

## Teaching Performance of Non-Social Studies Graduates handling Social Studies Subjects

Charmaine P. Pintes, and And Julie D. Rosal

Pangasinan State University, San Carlos Campus

San Carlos City, Pangasinan, Philippines

**Abstract** - This paper is focused on determining the teaching performance of non-Social Studies graduates handling Social Studies subjects in terms of mastery of the subject field, teaching skill, classroom management skill and evaluation skill. In this study, the descriptive method of research was utilized. The results were taken using survey questionnaire. Findings revealed that in terms of profiling, instructors are very highly competent as perceived by their supervisors and colleagues. On the contrary, there were some serious problems encountered that needs to be addressed. It is noted that there is a strong relationship between the age and years of teaching experience with the instructor's mastery of the subject. Apart from that, the perception of the supervisors is higher than that of the colleagues. Based on the results, it was recommended to conduct a more comprehensive study using a triangulation method and to address the variety of problems encountered and possible problems that would arise.

**Keywords** – Teaching Performance, Mastery of the Subject Field, Teaching Skill, Classroom Management Skill, Evaluation Skill

### INTRODUCTION

Teaching is considered the toughest foundation among all the professions in society. Teaching is the mother of all occupations and is considered to be the noblest of all professions. Teachers have always been respected in all societies. They, like a potter, meticulously shape the lives of their students by molding their minds and honing their skills that would later define their ambitions in life.

Teaching is a grounding and humbling profession which offers everyone a chance to continuously get better. The teachers witness the daily “eureka” moments when students finally got the idea or mastered a skill. Even in times of economic crisis, teachers will also be needed. They are one of the requisites of nation-building (Saxena, 2018)<sup>[1]</sup>.

The quality of the citizens contributed to the quality of the nation. The quality of the nation relies on the quality of its inhabitants. The quality of the inhabitants rides on the quality of their education. The quality of their education rests upon the competence, dedication, and quality of the teachers according to Shukla (2009) as cited in the study of Daguplo (2013).<sup>[2]</sup>

The statement prior-mentioned highlighted the demand for capable and dedicated teachers for today's times. Teacher competence is pinpointed as one of the most critical factors leading to the achievement in education and of every institution. Nation-building is anchored on the competence, which is tied up with work performance, of its citizens, particularly the teachers.

Apart from that, proficient teachers are mandated in every institution to increase its productivity. The very element that contributes to student achievement is the competence of the teacher in every classroom. Classroom facilities and instructional materials will be in vain in producing the learning outcomes without a competent teacher behind it.

The demand for teaching competence among many schools around the world exists in all levels of education from preschool to post-graduate school. Though there is a demand, there subsists anxiety over teaching and learning in education toward its desire to develop process. The core toward quality in education is just to improve the teaching and learning in the classroom through the school reform and the

managerial strategies in educational management (Chong Lee, 2009)<sup>[3]</sup>. Further, the goal of education, on one hand, is seen as the transfer of knowledge by the teachers to the students while on the other hand is the facilitation of students' autonomous learning and self-expression (Bar-Yam, 2002)<sup>[4]</sup>.

The changes and increased complexity of today's time show new challenges and place new demands on our educational system. Among which is the competency and new methods, digital and informational literacy, adaptive teaching, and digital learning architecture. Key technology-related teaching and learning issues in higher education have also been identified as the time shifts beyond formative stages and moving in new directions (Campbell, 2007)<sup>[5]</sup>.

Geared to the technological era, the teaching profession has moved beyond the early stages of providing implementations and random acts of progress. Teachers are projected to become more systematic and reflective in the approaches to developing and assessing teaching and learning. The concept of teaching progressively transformed into a learning concept. The quality of education is projected upon the acquisition of the desired learning outcomes by the students most especially on academic achievement. These aspects are linked to resources, academician professional competencies, and the learning environment (Houston and Maikw, 2005)<sup>[6]</sup>.

Professional competence is linked to the ability to master knowledge. The teachers' competence refers to the ability to manage learning which includes planning, implementing, and evaluating of learning outcomes of learners. In order to achieve success in the teaching and learning process, teachers must acquire the needed competencies (Rahman, 2014)<sup>[7]</sup>. Competency is involved in an educator's pursuit of excellence. Competency encompasses more than just knowledge and skills as it meets the complex demands in a particular context (Nessipbayeva, 2012)<sup>[8]</sup>. In this sense, competence is changing and process-oriented and includes the capability to use and adapt

knowledge (Jones, 2017 as cited in Gurriero and Revai, 2017)<sup>[9]</sup>.

Competency and qualification of teachers have been bewailed over the past years based on studies and reports. For this reason, reformers in many countries strengthened teacher education and certification standards to ensure that there are competent teachers in the classrooms (Ingersoll, 2003)<sup>[10]</sup>.

In order to fulfill the chronic and global shortage of teachers due to the increase in enrollment and retirement, various countries are forfeiting standards and undermining progress by hiring people with little or no training, particularly in Social Studies, according to UNESCO (2014)<sup>[11]</sup>. Even if the problem of assigning each classroom with qualified teachers is solved, it still posits another source of an issue known as the out-of-field teaching phenomenon wherein teachers who are assigned to teach the subject do not commensurate their training and education.

This phenomenon has long been and continues to be an important issue in our public schools as it entails that qualified teachers may become unqualified if they were given subjects, not in line with their specialization. This has an adverse effect on the quest for quality education. Students are affected since some studies show that out-of-field teachers produce lower student achievements than in-field teachers. Teachers with both knowledge and skills in the area are said to be effective as they have a deep understanding of the subjects they teach.

On the other hand, the impact of the out-of-field teachers on the students may tend to be negative through lower achievement scores. They may not be able to establish the content and might rely on teaching methods that are obsolete and futile. They might bring pressure on the students through disinterest and disengagement rather than being active.

In the local setting, school boards are also facing difficulty in finding teachers that specialize in the subject. However, there seems to be a lack of awareness of the issue because of the absence of accurate statistics and data on the subject (Patalinghug, 2018; Ingersoll, 2003)<sup>[12]</sup>.

Public school education faced adversities in the teaching and learning process as it appears to have an association with low-quality teaching and the ineffectiveness of the school system. A complex array of conditions such as lack of teachers teaching the particular subject, such as social studies, poor leadership practices and history of government, teacher unions, and school leaders led to this phenomenon.

According to the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) Memorandum Order No. 52 series of 2007, an allied discipline is required to teach at the tertiary level. Faculty members teaching the professional education course in the teacher education program, wherein social studies are one of its majors, must be a holder of a valid certificate of registration and professional licensure examination for teachers (LET). Unfortunately, some of the college instructors are given subjects that are not covered under their area of specialization for as long as they meet the desired number of teaching units for the given period. The Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) as administered by the Professional Regulatory Commission (PRC) is not only limited to those who took a Bachelor of Science (BS) in Education as their course during their tertiary education in accordance with Republic Act 7836 states that a bachelor's degree in the field of specialization or its equivalent with at least 18 units of professional education. PRC provided an updated guideline on LET majorship for non-education bachelor's degree holders (PRC, 2016)<sup>[13]</sup> and a list of equivalent degrees for teacher's examination (Llego, n.d)<sup>[14]</sup>.

One of the important criteria in the achievement of student growth and learning is the teachers who possess the competencies required in their specialty. As of the moment, little research is available that underscores the performance of non-social studies, graduates, teaching social studies subjects, a simple example of out-of-field teaching, however perturbing. Hence, the researcher is prompted to learn the performance of non-social studies graduates teaching social studies subjects.

## STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The study aims to investigate the teaching performance of non-social studies graduates teaching social studies subjects.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following:

1. What is the profile of the supervisors and colleagues of non-Social Studies instructors in terms of the following:
  - a. Age;
  - b. Sex;
  - c. Educational attainment;
  - d. Undergraduate study;
  - e. Graduate study;
  - f. Years of teaching experiences;
  - g. Number of seminars/training attended related to Social Studies; and
  - h. Eligibility
2. What is the level of competence of non-Social Studies graduates teaching Social Studies subjects as perceived by their supervisors and colleagues in terms of the following:
  - a. Mastery of the Subject Field;
  - b. Teaching Skill;
  - c. Classroom Management Skill; and
  - d. Evaluation Skill?
3. What are the problems encountered in teaching Social Studies subjects by non-social studies graduates?
4. Is there a relationship on the profile and the level of competency of non-social studies graduates?
5. Is there a significant difference on the level of competency of non-social studies graduates as perceived by their supervisors and colleagues?

## METHODOLOGY

Particularly, the researcher made use of the descriptive-survey method of research. This is appropriate when subjects vary among themselves and one is concerned with the extent to which different conditions and situations are obtained among these subjects. The word survey means gathering data on the present condition

(Calmorin, 2016)<sup>[15]</sup>. This method desired to meet the objectives of the study which is to assess the performance of non-Social Studies graduates in teaching social studies subjects.

The researcher employed a survey questionnaire type as the main tool for gathering pertinent data needed. The questionnaire contains three parts. The first part is for the profiling of the respondents in terms of age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, years of teaching experience, number of seminars/trainings attended related to Social Studies, and eligibility acquired. The second part contains a statement about the level of performance of non-social studies graduates in teaching Social Studies as perceived by the supervisors and colleagues in terms of mastery of the subject field, teaching skills, classroom management skills, and evaluation skills. The third part of the questionnaire includes the problems encountered in teaching social studies subjects by non-social studies graduates.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Profile of the supervisors and colleagues of Non-Social Studies Instructors

The profile of the supervisors and colleagues of non-social studies instructors in terms of age, sex, educational attainment, undergraduate study, graduate study, years of teaching experiences, seminars, and training attended are presented in tables 4-5 using frequency counts and percentage analysis.

The data in table 4 reveals that the profile of the supervisors of the non-graduate of social studies instructors in terms of sex is predominantly composed of male supervisors (9 or 60%) whereas female supervisors are 6 of 15 (40%). It is said that men in the faculty, like men in the population, take lesser leave than women do (Anderson and Solomon, 2015)<sup>[16]</sup>.

Table 4  
 Profile of the Supervisors

| Variable                                                      | Categories                       | Percentage |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|
| Sex                                                           | Male                             | 60.00      |
|                                                               | Female                           | 40.00      |
| Age                                                           | 30 years and below               | 6.67       |
|                                                               | 31 to 40 years old               | 20.00      |
|                                                               | 41 to 50 years old               | 40.00      |
|                                                               | 51 years old and up              | 33.33      |
| Undergraduate Study                                           | Allied Education                 | 60.00      |
|                                                               | BS Agriculture                   | 6.67       |
|                                                               | BS Psychology                    | 6.67       |
|                                                               | AB Political Science             | 13.33      |
|                                                               | BS Mathematics                   | 6.67       |
| Graduate Study                                                | BS Biology                       | 6.67       |
|                                                               | Master of Arts in Education      | 20.00      |
|                                                               | Master of Science in Agriculture | 6.67       |
|                                                               | Doctor of Philosophy             | 33.33      |
| Years of Teaching Experience                                  | Doctor of Education              | 40.00      |
|                                                               | 6 to 15 years                    | 33.33      |
|                                                               | 16 to 25 years                   | 40.00      |
| No. of Seminars/Trainings Attended Relevant to Social Studies | More than 25 years               | 26.67      |
|                                                               | 1 to 5 seminars/trainings        | 6.67       |
|                                                               | 6 to 10 seminars/trainings       | 26.67      |
|                                                               | 11 to 15 seminars/trainings      | 33.33      |
| Eligibility                                                   | More than 15 seminars/trainings  | 33.33      |
|                                                               | PRC license holder               | 75.00      |
|                                                               | CSC Sub./Prof. or CESO           | 6.25       |
|                                                               | PD 907                           | 18.75      |

A study by Shepherd (2017)<sup>[17]</sup> states that at the executive management level of higher education, there is a noteworthy number of gender imbalances. Further, the vice-chancellor and pro-vice chancellors in the eight institutions in United Kingdom are men despite the that majority of the students and staff are women. The study of Regalado (2017)<sup>[18]</sup> states that male respondents occupy higher ranks that the female respondents due to economic reasons. The highest occupational ranks and the highest paying positions are still occupied by male administrators.

As to age, the table also shows that the supervisors are 30 years old and below (1 or 6.67%), 31 to 40 years old (3 or 20%), 41 to 50

years old (6 or 40%) and 51 years old and up (5 or 33.33%). The age of supervisors varies in age. According to a book entitled “Understanding Supervision and the PhD” by Peelo (2011)<sup>[19]</sup>, being a novice supervisor does not mean as being inexperienced either in academe or other workplaces. The novice supervisors with different skills set and expectations are agreeing with the mantra that they should gain more courses to equip themselves. In fact, they are likely to be members of supervisory teams led by a director who has already experienced success. In addition, younger employees are oftentimes promoted to a supervisory level wherein they manage older subordinates (Kunze and Menges, 2016)<sup>[20]</sup>.

In terms of undergraduate studies, findings reveal that majority of the supervisors are allied Education graduates (9 or 60%) while the rest are BS Agriculture (1 or 6.67%), BS Psychology (1 or 6.67%), AB Political Science (2 or 13.33%), BS Mathematics (1 or 6.67%) and BS Biology (1 or 6.67%) graduates. According to the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) Memorandum Order No. 52 series of 2007, an allied discipline is required to teach at the tertiary level. The minimum qualifications of the head the unit that implements the degree program are the following: 1). If the college offering the education degree is a college of education, the dean should be a doctoral degree in education or a related field and a licensed professional teacher (LET/before PBET) and 2). If the unit offering the education degree is no a college of education, the chair/head of the unit must also possess the same qualifications as aforementioned.

While as to the graduate studies, almost all are doctorate degree holders with a Doctor of Education (6 or 40%) and Doctor of Philosophy (5 or 33.33%). The rests are Master of Arts in Education (3 or 20%) and Master of Science in Agriculture (1 or 6.67%). In general, the requirements portion of CHED CMO No. 52 series 2007, as a rule, a master’s degree in education or an allied discipline is required for teaching at the tertiary level. Also, the

head/chair of the unit must be a doctoral degree holder in education or a related field and a holder of a valid certificate of registration and professional license (LET).

In terms of years of teaching experiences, the supervisors are already teaching for 16 to 25 years (5 or 33.33%), 16 to 25 years (6 or 40%) and more than 25 years (4 or 26.67%). As stated by Podolsky (2016)<sup>[21]</sup>, there is a positive relationship between teaching experiences with student achievement gains. There is a steepness of gains in effectiveness vis-à-vis experience of teachers in their initial years but continues to be significant as they reach the second or often third decades of their career. As teachers gain experience, their students not only learn more but are likely to do better on other measures of success like school attendance. Also, teachers with more experience support greater learning for their colleagues and the school. On the contrary, the impact of experience is strongest during the first few years of teaching while after that, marginal returns diminish (Rice, 2010)<sup>[22]</sup>. However, research shows that experienced teachers can and do grow professionally but at slower rates than novice teachers.

Data also shows that there are 5 (33.33%) supervisors who attended 11 to 15 and more than 15 seminars and training related to Social Studies whilst 4 (26.67%) with 6 to 10 seminars and training and 1 (6.67%) with less than five. The findings in Truitt’s study in 2011 state that there is a direct relationship between one’s positive training experiences with attitudes and one’s proficiency. In contradiction, the study of Essien, E. et. al (2016)<sup>[23]</sup> said that there is no significant influence of a teacher attending an in-service, seminars, and workshops on the academic performance of the students. In addition, research by Hamza (2017)<sup>[24]</sup> on the effect of training and development on employee performance states that all independent variables have no significant impact on employee performance except job enrichment.

Further, it shows that in terms of eligibility, the majority (12 or 75%) are PRC license holders while the remainder (3 or

18,75%) is granted PD 907. One of them with multiple responses has Civil Service eligibility. This is true since they must be a holder of a valid certificate of registration and professional licensure examination for teachers (LET) according to CHED CMO No. 52 series of 2007.

**Table 5**  
**Profile of the Colleagues**

| Variable                                                      | Categories                         | Percentage |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|
| Sex                                                           | Male                               | 43.31      |
|                                                               | Female                             | 56.69      |
| Age                                                           | 30 years and below                 | 15.92      |
|                                                               | 31 to 40 years old                 | 32.48      |
|                                                               | 41 to 50 years old                 | 27.40      |
|                                                               | 51 years old and up                | 24.20      |
| Undergraduate Study                                           | Allied Education                   | 77.71      |
|                                                               | BS Agriculture                     | 2.55       |
|                                                               | BS Psychology                      | 3.18       |
|                                                               | AB Political Science               | 7.00       |
|                                                               | BS Mathematics                     | 4.46       |
|                                                               | BS Engineering                     | 3.18       |
|                                                               | BS Biology                         | 1.92       |
| Graduate Study                                                | No masters/doctorate               | 8.92       |
|                                                               | Master of Arts in Education        | 52.23      |
|                                                               | Master in Developmental Management | 3.18       |
|                                                               | Master of Science in Agriculture   | 2.55       |
|                                                               | Doctor of Philosophy               | 14.01      |
|                                                               | Doctor of Education                | 19.11      |
| Years of Teaching Experience                                  | 5 years and below                  | 14.65      |
|                                                               | 6 to 15 years                      | 36.31      |
|                                                               | 16 to 25 years                     | 30.57      |
|                                                               | More than 25 years                 | 18.47      |
| No. of Seminars/Trainings Attended Relevant to Social Studies | 1 to 5 seminars/trainings          | 1.27       |
|                                                               | 6 to 10 seminars/trainings         | 14.65      |
|                                                               | 11 to 15 seminars/trainings        | 36.31      |
|                                                               | More than 15 seminars/trainings    | 47.77      |
| Eligibility                                                   | PRC license holder                 | 84.62      |
|                                                               | CSC Sub./Prof. or CESO             | 7.10       |
|                                                               | PD 907                             | 8.28       |

Additionally, table 5 data shows that most of the instructors are female (89 or

56.69%) while the rest are male (68 or 43.31%). According to Regalado (2017)<sup>[18]</sup>, teaching is a woman-dominated profession. In the latest Educational Indicators in Focus brief, around 82% of primary school teachers and 63% of secondary school teachers are women (Van Damme, 2017)<sup>[25]</sup>. Also, data from the Human Resource Department as of September 2019 revealed that 305 (54.27%) are female.

As to their age, the highest number which is 51 (32.48%) belong to 31 to 40 years old, followed by 43 (27.40%) belonging to 41 to 50 years old, 38 (24.20%) from 51 years old and up and last is 30 years old and below with 25 (15.92%).

It can be noted that in terms of the instructors' undergraduate study, most are from allied education (122 or 77.71%). The rest are AB Political Science (11 or 7%), BS Mathematics (7 or 4.46%), BS Psychology and Engineering (5 or 3.15%), BS Agriculture (4 or 2.55%), and BS Biology (3 or 1.92%). It has been noted that there is a surge in enrollment in the Teacher Education field of 1.11 and 1.96 in 2015 and 2016 respectively based on the data from the Philippine Statistics Authority. Also, according to the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) Memorandum Order No. 52 series of 2007, an allied discipline is required to teach at the tertiary level. Hence, a trend in acquiring a teacher license by taking 18-unit in Education is evident.

In terms of the instructors' graduate studies, more than half (82 or 52.23%) are Masters of Arts in Education, Doctors of Education (30 or 19.11%), Doctors of Philosophy (22 or 14.01%), Masters of Developmental Management (5 or 3.18%) and Masters of Science in Agriculture (4 or 2.55%). Among the respondents, 14 (or 18.92%) have no master's and doctorate degrees but are ongoing. CHED CMO 52 s2007 also suggests that the institution should require the faculty members to complete doctoral degrees in education and other allied fields. Apart from that, as a general requirement to teach at the tertiary level, a master's degree in education or an allied discipline is required. Faculty members who are

yet to complete their masters are not given plantilla positions or items unless they have provided valid documents that they are finished with their graduate studies. Moreover, the Philippine Statistics Authority, as of March 2020, the functional literacy rate (%) for 10-64 years old of women and men are 92% and 88.7% respectively. This means that more women are knowledgeable or were able to go to school, thus, pursuing higher learning.

The data also reveals that in terms of years of teaching experience, 57 (36.31%) with 6 to 15 years, 48 (30.57%) with 16 to 25 years, 29 (18.47%) with more than 25 years, and 23 (14.65%) with 5 years and below teaching experience. Many studies find that new teachers are less effective than experienced teachers but their performance developed instantaneously during their first few years in teaching. Also, younger, less-experienced teachers leave the profession at higher rates than their older and more experienced peers according to Hanover Research (2016)<sup>[26]</sup>. Also, professional growth “plateaus” after five years state that the oldest and most experienced teachers may not be more effective than their comparatively younger and less experienced colleagues (Rice, 2010)<sup>[22]</sup>.

In terms of the number of seminars/training attended relevant to social studies, almost half (75 or 47.77%) attended more than 15 seminars/training, 57 (36.31%) with 11 to 15, 23 (14.65%) with 6 to 10 and only two (2.27%) with 1 to 5 seminars or training. CHED CMO 52 s2007 also suggests that the institution should require the faculty members to attend continuing education seminars, workshops, conferences, and others.

In terms of eligibility, 143, or 84.62% are PRC license holders while 14 (8.28%) are granted honor graduate eligibility (PD 907). Apart from that, 12 of them have Civil Service Eligibility. This is because the Section 11 of RA 8981 (PRC Modernization Act of 2000) stated that all subjects for licensure examinations shall be taught by persons who are holders of a valid certificate of registration and valid professional licenses of the profession and in compliance with CHED.

### **Level of Competence of Non-Social Studies Graduates in Teaching Social Studies Subjects as Perceived by their Supervisors/Colleagues**

The level of competence of non-social studies graduates in teaching Social Studies subjects as perceived by the supervisors and their colleagues in terms of mastery of the subject field, teaching skills, classroom management skills; and evaluation skills using frequency and percentage analysis, and weighted mean.

The data in Table 6a shows that the non-social studies graduates in teaching social studies subjects as perceived by the supervisors and colleagues in terms of mastery of the subject field are “Highly Competent” with a weighted mean of 4.50. Mastery of the subject field is the expertise of the instructor. Hence, they are experts in the subject.

Specifically, most of the instructors were perceived to be “Very Highly Competent” in terms of the following competencies: (a) The teacher explains the lesson by citing relevant examples and situations, (b) The teacher readily defines important terms in the lesson and uses a simple word that can be easily understood, and (c) The teacher answers questions clearly with confidence. Some instructors however have “Moderate Competency” in terms of the following: (a) The teacher emphasizes difficult parts of the lesson to make it easy to understand, and (b) The teacher reflects mastery of the entire subject he/ she teaches.

The review of related literature and studies states that the student’s academic achievement in Social Studies is related to the teachers’ level of mastery (Essien, 2008)<sup>[23]</sup>. The results of another study conducted by Olowoyeye (2014)<sup>[27]</sup> state there is a positive relationship between teachers’ subject mastery and students’ performance in the English language. Teachers show they recognize their interconnectedness of content areas/disciplines by demonstrating a knowledge of their subject by relating it to other disciplines and relating

global awareness of the subject. More so, teachers make their instructions relevant to the

students by integrating 21<sup>st</sup>-century skills and content in instruction (Nessipbayeva, 2012)<sup>[8]</sup>.

Table 6a  
Level of Competence of Non-Social Studies Graduates  
in Teaching Social Studies Subjects  
n = 172

| A. Mastery of the Subject Field                                                                                  | NC   | MC    | C     | HC                             | VHC          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-------|-------|--------------------------------|--------------|
|                                                                                                                  | f    | f     | f     | f                              | f            |
|                                                                                                                  | %    | %     | %     | %                              | %            |
| 1. The teacher manifests confidence and firmness with every information being given in the class.                | 0    | 0     | 22    | 43                             | <b>107</b>   |
|                                                                                                                  | 0.00 | 0.00  | 12.79 | 25.00                          | <b>62.21</b> |
| 2. The teacher emphasizes difficult parts of the lesson to make it easy to understand.                           | 0    | 11    | 10    | 43                             | <b>108</b>   |
|                                                                                                                  | 0.00 | 6.40  | 5.81  | 25.00                          | <b>62.79</b> |
| 3. The teacher explains the lesson by citing relevant examples and situations.                                   | 0    | 0     | 21    | 24                             | <b>127</b>   |
|                                                                                                                  | 0.00 | 0.00  | 12.21 | 13.95                          | <b>73.84</b> |
| 4. The teacher readily defines important terms in the lesson and uses simple word that can be easily understand. | 0    | 0     | 21    | 23                             | <b>128</b>   |
|                                                                                                                  | 0.00 | 0.00  | 12.21 | 13.37                          | <b>74.42</b> |
| 5. The teacher relates subject matter to previous topics and areas of interest.                                  | 0    | 0     | 0     | 64                             | <b>108</b>   |
|                                                                                                                  | 0.00 | 0.00  | 0.00  | 37.21                          | <b>62.79</b> |
| 6. The teacher is able to relate lessons to other subjects.                                                      | 0    | 0     | 21    | 43                             | <b>108</b>   |
|                                                                                                                  | 0.00 | 0.00  | 12.21 | 25.00                          | <b>62.79</b> |
| 7. The teacher answers questions clearly with confidence.                                                        | 0    | 0     | 19    | 34                             | <b>119</b>   |
|                                                                                                                  | 0.00 | 0.00  | 11.05 | 19.77                          | <b>69.19</b> |
| 8. The teacher cites current and timely information on the subject.                                              | 0    | 0     | 21    | 45                             | <b>106</b>   |
|                                                                                                                  | 0.00 | 0.00  | 12.21 | 26.16                          | <b>61.63</b> |
| 9. The teacher shows a full grasp of the lesson taught each day.                                                 | 0    | 0     | 42    | 23                             | <b>107</b>   |
|                                                                                                                  | 0.00 | 0.00  | 24.42 | 13.37                          | <b>62.21</b> |
| 10. The teacher reflects mastery of the entire subject he/ she teaches.                                          | 0    | 21    | 21    | 21                             | <b>109</b>   |
|                                                                                                                  | 0.00 | 12.21 | 12.21 | 12.21                          | <b>63.37</b> |
| <b>Mean</b>                                                                                                      |      |       |       | <b>4.50 (Highly Competent)</b> |              |

Note: Boldface means highest frequency.

Legend: 1.00-1.50: Not Competent (NC), 1.51-2.50: Moderately Competent (MC), 2.51-3.50: Competent (C), 3.51-4.50: Highly Competent (HC), 4.51-5.00: Very Highly Competent (VHC)

The data in Table 6b shows that the non-social studies graduates in teaching social studies subjects as perceived by the supervisors and colleagues in terms of teaching skills are “Very Highly Competent” with a weighted mean of 4.54 which means to say that they have the skills and strategies needed in instruction.

It is also shown that have “Very Highly Competent” in terms of the following competencies: (a) The teacher presents the lesson systematically and analytically, (b) The teacher uses language effectively in expressing ideas in class discussions, (c) The teacher encourages the students to think and clarify lessons through effective questioning towards the students, (d) The teacher adjusts teaching methods to students’ needs, interest, and abilities, (e) The teacher uses different teaching techniques, approaches and strategies to make the lesson interesting and meaningful, (f) The teacher is able to utilize activities that are helpful for students to understand the lesson, and (g) The teacher motivates the students by asking questions effectively to develop critical thinking and creativity.

The result is anchored on the research of Welsch and Schaffer (2017)<sup>[28]</sup> that teaching skills are directly tied to a pedagogical course. Evidence from faculty instructors, mentor teachers, and teacher candidates suggests that they are able to develop teaching skills in relation to instructional strategies, classroom management, and curriculum design during an early field experience. Skills in teaching are needed to ensure competency in teaching, to enable the teacher to understand individual differences in learning, and to make the class interesting (Nursing Education, 2011)<sup>[29]</sup>.

The data in table 6c shows that the non-social studies graduates in teaching social studies subjects as perceived by the supervisors and colleagues in terms of classroom management skills are “Very Highly Competent” with a weighted mean of 4.63. Thus, instructors are competent with regards to the skills and techniques that were used to keep students organized, orderly, focused, attentive on task and academically productive in class.

Almost all of the teacher shows a great deal of patience towards the students, while most of them are “Very Highly Competent” in the following competencies: (a) The teacher commands respect from the students, (b) The teacher starts learning activities on time, (c) The teacher comes to class early and leaves on time, (d) The teacher sustains students’ interest in the lessons and class discussion, (e) The teacher establishes authority in the classroom effectively by assertive while being student-centered on hearing the voice of the student, (f) The teacher helps the class achieve the objectives set for the day, (g) The teacher makes the students behave according to how they are expected to, and (h) The teacher is able to assist students in doing cooperative group tasks.

This implies that successful classroom instruction is dependent upon effective classroom management to maintain appropriate student behavior, engagement, and academic achievement (Gage and MacSuga-Gage, 2017)<sup>[30]</sup>. Another research states that classroom management is also as much as managing the learning processes when an activity is being done as it is about creating peace and quiet so pupils can get down to work (Postholm, 2013)<sup>[31]</sup>. Kayikci (2009)<sup>[32]</sup> observed that the dimensions regarding teachers’ classroom management skills are insatiable predictors in students’ disciplinary behavior. Horne (2002)<sup>[33]</sup> suggested that environmental competence is an important constituent of the skilled teacher.

The data in Table 6d likewise reveal that the non-social studies graduates in teaching social studies subjects as perceived by the supervisors and colleagues in terms of evaluation skills are “Very Highly Competent” with a weighted mean of 4.69. This means to say that the instructors have the ability to conduct a series of purposeful assessment tools to gauge the students’ progress.

Findings reveal that most of the instructors are “Very Highly Competent” in terms of the following: (a) The teacher evaluates

Table 6b

Level of Competence of Non-Social Studies Graduates in Teaching Social Studies Subjects at Pangasinan State University

n = 172

| B. Teaching Skills                                                                                                          | C                            | HC          | VHC                        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|
|                                                                                                                             | f<br>%                       | f<br>%      | f<br>%                     |
| 1. The teacher organizes and presents subject matter clearly and coherently.                                                | 3<br>1.74                    | 65<br>37.79 | <b>104</b><br><b>60.47</b> |
| 2. The teacher presents the lesson systematically and analytically.                                                         | 0<br>0.00                    | 43<br>25.00 | <b>129</b><br><b>75.00</b> |
| 3. The teacher uses language effectively in expressing ideas in class discussions.                                          | 21<br>12.21                  | 43<br>25.00 | <b>108</b><br><b>62.79</b> |
| 4. The teacher encourages the students to think and clarify lessons through effective questioning towards the students.     | 21<br>12.21                  | 24<br>13.95 | <b>127</b><br><b>73.84</b> |
| 5. The teacher adjusts teaching methods to students' needs, interest and abilities.                                         | 23<br>13.37                  | 26<br>15.12 | <b>123</b><br><b>71.51</b> |
| 6. The teacher uses different teaching techniques, approaches and strategies to make the lesson interesting and meaningful. | 23<br>13.37                  | 43<br>25.00 | <b>106</b><br><b>61.63</b> |
| 7. The teacher relates lesson to the existing conditions and real life situation convincingly.                              | 21<br>12.21                  | 65<br>37.79 | <b>86</b><br><b>50.00</b>  |
| 8. The teacher utilizes instructional materials that sustain students' attention in achieving teaching objectives.          | 21<br>12.21                  | 68<br>39.53 | <b>83</b><br><b>48.26</b>  |
| 9. The teacher is able to utilize activities that are helpful for students to understand the lesson.                        | 21<br>12.21                  | 26<br>15.12 | <b>125</b><br><b>72.67</b> |
| 10. The teacher motivates the students by asking questions effectively to develop critical thinking and creativity.         | 23<br>13.37                  | 34<br>19.77 | <b>115</b><br><b>66.86</b> |
| Mean                                                                                                                        | 4.54 (Very Highly Competent) |             |                            |

Note: Boldface means highest frequency.

Legend: 1.00-1.50: Not Competent (NC), 1.51-2.50: Moderately Competent (MC), 2.51-3.50: Competent (C), 3.51-4.50: Highly Competent (HC), 4.51-5.00: Very Highly Competent (VHC)

Table 6c

Level of Competence of Non-Social Studies Graduates in Teaching Social Studies Subjects at Pangasinan State University

n = 172

| C. Classroom Management Skills                                                                                                                   | C                            | HC          | VHC                        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                  | f<br>%                       | f<br>%      | f<br>%                     |
| 1. The teacher commands respect from the students.                                                                                               | 8<br>4.65                    | 28<br>16.28 | <b>136</b><br><b>79.07</b> |
| 2. The teacher shows a great deal of patience towards the students.                                                                              | 19<br>11.05                  | 35<br>20.35 | <b>118</b><br><b>68.60</b> |
| 3. The teacher starts learning activities on time.                                                                                               | 11<br>6.40                   | 34<br>19.77 | <b>127</b><br><b>73.84</b> |
| 4. The teacher comes to class early and leaves on time.                                                                                          | 14<br>8.14                   | 45<br>26.16 | <b>113</b><br><b>65.70</b> |
| 5. The teacher makes every moment in class active promoting fun about learning.                                                                  | 21<br>12.21                  | 54<br>31.40 | <b>97</b><br><b>56.40</b>  |
| 6. The teacher sustains students' interest in the lessons and class discussion.                                                                  | 16<br>9.30                   | 26<br>15.12 | <b>130</b><br><b>75.58</b> |
| 7. The teacher establishes authority in the classroom effectively by assertive while being student-centered on hearing the voice of the student. | 15<br>8.72                   | 29<br>16.86 | <b>128</b><br><b>74.42</b> |
| 8. The teacher helps the class achieve the objectives set for the day.                                                                           | 11<br>6.40                   | 35<br>20.35 | <b>126</b><br><b>73.26</b> |
| 9. The teacher makes the students behave according to how they are expected to.                                                                  | 9<br>5.23                    | 34<br>19.77 | <b>129</b><br><b>75.00</b> |
| 10. The teacher is able to assist students in doing cooperative group tasks.                                                                     | 8<br>4.65                    | 45<br>26.16 | <b>119</b><br><b>69.19</b> |
| Mean                                                                                                                                             | 4.63 (Very Highly Competent) |             |                            |

Note: Boldface means highest frequency.

Legend: 1.00-1.50: Not Competent (NC), 1.51-2.50: Moderately Competent (MC), 2.51-3.50: Competent (C), 3.51-4.50: Highly Competent (HC), 4.51-5.00: Very Highly Competent (VHC)

students' performances fairly and uses adequate and accurate standard measures of evaluation, (b) The teacher provides evaluative activities appropriate to students' abilities, interests, and needs, (c) The teacher gives evaluation results and ratings that are well-accepted by the students, (d) The teacher utilizes evaluation result as a basis for improving instruction, (e) The teacher uses different methods in evaluating students' learning aligned to the learning objectives such as oral performance, project, hands-on, (f) The teacher includes items in the tests that are based on the lesson objectives consisted with actual discussions, activities and classroom interactions, and (g) The teacher gives grades on the basis of students' actual performance. Likewise, the majority of them are "Very Highly Competent" in terms of the following: (a) The teacher bases ratings according to on the objectives of the lessons and criteria set in class, and (b) The teacher allows students to rate their own performances in some of the activities in the class.

The competency in evaluation skills is inferred in the study of Koloi-Keaikitse (2017)<sup>[34]</sup> that states that teachers are more

skilled in test construction than other practices such as using classroom assessment results to make informed decisions in their teaching and learning process. This is also based on the research of Blazar and Kraft (2017)<sup>[35]</sup> which found out that the upper-elementary teachers have large effects on self-reported measures of students' self-efficacy in math, happiness, and behavior in class. However, there are studies that indicate that student learning is multi-faceted with many factors beyond their core academic knowledge as an important contribution to both short- and long-term success. Instructors are then effective to improve the test scores of their students.

It also revealed that the non-social studies graduate in teaching social studies subjects have an overall weighted mean of 4.59. This implies that they are "Very Highly Competent" in teaching Social Studies subjects on all indicators (mastery of the subject field, teaching skills, classroom management skills, and evaluation skills) as perceived by the supervisors and colleagues.



Table 6c  
Level of Competence of Non-Social Studies Graduates in Teaching  
Social Studies Subjects at Pangasinan State University

n = 172

| C. Classroom Management Skills                                                                                                                   | C                                   | HC          | VHC                        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                  | f<br>%                              | f<br>%      | f<br>%                     |
| 1. The teacher commands respect from the students.                                                                                               | 8<br>4.65                           | 28<br>16.28 | <b>136</b><br><b>79.07</b> |
| 2. The teacher shows a great deal of patience towards the students.                                                                              | 19<br>11.05                         | 35<br>20.35 | <b>118</b><br><b>68.60</b> |
| 3. The teacher starts learning activities on time.                                                                                               | 11<br>6.40                          | 34<br>19.77 | <b>127</b><br><b>73.84</b> |
| 4. The teacher comes to class early and leaves on time.                                                                                          | 14<br>8.14                          | 45<br>26.16 | <b>113</b><br><b>65.70</b> |
| 5. The teacher makes every moment in class active promoting fun about learning.                                                                  | 21<br>12.21                         | 54<br>31.40 | <b>97</b><br><b>56.40</b>  |
| 6. The teacher sustains students' interest in the lessons and class discussion.                                                                  | 16<br>9.30                          | 26<br>15.12 | <b>130</b><br><b>75.58</b> |
| 7. The teacher establishes authority in the classroom effectively by assertive while being student-centered on hearing the voice of the student. | 15<br>8.72                          | 29<br>16.86 | <b>128</b><br><b>74.42</b> |
| 8. The teacher helps the class achieve the objectives set for the day.                                                                           | 11<br>6.40                          | 35<br>20.35 | <b>126</b><br><b>73.26</b> |
| 9. The teacher makes the students behave according to how they are expected to.                                                                  | 9<br>5.23                           | 34<br>19.77 | <b>129</b><br><b>75.00</b> |
| 10. The teacher is able to assist students in doing cooperative group tasks.                                                                     | 8<br>4.65                           | 45<br>26.16 | <b>119</b><br><b>69.19</b> |
| Mean                                                                                                                                             | <b>4.63 (Very Highly Competent)</b> |             |                            |

Note: Boldface means highest frequency.

Legend: 1.00-1.50: Not Competent (NC), 1.51-2.50: Moderately Competent (MC), 2.51-3.50: Competent (C), 3.51-4.50: Highly Competent (HC), 4.51-5.00: Very Highly Competent (VHC)

Table 6d  
Level of Competence of Non-Social Studies Graduates in Teaching  
Social Studies Subjects at Pangasinan State University  
n = 172

| D. Evaluation Skills                                                                                                                                           | C           | HC          | VHC                                 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                | f<br>%      | f<br>%      | f<br>%                              |
| 1. The teacher evaluates students' performances fairly and uses adequate and accurate standard measures of evaluation.                                         | 12<br>6.98  | 23<br>13.37 | <b>137</b><br><b>79.65</b>          |
| 2. The teacher provides evaluative activities appropriate to students' abilities, interests and needs.                                                         | 9<br>5.23   | 43<br>25.00 | <b>120</b><br><b>69.77</b>          |
| 3. The teacher gives evaluation results and ratings that are well-accepted by the students.                                                                    | 6<br>3.49   | 10<br>5.81  | <b>156</b><br><b>90.70</b>          |
| 4. The teacher utilizes evaluation result as a basis for improving instruction.                                                                                | 5<br>2.91   | 34<br>19.77 | <b>133</b><br><b>77.33</b>          |
| 5. The teacher uses different methods in evaluating students' learning aligned to the learning objectives such as oral performance, project, hands-on and etc. | 6<br>3.49   | 45<br>26.16 | <b>121</b><br><b>70.35</b>          |
| 6. The teacher includes items in the tests that are based on the lesson objectives consisted with actual discussions, activities and classroom interactions.   | 8<br>4.65   | 45<br>26.16 | <b>119</b><br><b>69.19</b>          |
| 7. The teacher gives grades on the basis of students' actual performance.                                                                                      | 12<br>6.98  | 34<br>19.77 | <b>126</b><br><b>73.26</b>          |
| 8. The teacher treats each student fairly in giving grades.                                                                                                    | 8<br>4.65   | 23<br>13.37 | <b>141</b><br><b>81.98</b>          |
| 9. The teacher bases ratings according to the objectives of the lessons and criteria set in class.                                                             | 19<br>11.05 | 41<br>23.84 | <b>112</b><br><b>65.12</b>          |
| 10. The teacher allows students to rate their own performances in some of the activities in the class.                                                         | 8<br>4.65   | 45<br>26.16 | <b>119</b><br><b>69.19</b>          |
| <b>Mean</b>                                                                                                                                                    |             |             | <b>4.69 (Very Highly Competent)</b> |
| <b>Overall Mean</b>                                                                                                                                            |             |             | <b>4.59 (Very Highly Competent)</b> |

Note: Boldface means highest frequency.

Legend: 1.00-1.50: Not Competent (NC), 1.51-2.50: Moderately Competent (MC), 2.51-3.50: Competent (C), 3.51-4.50: Highly Competent (HC), 4.51-5.00: Very Highly Competent (VHC)

Table 7  
Problems Encountered in Teaching Social Studies Subjects By  
Non-Social Studies Graduates Instructors  
n = 172

| Problems Encountered                                              | NS                        | MS                        | S                         | VS                        | ES          | WM   | RANK |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|------|------|
| 1. New in teaching                                                | 43<br>25.00               | <b>81</b><br><b>47.09</b> | 12<br>6.98                | 23<br>13.37               | 13<br>7.56  | 2.31 | 7    |
| 2. Subjects taught not a major field                              | 21<br>12.21               | <b>63</b><br><b>36.63</b> | 21<br>12.21               | 63<br>36.63               | 4<br>2.33   | 2.80 | 2    |
| 3. Overloading of schedule                                        | 21<br>12.21               | 63<br>36.63               | 21<br>12.21               | <b>65</b><br><b>37.79</b> | 2<br>1.16   | 2.79 | 3    |
| 4. Assigned many other duties to perform                          | 21<br>12.21               | 63<br>36.63               | <b>65</b><br><b>37.79</b> | 21<br>12.21               | 2<br>1.16   | 2.53 | 5    |
| 5. Class schedule does not provide time to prepare for the lesson | 21<br>12.21               | 34<br>19.77               | 32<br>18.60               | <b>64</b><br><b>37.21</b> | 21<br>12.21 | 3.17 | 1    |
| 6. Poor building accommodations                                   | 43<br>25.00               | 43<br>25.00               | <b>54</b><br><b>31.40</b> | 21<br>12.21               | 11<br>6.40  | 2.50 | 6    |
| 7. Lack of reference and reading materials                        | 43<br>25.00               | <b>74</b><br><b>43.02</b> | 21<br>12.21               | 32<br>18.60               | 2<br>1.16   | 2.28 | 8    |
| 8. Lack of teaching aid and devices                               | <b>65</b><br><b>37.79</b> | 23<br>13.37               | 61<br>35.47               | 21<br>12.21               | 2<br>1.16   | 2.26 | 9    |
| 9. Lack of supplies and equipment                                 | <b>75</b><br><b>43.60</b> | 38<br>22.09               | 36<br>20.93               | 21<br>12.21               | 2<br>1.16   | 2.05 | 10   |
| 10. Lack of administrative support                                | 43<br>25.00               | 22<br>12.79               | <b>75</b><br><b>43.60</b> | 21<br>12.21               | 11<br>6.40  | 2.62 | 4    |
| <b>Mean</b>                                                       |                           |                           |                           | <b>2.53 (Serious)</b>     |             |      |      |

Note: Boldface means highest frequency.

Legend: 1.00-1.50: Not Serious (NS), 1.51-2.50: Moderately Serious (MS), 2.51-3.50: Serious (S), 3.51-4.50: Very Serious (VS), 4.51-5.00: Extremely Serious (ES)

Problems Encountered by the Non-Social

### **Studies Graduates in Teaching Social Studies Subjects**

The problems encountered by the non-social studies graduates in teaching Social Studies subjects is presented in table 7 using counts and percentage analysis, weighted mean, and ranking.

The problems encountered by the non-Social Studies graduates in teaching Social Studies subjects is seen to be “Serious” with an overall weighted mean of 2.53.

Table 7 revealed that the majority of the instructors “Seriously” encountered the following problems: (1) Assigned many other duties to perform and (2) Poor building accommodations and (3) lack of administrative support. This is supported by the research of Van der Want (2018)<sup>[36]</sup> who noted there were too many tasks to perform is an issue that teachers encountered. Some of the complexities reported in the study of Vlachou (2015)<sup>[37]</sup> that hamper the professional development of teachers are lack of collaboration and the devalued position within the teaching staff of the school.

Furthermore, the data also reveal that most of the respondents encountered “Very Serious” problems about (1) Overloading of schedule and (2) Class schedule does not provide time to prepare for the lesson. The survey conducted by Baraboo teachers (Hurley, 2016)<sup>[38]</sup> states that teachers are feeling overloaded and under growing stress. Initiative programs placed teachers to work more and demand a lot of their time. The Educator’s Room (n.d)<sup>[39]</sup> said that teachers are so busy taking care of their student’s needs and are overloaded with so many other tasks, they don’t do anything for themselves. A permanent employee may be given administrative functions and delegated with other tasks. Hence, this became a growing concern of the instructors.

Meanwhile, others have encountered “Moderately Serious” problems specific to: (1) New in teaching, (2) Subjects taught not a major field and (3) Lack of reference and reading materials. Boakye and Ampiah (2017)<sup>[40]</sup> presented in their study the challenges that

newly qualified teachers encountered namely (a) lack of resources for teaching and learning, (b) deficiency in content knowledge and (c) time management.

Most of them however have Encountered “Not Serious” problems about (1) Lack of teaching aid and devices, and (2) Lack of supplies and equipment. The problems that they have encountered are also being experienced by other teachers as the study of Nemenzo (2018)<sup>[41]</sup> suggests. It articulates that teachers experience a very high extent of the problem in the availability of personal laptops for academic purposes, an insufficient number of computer units in schools for ICT integration, and damaged/obsolete computer units. Also, teachers have problems with using information technology, classroom management, and developing materials creatively (Jabu, 2015)<sup>[42]</sup>.

### **Relationship of the Profile and the Level of Competency of Non-social studies Graduates**

The relationship between the profile and the level of competency of non-social studies graduate instructors is presented in table 8a.

The findings in Table 8a reveal that there is a significant relationship between the level of competency of non-social studies graduates in terms of mastery of the subject matter and their profile in terms of age ( $r = 0.894$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and years of teaching experience ( $r = 0.894$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). This means that age and years of teaching experience are factors of the instructors’ mastery of the subject field they are teaching. This implies that older instructors and those who are already teaching for longer years tend to have a higher master of the subject they are teaching.

On the other hand, the data in table 8b reveal that there is no significant relationship between the profile of the non-graduate social studies instructors in terms of undergraduate study and eligibility with their level of competency in teaching Social Studies subjects as to the mastery of the subject field, teaching skill, classroom management skill, and evaluation skill. This implies that the profile of the instructors has no effect on their level of

competency in teaching.

### Differences on the Level of Competency of Non-social Studies Graduates as Perceived by their Supervisors and Colleagues

The difference in the level of competency of non-social studies graduate instructors as perceived by their supervisors and colleagues is presented in table 8.

The data reveal that there is no significant difference in the level of competency of non-social studies graduate instructors as perceived by their supervisors and colleagues in terms of mastery of the subject field ( $U = 1.50$ ), teaching skills ( $U = 3.00$ ), classroom management skills ( $U = 1.50$ ) and evaluation

skills ( $U = 1.50$ ). This means that the supervisors and colleagues perceived the same level of competency as the non-social studies graduate instructors.

The data reveal that there is a significant difference in the level of competency of non-social studies graduate instructors as perceived by their supervisors and colleagues in terms of mastery of the subject field ( $t = 2.044$ ,  $p < 0.05$ , mean difference = 0.22549) and evaluation Skills ( $t = 2.829$ ,  $p < 0.05$ , mean difference = 0.36127). These findings mean that the perception of the supervisors on the level of competency of non-social studies graduate instructors is significantly higher than the perception of their colleagues.

Table 8a

**Relationship of the Profile and the Level of Competency of Non-social studies Graduates Instructors**

| Profile Variables                         |           | Mastery of the Subject Field | Teaching Skill | Classroom Management Skill | Evaluation Skill |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| Sex <sup>a</sup>                          | r - value | .287                         | .783           | .172                       | .287             |
|                                           | p - value | .351                         | .118           | .645                       | .805             |
| Age <sup>b</sup>                          | r - value | .894 <sup>**</sup>           | .860           | .783                       | -.112            |
|                                           | p - value | .041                         | .061           | .118                       | .858             |
| Graduate Study <sup>c</sup>               | r - value | -.316                        | -.406          | -.158                      | .791             |
|                                           | p - value | .604                         | .498           | .800                       | .111             |
| Years of Teaching Experience <sup>b</sup> | r - value | .894 <sup>**</sup>           | .860           | .783                       | -.112            |
|                                           | p - value | .041                         | .061           | .118                       | .858             |
| Seminars Trainings Attended <sup>b</sup>  | r - value | .707                         | .544           | .354                       | .354             |
|                                           | p - value | .182                         | .343           | .559                       | .559             |

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Note: a. Point Biserial Correlation, b. Pearson Correlation, c. Spearman Rho

Table 8b

**Relationship of the Profile and the Level of Competency of Non-social studies Graduates Instructors**

| Variables           |                  | Mastery of the Subject Field | Teaching Skill | Classroom Management Skill | Evaluation Skill |
|---------------------|------------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| Undergraduate Study | likelihood ratio | 10.549                       | 7.777          | 10.549                     | 10.549           |
|                     | Sig.             | .229                         | .255           | .229                       | .229             |
|                     | Eta              | 0.651                        | 0.522          | 0.438                      | 0.911            |
| Eligibility         | likelihood ratio | 13.322                       | 10.549         | 13.322                     | 13.322           |
|                     | Sig.             | .346                         | .308           | .346                       | .346             |
|                     | Eta              | 0.772                        | 0.842          | 0.969                      | 0.917            |



Table 9

**Difference in the Perception of the Supervisors and Colleagues on the level of Competency of the Non-Graduate of Social Studies**

| Dependent Variables          | t     | df  | p - value | Mean Difference |
|------------------------------|-------|-----|-----------|-----------------|
| Mastery of the Subject Field | 2.044 | 170 | 0.043*    | .22549          |
| Teaching Skills              | .460  | 170 | .646      | .04902          |
| Classroom Management Skills  | 1.526 | 170 | .129      | .17598          |
| Evaluation Skills            | 2.829 | 170 | 0.005*    | .36127          |

\*, Significant at 0.05 level

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the comprehensive analysis of the findings of the study, it is noted that supervisors and colleagues are all eligible to teach in Education. This is in accordance with the CHED's mandate that eligible instructors, with PRC licenses and post-graduate degrees, are required to teach in board courses. Overall, the non-Social Studies graduates demonstrated a very high level of competency as perceived by their supervisors and colleagues. This goes to show that instructors are proficient in terms of mastery of the subject, teaching classroom management skills, and evaluation skills. The problems encountered which are seriously affected the efficiency of the instructors, particularly with regard to scheduling and assignment of other tasks. There is a relationship between the age and years of teaching experience with the instructors' mastery of the subject, the null hypothesis is rejected. The supervisor and colleagues perceived the same level of competence in the non-Social Studies graduates teaching Social Studies subjects.

Despite having an overall rating of very highly competent, it is suggested that the instructors must be able to identify more strategies for developing the full range of teacher skills when it comes to improving students' attitudes and behavior since the nature of teaching is multidimensional. It is recommended to conduct a more comprehensive

A research study using a triangulation method which includes the students of the instructors. It is suggested that the administration would consider the teaching schedule of those faculty with designation and various tasks. Lastly, improve the study made by the researcher for future research regarding the same subject matter. This will include the use of different statistical analyses and extensive studies that will yield another output that will either make this study strong or be changed.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Saxena, Hina. (2018). What Makes Teaching so Rewarding for You. Retrieved March 18, 2020 from [www.quora.com](http://www.quora.com).
- [2] Daguplo, Marvin (2013). Teaching Competence of the Graduate Education Faculty in Southern Leyte State University, Philippines. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research*, 36-48.
- [3] Chong Lee (2009). The 21<sup>st</sup> Century University Visions and Policy Issues in Korea. East Asia Conference, Tokyo, Japan.
- [4] Bar-Yam, Miriam, et.al. (2002). Complex Systems Perspectives on Education and the Educational System, *New England Systems Institute*. Retrieved April 11, 2020 from [www.necsi.edu](http://www.necsi.edu).
- [5] Campbell, John and Diana Oblinger (2007). Top Ten Teaching and Learning Issues. *Educause Review*.

- [6] Houston, D. and A. Maikw (2005). System Perspective on External System in Korea. *Korean Educational Development Institute*.
- [7] Rahman, M. H. (2014). Professional Competence, Pedagogical Competence and the Performance of Junior High School of Science Teachers. *Journal of Education and Practice*. Vol 5, No. 9.
- [8] Nessipbayeva, Olga (2012). The Competencies of the Modern Teacher. 148-154. Almaty, Kazakhstan.
- [9] Jones, Gary (2017). Developing Teachers' Professional Competence: Accessing Research Evidence and a Theory of Action. *Journal of the Chartered College of Teaching*.
- [10] Ingersoll, Richard (2003). Is There Really a Teacher Shortage? University of Pennsylvania: Penn Libraries.
- [11] UNESCO (2014). Quality Education Needs Qualified Teachers. Retrieved March 19, 2020 from [www.unesco.org](http://www.unesco.org).
- [12] Patalinghug, Kristel (2018). Out-of-the-Field Teaching in the Philippines. Retrieved March 20, 2020 from [www.studocu.com.ph](http://www.studocu.com.ph)
- [13] Professional Regulatory Commission (2016). LET Majorship Guide for Non-Education Bachelor's Degree with 18 Units of Professional Education. Retrieved March 30, 2020 from [www.prcboard.com](http://www.prcboard.com)
- [14] Llego, Mark Anthony (n.d.) PRC List of Equivalent Degrees for Teacher Examination. Retrieved March 25, 2020 from [www.teacherph.com](http://www.teacherph.com)
- [15] Calmorin, Laurentina (2016). Research and Thesis Writing with Statistics and Computer Application. Manila: Rex Bookstore Inc.
- [16] Anderson, E. K. and Catherine R. Solomon (2015). Family-friendly Policies and Practices in Academe. USA: Lexington Books.
- [17] Shepherd, Sue (2017). Why are There so Few Female Leaders in Higher Education: A Case of Structure or Agency? *Management Education*, 31(2), 82-87.
- [18] Regalado, Manolota (2017). Career Mobility and Gender: A Descriptive Study of Selected DepEd Teachers in Iligan City.
- [19] Peelo, Moira (2011). Understanding Supervision and the PhD. India: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- [20] Kunze, F. and Menges, J. (2017) Younger Supervisors, Older Subordinates: An Organizational-level Study of Age Differences, Emotions, and Performance. *J. Organiz. Behav.*, 38:461-486.
- [21] Podolsky, Tara K. (2016). Does Teaching Experience Increase Teacher Effectiveness? A Review of Research. Retrieved March 27, 2020 from <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org>
- [22] Rice, Jennifer K. (2010). The Impact of Teacher Experience: Examining the Evidence and Policy Implications. National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Educational Research.
- [23] Essien, Ekpenyon E.et. al. (2016). The Influence of In-service Training, Seminars and Workshops Attendance by Social Studies Teachers on Academic Performance of Students in Junior Secondary Schools Incross River State, Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*. No.22, 31-35.
- [24] Hamza, Sahibzada and Sumaiya Shafiq (2017). The Effect of Training and Development on Employee Performance in Private Company, Malasia.
- [25] Van Damme, Dirk (2017). Why Do So Many Women Wants to Become Teachers? OECD Education and Skills Today. Retrieved March 28, 2020 from <https://oecdeductoday.com>
- [26] Hanover Research (2016). Teacher Experience and Student Achievement. Retrieved March 21, 2020 from [www.gssaweb.org](http://www.gssaweb.org).

- [27] Olowoyeye, C. and C. Abioye (2014). Impact of Teacher's Subject Mastery and Questioning Behavior on Student's Performance in English Language in Selected Senior Secondary Schools in Ikere Monopolis. Vol. 4. No. 14. ISSN 2224-5766. 127-131.
- [28] Welsh, Kelly A. and Connie Schaffer (2017). Developing the Effective Teaching Skills of Teacher Candidates During Early Field Experiences. *The Educational Forum*.
- [29] Nursing Education (2011). Teaching Skills. Retrieved March 21, 2020 from [www.currentnursing.com](http://www.currentnursing.com)
- [30] Gage Nicholas A. and MachSuga-Gage, Ashley S (2017). Salient Classroom Management Skills: Finding the Most Effective Skills to Increase Student Engagement and Decrease Disruptions. Report on Emotional and Behavioral Disorders in Youth, 17(1), 13-18.
- [31] Postholm, May Britt (2013). Classroom Management: What Does Research Tell Us? *European Educational Research Journal*. Vol. 12. No. 3.
- [32] Kayikci, Kemal (2009). The Effect of Classroom Management Skills of Elementary School Teacher on Undesirable Discipline Behavior of Students. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*.
- [33] Horne, Sandra (2002). The Classroom Environment and its Effects on the Practice of Teachers. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*.
- [34] Koloi-Keaikitse, Setlthomo and Sammy King Fai Hui (2017). Assessment of Teacher-Perceived Skill in Classroom Education. 4:1.
- [35] Blazar, David and Matthew A. Kraft (2017). Teacher and Teaching Effects on Students' Attitudes and Behaviors. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. 39(1), 146-170.
- [36] Van de want, Anna, et. al. (2018). Experienced Teachers Dealing with Issues in Education: A Career Perspective, Teachers and Teaching. 24:7, 802-824.
- [37] Vlachou, Anna Eleni and Maria Kontofryou (2015). Roles, Duties and Challenges of Special Support Teachers at Secondary Education: Implications for Promoting Inclusive Practices. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*. 30:4, 551-564.
- [38] Hurley, Bill (2016). Teachers Feeling Overloaded and Stressed. Retrieved March 20, 2020 from [www.weac.org](http://www.weac.org).
- [39] The Educator's Room (n.d.) Initiative Overload: A Teacher's Harsh Reality. Retrieved March 20, 2020 from [www.theeducatorsroom.com](http://www.theeducatorsroom.com)
- [40] Boakye, C. and Ampiah, J. G. (2017). Challenges and Solutions: The Experiences of Newly Qualified Science Teachers. *SAGE Open*.
- [41] Nemenzo, Norlita (2018). Problems Encountered by Teachers in the Teaching-Learning Process: A Basis of an Action Plan.