

The Teachers' Competencies in the Implementation of the Early Language, Literacy, and Numeracy (ELLN) Program in Libmanan South District, Division of Camarines Sur

Dainna Rose R. Galacan¹

¹University of Northeastern Philippines, School of Graduate Studies

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: August 2026 Keywords: ELLN Early Literacy Early Numeracy Teacher Competence Professional Development	This study assessed implementation of the Early Language, Literacy, and Numeracy Program (ELLNP) and teachers' professional-development competencies in Libmanan South District, Division of Camarines Sur, during School Year 2023–2024. A descriptive-evaluative-correlational survey selected the locale purposively and used total enumeration of eligible teachers. Because the study report did not state a valid respondent total, no sample size is inferred. Weighted means and ranks described four implementation domains and four competency domains; Kendall's W and chi-square examined concordance across school categories. ELLNP implementation was Much Implemented overall (M=4.07). Establishment of competency standards and strengthening teachers' capacity shared the highest mean (both M=4.14), followed by school-based professional development (M=4.03) and school administration and management (M=3.95). Concordance was significant for competency standards (W=.79, $\chi^2=21.33$) and teacher capacity (W=.73, $\chi^2=19.71$), but not for administration (W=.50, $\chi^2=13.51$) or school-based professional development (W=.61, $\chi^2=16.47$). Teacher competency was Much Competent overall (M=4.24), led by teaching practices and beliefs (M=4.30) and classroom management (M=4.26); appraisal and feedback ranked last (M=4.07). Only classroom-management rankings showed significant concordance (W=.68, $\chi^2=18.36$). The findings support a stronger implementation architecture: common competency progressions, embedded coaching, observation and feedback, classroom-management support, and learner-outcome monitoring. Self-report ratings and rank concordance do not demonstrate that ELLNP implementation caused literacy or numeracy gains.

1. Introduction

Foundational language, literacy, and numeracy enable learners to access every later area of the curriculum. Early gaps in oral language, phonological awareness, decoding, fluency, comprehension, number sense, and operations can compound when instruction moves to more complex texts and problems.

The Department of Education established the Early Language, Literacy, and Numeracy Program to strengthen skills among Kindergarten to Grade 3 learners and create a sustainable, cost-effective professional-development system for teachers (Department of Education, 2015). The policy recognizes that instructional improvement requires more than materials: teachers need coherent standards, sustained capacity building, school leadership, and evidence-responsive support.

Professional development is most likely to influence practice when it is focused on specific content, connected to curriculum and assessment, active rather than lecture-dominated, collaborative, sustained, and accompanied by feedback (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). One-off orientation may increase awareness without changing routines for diagnosing and responding to learner needs.

Competency standards make expectations visible and support progression from awareness to independent and adaptive practice. Their value depends on whether they are translated into observable behaviors, usable exemplars, coaching conversations, and evidence from learner work. Standards without supported enactment can become compliance statements.

School-based professional development can make learning context-sensitive because teachers examine the same curriculum, learners, resources, and constraints. Learning Action Cells and lesson study can connect professional inquiry with daily teaching, but they require protected time, facilitation, access to evidence, and follow-through.

Classroom management is integral to early literacy and numeracy. Small-group instruction, differentiated tasks, oral participation, manipulatives, and repeated practice require predictable routines and efficient transitions. Management should therefore be understood as the organization of opportunities to learn, not merely the control of behavior.

The present survey describes implementation and competence from teachers' perspectives. It is useful for identifying shared and variable priorities across school categories, but it does not directly measure the quality of lessons or the progress of learners. The discussion therefore connects ratings to an implementation framework while maintaining causal restraint.

1.1 Research Purpose and Analytical Focus

The study aimed to assess ELLNP implementation in school administration and management, competency standards, school-based professional development, and teacher capacity; test concordance in those rankings; determine teacher competence in personal

development, appraisal and feedback, teaching practices and beliefs, and classroom management; and test concordance in competency rankings.

The journal analysis sought to identify the institutional conditions required to convert favorable perceptions into consistent, observable early-literacy and early-numeracy practice supported by learner evidence.

1.2 Conceptual and Empirical Synthesis

ELLNP implementation is conceptualized as a chain from standards to professional learning, classroom enactment, feedback, and learner response. Standards specify practice; development builds knowledge and skill; school leadership organizes conditions; classroom implementation creates learning opportunities; and assessment evidence guides adjustment.

Teacher competence includes personal responsibility for learning, receptiveness to appraisal, instructional beliefs and practices, and the management of a differentiated early-grade classroom. These are interdependent: feedback has limited value without psychological safety and actionable evidence, while strong beliefs have limited effect without routines and resources.

Kendall concordance indicates whether school categories similarly order practices. High agreement can support common priorities, whereas non-significant agreement may indicate contextual adaptation, uneven support, or differences in interpretation that warrant qualitative inquiry.

2. Methodology

A descriptive-evaluative-correlational design was used in Libmanan South District during School Year 2023–2024. The district was purposively selected, and total enumeration was reported for eligible teacher respondents.

A researcher-made five-point questionnaire measured four ELLNP implementation domains and four professional-development competency domains. The results available for this article did not report a verified respondent count; the analysis therefore does not invent one. Weighted means and rank order summarized domain ratings. Kendall's *W* and corresponding chi-square statistics were used to determine concordance in indicator rankings across school categories at the source's stated .05 significance level.

Because the measures were self-reported and cross-sectional, the terms implementation and competence refer to teachers' assessments. No learner achievement test, observation score, or statistical association between implementation and competency was reported.

Table 1. Research Design, Participants, Measures, and Analysis

Component	Specification
Design and locale	Descriptive-evaluative-correlational survey; Libmanan South District; SY 2023–2024
Sampling	Purposive selection of locale; total enumeration of eligible teachers; verified <i>N</i> not stated in the available results
Measure	Researcher-made five-point questionnaire
Domains	Four implementation domains and four teacher-competency domains
Analysis	Weighted mean, rank, Kendall's <i>W</i> , chi-square; $\alpha=.05$ as reported

2.1 Analytical Rigor and Boundaries

The instrument reflects the major components of the ELLNP professional-development architecture, allowing implementation conditions and individual competence to be examined separately. School-category comparisons add diagnostic value to the district means. The missing verified respondent total limits assessment of precision and generalizability. The report also did not provide reliability coefficients, item-level missing-data procedures, exact *p*-values, cluster sizes, or learner outcomes. These elements should be supplied before journal submission.

The concordance tests are interpreted as agreement in rankings—not as correlations between ELLNP implementation and teacher competence. A future multilevel design should link validated teacher measures, observed practice, intervention dosage, and repeated learner outcomes.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Extent of ELLNP Implementation

All four implementation components were rated Much Implemented.

Table 2. Summary of ELLNP Implementation

Implementation Domain	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Establishment of competency standards	4.14	Much Implemented	1.5
Strengthening teachers' capacity	4.14	Much Implemented	1.5
School-based professional development	4.03	Much Implemented	3
School administration and management	3.95	Much Implemented	4
Overall	4.07	Much Implemented	—

Competency standards and teacher capacity jointly led the profile. Their pairing is substantively coherent: standards clarify expected practice, while capacity building enables teachers to enact it. The next implementation step is to map standards to observable early-language, literacy, and numeracy routines, proficiency levels, and evidence sources.

School-based professional development remained favorable but lower. Professional learning should move from program orientation to repeated cycles of diagnosing learner needs, co-planning lessons, rehearsing routines, examining learner work, observing instruction, and revising practice.

Administration and management ranked last. Although the mean remained Much Implemented, leadership is the enabling layer for schedules, materials, coaching, assessment windows, data review, and equitable intervention. A relatively lower rating can therefore constrain the sustainability of otherwise strong teacher effort.

3.2 Concordance in Implementation Rankings

Agreement was significant for standards and teacher capacity, but not for administration or school-based professional development.

Table 3. Kendall Concordance for ELLNP Implementation

Implementation Domain	W	χ^2	Reported Decision
Administration and management	.50	13.51	Not significant
Competency standards	.79	21.33	Significant
School-based professional development	.61	16.47	Not significant
Strengthening teacher capacity	.73	19.71	Significant

High, significant concordance for competency standards indicates a stable ordering of standard-related practices across school categories. Significant agreement for capacity building likewise identifies a shared set of priorities that can anchor district-wide training and coaching.

The non-significant results for administration and school-based professional development imply less consistent ordering. Schools may differ in leadership routines, protected time, facilitator expertise, resource availability, and use of learner data. Common minimum standards should be paired with context-specific implementation plans.

Agreement should not be confused with quality. Schools can agree on priorities that are weakly enacted, or disagree because they face different legitimate needs. Verification requires schedules, attendance and dosage records, session artifacts, observation, coaching logs, and evidence of changed practice.

3.3 Teacher Competencies for ELLNP Implementation

Teaching practices and beliefs ranked first; appraisal and feedback ranked last.

Table 4. Teacher Professional-Development Competencies

Competency Domain	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Teaching practices and beliefs	4.30	Much Competent	1
Classroom management	4.26	Much Competent	2
Personal development	4.14	Much Competent	3
Appraisal and feedback	4.07	Much Competent	4
Overall	4.24	Much Competent	—

The leading rating for practices and beliefs suggests strong reported commitment to early-grade instruction. This strength becomes consequential when it is visible in explicit modeling, language-rich interaction, cumulative review, differentiated groups, numeracy representations, and responsive assessment.

Classroom management ranked second. In ELLN classrooms, effective management protects learning time and makes small-group or station-based instruction feasible. Routines should support learner agency, oral participation, safe error making, rapid transitions, and access to appropriate materials.

Appraisal and feedback was the lowest competency. Feedback is a likely leverage point because it connects standards with actual practice. High-quality feedback is timely, specific, evidence-based, dialogic, and followed by an opportunity to apply and review the recommendation; generic evaluation ratings rarely produce this cycle.

3.4 Concordance in Competency Rankings

Only classroom-management rankings showed significant concordance.

Table 5. Kendall Concordance for Teacher Competencies

Competency Domain	W	χ^2	Reported Decision
Personal development	.36	9.72	Not significant

Competency Domain	W	χ^2	Reported Decision
Appraisal and feedback	.27	7.29	Not significant
Teaching practices and beliefs	.57	15.39	Not significant
Classroom management	.68	18.36	Significant

Significant classroom-management concordance indicates that school categories shared a stable ranking of management practices. This provides a basis for district exemplars and peer observation focused on routines that enable differentiated ELLN teaching. Personal development, appraisal and feedback, and teaching practices did not show significant concordance. The result may reflect uneven coaching cultures, access to professional learning, beliefs about early instruction, or interpretation of the items. A common rubric and moderated review of lesson and learner evidence could reduce ambiguity.

The finding does not establish that classroom management is the only important competency. It indicates shared ordering, while the domain means show that all four were rated favorably.

3.5 Implementation Priorities from the Combined Profile

The strongest implementation components and the clearest competency gap point to an embedded coaching model.

Table 6. Strength–Gap Synthesis

Evidence	Interpretation	Priority Response
Standards and capacity both M=4.14	Shared program foundation	Translate standards into observable progressions and exemplars
Administration M=3.95	Relative enabling-condition gap	Protect time, resources, assessment, and monitoring routines
Appraisal/feedback M=4.07	Relative professional-learning gap	Use coaching cycles with specific follow-up
Classroom management W=.68	Shared ranking across contexts	Develop district exemplars and peer observation

The combined profile argues for job-embedded improvement. Standards and capacity are already favorably perceived; administration should organize repeated opportunities for teachers to apply those standards and receive evidence-rich feedback. A coaching cycle can begin with learner data, identify a narrow instructional goal, co-plan and rehearse a routine, observe or video a lesson, analyze learner responses, agree on one actionable refinement, and review its use. This creates a traceable bridge from professional development to classroom practice.

3.6 Integrated Interpretation of the Findings

ELLNP implementation and teacher competency were both rated favorably, but the profile was not uniform. Standards and capacity were the strongest implementation components; administration and school-based professional development were relatively lower. Teaching practice and classroom management were strong reported competencies, while appraisal and feedback was the clearest development area. This pattern suggests that teachers are willing and active, but the system for observing, calibrating, and refining practice needs strengthening.

Concordance was concentrated in competency standards, teacher capacity, and classroom management. These domains can anchor common district supports. Variation in administration, professional development, appraisal, and teaching practice should be investigated at school level.

The most coherent improvement model is an evidence loop: common early-grade standards, valid screening and progress monitoring, protected collaborative learning, observation and coaching, targeted intervention, and review of learner response.

4. Conclusions and Implications

4.1 Conclusions

ELLNP implementation was Much Implemented overall (M=4.07), with competency standards and teacher-capacity strengthening highest and administration lowest.

Implementation rankings showed significant concordance for competency standards and teacher capacity, but not for administration or school-based professional development.

Teachers rated themselves Much Competent overall (M=4.24). Teaching practices and beliefs ranked first, whereas appraisal and feedback ranked last.

Only classroom-management competency showed significant concordance. The findings support embedded professional learning and stronger implementation evidence, not causal claims about learner outcomes.

4.2 Study Limitations

The cross-sectional design describes conditions during the stated school year and cannot establish temporal or causal effects. Ratings of effectiveness, competence, or implementation are therefore interpreted as respondent perceptions rather than independently verified improvements in learner performance.

The principal measures were researcher-made, self-report scales. Social desirability, recall, common-method variance, and differences in interpretation of the response anchors may have influenced the estimates. Classroom observation, document review, learning-resource audits, and learner-level outcome data were not incorporated into the principal analyses.

Kendall's W evaluates concordance in the ordering of indicators. It does not test a respondent-level causal relationship between program implementation and competence, nor does it show that a higher-rated practice produced a learner outcome.

A verified respondent count and complete psychometric documentation were not stated in the available results. This prevents precise evaluation of sampling coverage and measurement quality.

4.3 Implications for Practice and Policy

Operationalize ELLN competency standards as observable progressions with examples of beginning, proficient, and adaptive practice.

Protect regular school-based professional-learning cycles centered on current learner evidence rather than general seminars.

Train instructional leaders in content-specific observation and feedback for early language, literacy, and numeracy.

Use classroom-management exemplars to support small-group instruction, station work, oral language, manipulatives, and intervention routines.

Connect screening, progress monitoring, teaching adjustments, and professional-development priorities through a common district dashboard.

5. Policy and Implementation Priorities

Table 7. ELLNP Implementation and Professional-Learning Framework

Priority Area	Recommended Direction	Expected Evidence
Standards	Define observable ELLN competencies and developmental progressions.	Rubric; exemplars; calibration records
Assessment	Use common screening and brief progress-monitoring schedules.	Learner profile; growth trend; action threshold
School-based PD	Run recurring data–plan–practice–observe–revise cycles.	Session artifacts; revised lesson; learner work
Feedback	Provide one or two specific, evidence-based actions with follow-up.	Coaching log; implementation check
Management	Standardize routines that enable differentiated early-grade instruction.	Observation evidence; time-on-task data
Governance	Monitor dosage, reach, fidelity, equity, and learner response.	Dashboard; school review; technical-assistance plan

6. Directions for Future Research

Link validated teacher-competency measures and observed practice with repeated learner literacy and numeracy outcomes.

Examine how school leadership, resources, facilitator expertise, and protected time explain differences in school-based professional development. Test the effects of structured coaching and feedback through stepped-wedge, cluster-randomized, or well-matched quasi-experimental designs.

Use qualitative case studies to understand why administration, appraisal, and teaching-practice priorities differ across school categories.

References

- [1] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE.
- [2] Department of Education. (2017). DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2017/08/11/do-42-s-2017-national-adoption-and-implementation-of-the-philippine-professional-standards-for-teachers-2/>
- [3] Department of Education. (2022). *Basic Education Development Plan 2030*. Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines.
- [4] Republic Act No. 10533. (2013). *Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013*. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.
- [5] Siegel, S., & Castellan, N. J., Jr. (1988). *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- [6] Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.
- [7] Department of Education. (2015). DepEd Order No. 12, s. 2015: Guidelines on the Early Language, Literacy, and Numeracy Program—Professional Development Component. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2015/04/10/do-12-s-2015-guidelines-on-the-early-language-literacy-and-numeracy-program-professional-development-component/>
- [8] Department of Education. (2016). DepEd Order No. 33, s. 2016: Guidelines on the utilization of ECARP funds for the ELLN professional-development component. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2016/05/30/do-33-s-2016-guidelines-on-the-utilization-of-the-2016-every-child-a-reader-program-funds-for-the-early-language-literacy-and-numeracy-program-professional->
- [9] Desimone, L. M., & Garet, M. S. (2015). Best practices in teachers' professional development in the United States. *Psychology, Society & Education*, 7(3), 252–263.
- [10] Timperley, H. (2011). *Realizing the power of professional learning*. Open University Press.