction to learners and classroom conditions. Changes in curricula, teaching approaches, and technology can create opportunities for improvement, but teachers also need time, knowledge, and support to put them into practice. Research on instructional adaptation describes how teachers adjust their teaching in response to students and learning situations (Parsons et al., 2018).

Alongside responsiveness to change, didactic competence is important to the work of teaching. It includes the capacity to engage learners, select instructional strategies, manage the classroom, communicate learning goals, and maintain productive relationships. Shulman (1986) emphasized that teaching requires an understanding of both subject matter and how it can be made accessible to learners. Together, these perspectives suggest a reason to examine whether teachers who report greater responsiveness to change also report stronger didactic competence.

In the Philippines, professional development can help teachers respond to evolving pedagogical demands, but access and participation are not always equitable. Rivera et al. (2025) identified geographic constraints, workload, inconsistent funding, and limited alignment between training and teachers' needs as barriers to professional development. These national findings make it useful to examine teachers' experiences within particular districts, without assuming that the same barriers were measured in Laak North.

The present study contributes district-level evidence on change responsiveness and didactic competence among public elementary school teachers in Laak North. It focuses on teachers' perceptions of the two constructs and their relationship. Because the study is correlational, its results cannot establish whether responsiveness produces stronger teaching competence or whether other factors account for their association.

The study aimed to determine the levels of change responsiveness and didactic competence, examine their relationship, and assess whether the five domains of change responsiveness jointly predict didactic competence. The five domains correspond to the elements of the ADKAR model: awareness, desire, knowledge, ability, and reinforcement (Prosci, n.d.). Didactic competence covered student engagement, instructional strategies, classroom management, instructional competence, and socio-personal competence.

Two null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level: first, that change responsiveness is not significantly related to didactic competence; and second, that its domains do not jointly predict didactic competence.

METHODOLOGY

The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational design. It described teachers' self-reported change responsiveness and didactic competence, examined their association, and used multiple regression to assess the combined predictive contribution of the five responsiveness domains. Neither variable was manipulated.

The participants were 80 public elementary school teachers in Laak North District during school year 2025–2026. According to the sampling section, the teachers were drawn from seven schools using proportionate stratified random sampling, with schools treated as strata. The source identifies a population of 212 teachers in its sampling table, but elsewhere calls the 80 teachers the entire accessible population. This inconsistency requires confirmation against the sampling records before publication. Eligible participants were described as active teachers with at least one academic year of experience who voluntarily consented to participate.

Data were collected through an adapted, structured questionnaire using five-point response scales. The change responsiveness section covered awareness, desire, knowledge, ability, and reinforcement; the didactic competence section covered the five instructional domains. The manuscript attributes the instruments to Bolivar (2023) and Linda (2022), respectively, but their complete source details and the match between the original instruments and adapted items require verification. Some sample change-responsiveness items concern school-level administrative duties, so their suitability for classroom teachers also warrants review.

The manuscript reports an overall content validity index of .99 following expert review. The revised questionnaire was pilot-tested with 30 teachers outside the final sample, yielding Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .93 for change responsiveness and .92 for didactic competence. These estimates describe internal consistency in the pilot; they do not by themselves establish that all domains are valid or unidimensional.

Following the reported requests for permission from division and district authorities, the researcher coordinated with school heads and distributed questionnaires directly or through school coordinators. The manuscript describes informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, and the right to withdraw. Mean and standard deviation summarized the responses; Pearson's r assessed the relationship between the composite variables, and multiple regression examined the five responsiveness domains as predictors of didactic competence. Statistical significance was assessed at .05.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Change Responsiveness

Teachers reported a high overall level of change responsiveness (M = 3.65, SD = 0.55). Desire had the highest mean (M = 3.77), while awareness had the lowest (M = 3.58); all five domains fell in the manuscript's high range. The pattern suggests willingness to engage with change, while awareness may be a useful area for continued communication and support. These scores reflect teachers' perceptions rather than observed implementation.

Table 1. Change Responsiveness

Domain	M	SD	Level
Awareness	3.58	0.60	High
Desire	3.77	0.57	High
Knowledge	3.66	0.55	High
Ability	3.64	0.62	High
Reinforcement	3.61	0.59	High
Overall	3.65	0.55	High

Note. Values are reproduced from the source manuscript; N = 80.

The distribution in Table 1 points to a favorable self-reported orientation toward change, although the differences between the highest and lowest means are descriptive and were not tested for statistical significance. The comparatively lower awareness score suggests a possible focus for explaining the purpose and implications of new initiatives. It does not establish that teachers lack awareness or that communication is the cause of the difference.

The ADKAR model identifies awareness of the need for change and desire to participate as distinct elements, alongside knowledge, ability, and reinforcement (Prosci, n.d.). Its distinction helps interpret the domain pattern, though the model does not independently validate this study's questionnaire. In the Philippine context, Rivera et al. (2025) found that professional development access can be affected by workload and geographic constraints; schools could consider these conditions when planning follow-up support, rather than assuming they were documented among these respondents.

Didactic Competence

Didactic competence was also rated high overall (M = 3.63, SD = 0.49). Instructional competence had the highest mean (M = 3.69), whereas student engagement and socio-personal competence shared the lowest mean (M = 3.60). All domains remained within the high range. The results describe teachers' self-assessments; they do not independently establish classroom performance or student achievement. Shulman's (1986) account of pedagogical knowledge provides a useful context for considering how subject knowledge and instructional decisions come together in teaching.

EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management
Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0414 |ISI I.F Value: 0.815|SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.752 ISSN: 2348 – 814X
Volume: 13 | Issue:10 | October 2026 -Peer Reviewed Journal

Table 2. Didactic Competence

Domain	M	SD	Level
Student Engagement	3.60	0.50	High
Instructional Strategies	3.63	0.53	High
Classroom Management	3.62	0.55	High
Instructional Competence	3.69	0.54	High
Socio-Personal Competence	3.60	0.53	High
Overall	3.63	0.49	High

Note. Values are reproduced from the source manuscript; N = 80.

Table 2 indicates that respondents viewed themselves positively across the five instructional domains. The numerical differences between domains are small and have not been tested for statistical significance. The scores therefore provide a starting point for reflection and professional development, not proof that one skill is stronger in classroom practice than another.

Shulman (1986) described the knowledge needed to transform subject matter into forms learners can understand. Complementing this view, Parsons et al. (2018) synthesized research on how teachers adjust instruction to classroom situations. These works help explain why instructional decisions and responsiveness matter, but neither verifies the teachers' self-ratings in this study. Classroom observation and learner feedback could provide additional evidence about actual practice.

Relationship Between the Variables

Change responsiveness and didactic competence were positively and significantly related, $r = .66$, $p < .001$. Teachers who reported greater responsiveness to change also tended to report greater didactic competence. The null hypothesis of no relationship was therefore rejected. The squared correlation is approximately .436, indicating shared variation between the two composite scores; it should not be interpreted as evidence that responsiveness caused 43.6% of competence. The association is consistent with the broader view that adapting instruction is relevant to teaching practice (Parsons et al., 2018), although that literature does not establish the direction of this study's relationship.

Table 3. Relationship Between Change Responsiveness and Didactic Competence

Variables	r	r^2	p
Change responsiveness and didactic competence	.66	.436	< .001

Note. Values are reproduced from the source manuscript; N = 80.

As Table 3 shows, the positive coefficient suggests that higher scores on one measure tended to occur alongside higher scores on the other. This relationship is consistent with the idea that teachers' responses to changing circumstances are relevant to instructional work. However, the measures were collected through the same self-report survey, so shared response tendencies and other unmeasured factors may have contributed to the association.

Parsons et al. (2018) describe adaptation as an aspect of instructional practice, while Shulman (1986) connects effective teaching with the ability to make subject matter understandable to learners. These perspectives offer a plausible conceptual context for the association, but they do not show that the specific change-responsiveness scale caused differences in didactic competence. Longitudinal or intervention studies would be needed to examine direction and change more closely.

Regression Analysis

The five-domain regression model was statistically significant, $F(5, 74) = 11.71$, $p < .001$, with $R = .66$, $R^2 = .44$, and adjusted $R^2 = .40$. As reported, the predictors jointly accounted for approximately 44% of the variation in self-reported didactic competence in this sample. The model-level null hypothesis was rejected. However, the source does not include a coefficient table, standard errors, or individual p-values. Accordingly, the separate statistical contribution of awareness, desire, knowledge, ability, or reinforcement cannot be determined from the available results, despite the source abstract naming some as significant predictors.

Table 4. Multiple Regression Model

R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	df	p
.66	.44	.40	11.71	5, 74	< .001

Note. Values are reproduced from the source manuscript; N = 80.

Table 4 addresses the predictors as a set. A significant overall F test does not show that every predictor is significant, and the missing coefficient table prevents a defensible assessment of their individual contributions. In addition, the reported model values should be checked against the original output before any conclusion about the proportion of variance explained is treated as final.

For practical planning, the findings can prompt schools to consider both instructional learning and the conditions surrounding change. Rivera et al. (2025) recommend more accessible, needs-aligned professional development, including school-based learning and mentoring. Such recommendations are consistent with a focus on practical support, but this study did not test whether those activities improve didactic competence.

The reported F statistic and R^2 appear inconsistent when checked using the stated degrees of freedom, even allowing for normal rounding. The original statistical output, sample size, missing-data handling, and model specifications should therefore be checked before the model figures are used in a final submission. Regression assumptions and diagnostics are also not documented in the source.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The participating teachers reported high change responsiveness and didactic competence, and the two composite measures showed a positive association. The reported regression model was significant overall, subject to verification of its fit statistics. The study cannot establish that increasing responsiveness improves competence, nor can it identify which individual domains independently predict competence without the missing coefficients.

School leaders may use the descriptive findings to plan professional learning that combines discussion of educational changes with opportunities to practice instructional strategies, reflect with colleagues, and receive follow-up support. Awareness, the lowest-rated responsiveness domain, may be considered when planning communication about new initiatives. These suggestions are practical directions for development, not demonstrated effects of an intervention.

Future studies may combine teacher surveys with classroom observations, establish the suitability of the adapted items, and examine changes over time. Before dissemination, the researcher should reconcile the conflicting population descriptions, provide original instrument citations, check all statistical output and assumptions, and report the full regression coefficients. The single-district sample and self-report measures limit the conclusions that can be drawn beyond the participants and setting.

REFERENCES

1. *Parsons, S. A., Vaughn, M., Scales, R. Q., Gallagher, M. A., Parsons, A. W., Davis, S. G., Pierczynski, M., & Allen, M. (2018). Teachers' instructional adaptations: A research synthesis. Review of Educational Research, 88(2), 205–242. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654317743198*
2. *Prosci. (n.d.). The Prosci ADKAR model. https://www.prosci.com/methodology/adkar*
3. *Rivera, J. P. R., Sinsay-Villanueva, L. M. V., Tanyag, I. H., Berroya, J. D., Garcia, G. D. V., & Lim, V. L. (2025). Revitalizing the Philippine education system: Facilitating access and participation to in-service training (INSET) and teacher professional development (TPD) (Discussion Paper No. 2025-14). Philippine Institute for Development Studies. https://doi.org/10.62986/dp2025.14*
4. *Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational Researcher, 15(2), 4–14. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X015002004*