RESEARCH ARTICLE

JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research
Volume 2, Issue 10, Page 761-768 | Article No. 86
DOI: 10.4898/jenerv2i10.a86
ISSN: 7895-9216
Journal homepage: https://jenerjournal.com
Journal email: editor@jenerjournal.com

Ang Kabisaan Ng Pagpapalaganap Ng Digital Literacy Sa Pagpapahusay Ng Kakayahang Pangkomunikasyon Ng Mga Mag-Aaral Sa Filipino Sa Pampublikong Paaralang Sekondarya Sa Purok Ng Sagñay, Sangay Ng Camarines Sur

Aline Palaypayon-Benipayo[1]

[1]University of Northeastern Philippines · Iriga City, Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:
Published: October 2026

Keywords:
Digital Literacy
Filipino Language
Digital Communication
Secondary Schools
Teachers
Kendall concordance

ABSTRACT

The study described Filipino-language teachers' reported digital-literacy capabilities and their perceptions of the effectiveness of digital practices for students' communication in secondary schools in the Sagñay area of Camarines Sur during school year 2025–2026. The study used a descriptive–evaluative–correlational survey involving 31 Filipino teachers from eight schools grouped as large, medium, and small. Its locally developed questionnaire contained 98 items in ten domains. Weighted means summarized the responses, while Kendall's coefficient of concordance and chi-square approximations examined the similarity of school-group rankings. The overall reported capability rating was 4.51 (Lubos ang Kakayahan), highest for social media and online platforms (4.63) and lowest for collaborative tools (4.41). Perceived effectiveness for student communication averaged 4.50 (Mabisang Mabisa), highest for listening (4.67) and lowest for writing (4.37). Reported concordance coefficients across the ten domains ranged from 0.71 to 0.79 and were labeled significant. These measures represent teacher ratings and concordant rankings, not directly assessed pupil communication outcomes or a tested causal relationship between digital literacy and attainment. The findings provide priorities for strengthening collaborative digital pedagogy, online information evaluation, and writing instruction, while suggesting the need for direct learner assessment in subsequent research.

1. Introduction

Digital communication is now embedded in routine schooling: learners encounter texts, explanations, feedback, collaborative documents, audio recordings, and public-facing messages through digital interfaces. Language learning is therefore shaped both by familiar linguistic competencies and by the ability to use networked environments safely and purposefully. Within Filipino language education, these demands concern expressive fluency, accurate written forms, comprehension of spoken and written material, and appropriate participation in online discourse. The study situated these interconnected demands within public secondary schools in the Sagñay area of Camarines Sur.

Digital literacy is wider than operational familiarity with particular software. The European Commission's DigComp 2.2 framework encompasses information and data literacy, communication and collaboration, digital content creation, safety, and problem solving. This integrated view clarifies why using social platforms frequently does not by itself demonstrate proficiency in source evaluation, constructive collaboration, or responsible publication (Vuorikari et al., 2022). The study addressed several of these components separately rather than treating technology use as a single undifferentiated practice. UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2018) also frames digital literacy as measurable skills and competencies; in this article, those external frameworks provide conceptual context rather than an untested validation of the local survey.

The 2023 UNESCO Global Education Monitoring Report similarly cautioned against equating the availability of educational technology with learning improvement. Technologies may increase access and participation, but their benefits depend on context, teacher preparation, accessibility, implementation, and evidence of learning (UNESCO, 2023). This distinction is especially consequential for language subjects, where an appealing digital activity cannot substitute for attention to meaning, linguistic feedback, conceptual understanding, and learner participation.

In the local setting, Filipino teachers may use messaging applications for notices, video and audio material for speaking and listening tasks, online reading for exposure to texts, and shared documents for drafts and peer review. Each use implies a different pedagogical mechanism. Audio playback offers opportunities for repeated listening; collaborative documents can support revision; public comment spaces can encourage argumentation but introduce risks of harassment and misinformation. Evaluating these activities separately can produce a more useful improvement agenda than an aggregate measure of generalized digital engagement.

The study described five teacher-capability domains: social media and online platforms; email and online communication tools; digital etiquette; collaborative tools; and identifying or avoiding misinformation. It also assessed five perceived student-communication domains: speaking, writing, listening, reading, and expressing emotions and ideas. The distinction between capability and perceived effectiveness is central: one set of ratings concerns the teacher's capacity to support digital activities, while the second concerns the teacher's judgment of how beneficial those activities are for students.

The inquiry adopted a group-comparative perspective by categorizing schools as large, medium, and small. Such categories can reflect practical differences in infrastructure, connectivity, staffing, and access to instructional support; however, the study did not measure these possible explanatory conditions. For this reason, between-group similarity or difference in item rankings should not be equated with evidence that school size produced particular communication results.

A particular analytical issue arises when an evaluative survey is described as "correlational." Kendall's W measures the concordance of ranked judgments across groups or raters. It does not, on its own, calculate a correlation between individual teachers' digital-literacy scores and individual learners' measured language performance. Careful interpretation is therefore necessary to retain the substantive value of the study while avoiding an inference unsupported by the statistical design.

The study aimed to characterize digital-literacy capacities and the perceived value of digital approaches for Filipino communication, determine the agreement of rankings among school-size categories, and identify evidence-informed instructional and policy priorities. The article synthesizes the thesis's findings without changing its reported statistics or representing respondent perceptions as experimentally verified improvements.

2. Methods

2.1 Design and setting

The study employed the descriptive–evaluative–correlational design stated in the thesis. Data were collected for school year 2025–2026 from public secondary schools in the Sagñay area, Division of Camarines Sur. For the journal account, the term "correlational" reflects the study's description; the reported inferential analyses concerned rank agreement among school groups rather than a pupil-level predictor–outcome correlation. No experimental manipulation or pretest–posttest learner intervention was reported.

2.2 Participants and sampling

Purposive selection of the locale was combined with an intended enumeration of Filipino teachers in the identified schools. The thesis stated that 31 teachers participated: 14 from the large-school category, 14 from medium schools, and three from small schools. The methods text refers both to Junior High School Filipino teachers and to junior and senior high school teachers; the precise grade-level eligibility criteria should be confirmed against the respondent roster before submission.

Table 1. Reported distribution of Filipino teachers by school-size category

School-size category	Teachers (n)	Reported %
Large	14	45
Medium	14	45
Small	3	10
Total	31	100

2.3 Instrument and measures

The researcher-developed 98-item survey had two 49-item parts. The first recorded teachers' reported capacity to promote digital literacy in five domains; the second rated perceived effectiveness for five Filipino communication domains. Each indicator was scored on a five-point scale, with domain means interpreted according to the scale printed in the thesis. For teacher capability, 4.50–5.00 was "Lubos ang Kakayahan" (LK) and 3.50–4.49 "Higit ang Kakayahan" (HK). For perceived effectiveness, corresponding categories were "Mabisang Mabisa" (MM) and "Higit na Mabisa" (HM). Because the two parts used distinct labels, their verbal interpretations are presented separately.

Table 2. Questionnaire structure

Questionnaire part	Construct	Items
Teacher capability	Social media and online platforms	11
Teacher capability	Email and online communication tools	10
Teacher capability	Digital etiquette	9
Teacher capability	Collaborative tools	10
Teacher capability	Identifying and avoiding misinformation	9
Perceived effectiveness	Speaking	9
Perceived effectiveness	Writing	10
Perceived effectiveness	Listening	9
Perceived effectiveness	Reading	10
Perceived effectiveness	Expressing emotions and ideas	11
Total	Two parts	98

2.4 Data collection and quality checks

The study described school and district permissions, administration of questionnaires, retrieval, encoding, tabulation, and advisory review. It recorded instrument review by district supervisors, school heads, master teachers, and the thesis adviser. A Kuder–Richardson 21 procedure was mentioned, followed by a reported t-value of 7.36. The actual internal-consistency coefficient, sample used in the calculation, and the appropriateness of KR-21 to the five-point items were not sufficiently documented for independent evaluation. Accordingly, the article does not characterize reliability as established by a reproducible coefficient. An institutional ethics reference and the exact consent wording were not supplied in the materials examined.

2.5 Statistical treatment and limits of inference

The study used frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, item ranks, Kendall's W for three school-size groups, and a chi-

square approximation to Kendall's W; significance was reported at .05 and selected more stringent thresholds. The original W and χ^2 values were retained. As only summarized statistics were available, the article did not recompute rank concordance, estimate confidence intervals, or infer an association between two unpaired scale scores. Differences of a few hundredths on a descriptive Likert-type scale are discussed conservatively, and reported significance is not treated as evidence of a technology-induced improvement in learners.

3. Results

3.1 Teacher capability across digital-literacy domains

Table 3. Teacher digital-literacy capability: reported weighted means by school-size group

Domain	Large	Medium	Small	Overall	Rank
Social media and online platforms	4.65	4.64	4.61	4.63	1
Email and online communication tools	4.57	4.58	4.55	4.57	2
Digital etiquette	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.51	3
Collaborative tools	4.41	4.42	4.40	4.41	5
Identifying and avoiding misinformation	4.46	4.47	4.43	4.45	4
Overall	4.52	4.52	4.50	4.51	—

The overall digital-capability rating of 4.51 fell in the highest category used in the thesis. Social-media and online-platform activities ranked first (4.63), followed by email and online communication tools (4.57). Collaborative tools received the lowest overall mean (4.41), with identifying and avoiding misinformation close behind (4.45). The gaps are small in absolute scale units, so the most defensible interpretation is relative priority for professional learning rather than a sharp separation of proficient and deficient teachers.

The pattern was stable across all three school-size categories: each group ranked social media first and collaborative tools last. The large-school and medium-school overall capability means were both 4.52, while the small-school mean was 4.50. Such numerical proximity cannot establish equal digital access or pedagogical opportunity across sites; it records similar responses among those participating. It also does not justify treating teachers' perceptions as independent performance observations.

3.2 Representative practices within the digital-literacy domains

Table 4. Selected individual teacher-capability indicators

Domain	Reported practice	Mean
Social media	Support active Filipino-language participation in online discussions	4.66
Social media	Create meaningful digital content in Filipino	4.61
Email tools	Send important announcements and reminders by email	4.69
Email tools	Share learning materials and assignments by email	4.64
Digital etiquette	Use courteous and clear language online	4.69
Digital etiquette	Respect differing views on digital platforms	4.66
Collaboration	Use online tools to broaden student participation	4.63
Collaboration	Guide students in effective use of shared documents	4.54
Collaboration	Manage online collaborative spaces effectively	4.17
Misinformation	Avoid sharing information before verification	4.64
Misinformation	Verify data using trustworthy sources	4.28
Misinformation	Promote critical, accountable use of digital media	4.25

The selected items reveal an instructional asymmetry. Email announcements and respectful online language attracted some of the strongest ratings, reflecting established communication norms. By contrast, the management of shared digital workspaces, the use of trustworthy references, and fostering critical engagement with media received more modest endorsements. These activities place additional demands on instructional design, iterative feedback, source evaluation, and authentic student contributions beyond the capacity to send or read digital messages.

This differentiation is substantively important. A teacher may navigate applications with ease while lacking specific routines for guiding peer editing or checking the provenance of online claims. Conversely, competent verification requires both access to reliable sources and a disciplinary practice of asking how a claim is supported. The observed pattern therefore supports a professional-development agenda organized by pedagogy and judgment, not solely introductory software training.

3.3 Rank concordance for teacher capability

Table 5. Reported concordance of digital-capability indicator rankings across school-size groups

Capability domain	Kendall W	χ^2	df	Threshold
Social media and online platforms	0.75	20.31	9	0.025
Email and online communication tools	0.74	17.87	8	0.05
Digital etiquette	0.75	15.67	8	0.05
Collaborative tools	0.74	17.69	8	0.05
Identifying and avoiding misinformation	0.79	16.56	7	0.025

The reported W values between 0.74 and 0.79 indicate that the three school-size groups ordered the relevant activities similarly. The highest concordance occurred for misinformation avoidance (W = 0.79), even though that domain's average capability rating was below the top two domains. This distinction illustrates why mean level and rank agreement must be interpreted as different features of the data: groups can strongly agree on which practices are most or least prominent without reporting the same absolute strength in every practice.

3.4 Perceived effectiveness for student communication

Table 6. Perceived effectiveness of digital literacy for Filipino communication: reported domain means

Domain	Large	Medium	Small	Overall	Rank
Speaking	4.45	4.44	4.42	4.44	4
Writing	4.36	4.39	4.36	4.37	5
Listening	4.69	4.66	4.65	4.67	1
Reading	4.58	4.55	4.55	4.56	2
Expressing emotions and ideas	4.50	4.47	4.46	4.48	3
Overall	4.52	4.50	4.49	4.50	—

Teachers gave the highest perceived-effectiveness rating to listening (4.67), followed by reading (4.56). Expressing emotions and ideas was rated 4.48, speaking 4.44, and writing 4.37. The 0.30-point difference between listening and writing was the largest spread across the five communication domains. Although the study described digital approaches as effective overall, these findings do not demonstrate a corresponding gain in test scores or quality of student writing because the study did not present independently scored learner tasks or longitudinal data.

Listening may be particularly salient to teachers because online lessons can readily incorporate podcasts, narrated clips, recorded dialogues, and replayed explanations. Reading activities can use accessible electronic texts and interactive materials, although their quality depends on careful selection and guided comprehension. Written communication, by contrast, requires repeated drafting, precise feedback, sustained attention to vocabulary and organization, and an opportunity to revise. Teachers' relatively lower writing ratings therefore point to a plausible area for closer practice-based inquiry, but they do not establish why the difference occurred.

3.5 Representative communication indicators

Table 7. Selected individual communication indicators

Communication domain	Reported digitally supported activity	Mean
Speaking	Teach pronunciation, stress, and intonation using digital tools	4.55
Speaking	Guide use of audio/video tools to express ideas coherently	4.54
Writing	Teach grammar, spelling, and punctuation with online tools	4.43
Writing	Develop Filipino writing through digital writing platforms	4.42
Listening	Use podcasts and audio recordings to develop listening	4.84
Listening	Use digital audio/video resources for active listening	4.81
Reading	Increase reading interest through ebooks and online materials	4.76
Reading	Encourage reading diverse digital Filipino texts	4.74
Expression	Encourage open, respectful online opinion sharing	4.75
Expression	Teach appropriate responses in digital spaces	4.69
Expression	Employ digital storytelling for personal experiences	4.24

Within listening, podcasts and recorded materials reached a reported mean of 4.84, substantially above the domain overall mean of 4.67. The gap between the highest and the lowest selected expression indicator, digital storytelling of personal experience (4.24), suggests that the perceived utility of technology depended on task characteristics rather than on a general preference for digital interaction. Receptive experiences such as listening to recordings and reading digital texts received especially strong endorsements, while producing and revising self-authored material appeared less uniformly established.

This pattern can be connected to cognitive and pedagogical demands without making causal assertions. Listening to a recording is comparatively easy to schedule and repeat; authoring a sustained text or personal digital story requires scaffolding, language choices, and feedback loops. The study did not measure time on task, materials quality, or access constraints, so it cannot distinguish those possible explanations empirically. Its contribution lies in identifying domains that merit observation and assessment in future classroom studies.

3.6 Rank concordance for perceived effectiveness

Table 8. Reported concordance for digital-communication indicators across school-size groups

Communication domain	Kendall W	χ^2	df	Source threshold
Speaking	0.76	16.00	7	0.05
Writing	0.73	17.60	8	0.05
Listening	0.75	15.67	7	0.05
Reading	0.71	17.07	8	0.05
Expressing emotions and ideas	0.75	20.16	9	0.025

Reported concordance ranged from W = 0.71 for reading to W = 0.76 for speaking. The groups therefore exhibited fairly similar item rankings even when their reported averages differed slightly. The statistical outcome cannot establish that better digital competence caused stronger language skills: the paired units necessary for that claim, and direct student outcome data, were not presented. In a journal report, that distinction is essential to avoid implying a causal conclusion from agreement statistics.

3.7 Additional item-level detail: classroom digital practices

Table 9. Further source-reported capability indicators for instructional interpretation

Domain	Additional questionnaire practice (English rendering)	Reported mean
Social media	Promote safe and responsible use of the internet among learners	4.52
Social media	Broaden access to current digital learning resources	4.49

Domain	Additional questionnaire practice (English rendering)	Reported mean
Social media	Use social media to strengthen critical thinking	4.48
Social media	Demonstrate digital citizenship on online platforms	4.42
Email	Write clear and professional messages in Filipino	4.62
Email	Follow appropriate netiquette in online tools	4.58
Email	Communicate effectively with learners and parents	4.56
Email	Use chat and video-conferencing tools interactively	4.56
Email	Organize online discussions to extend learning	4.51
Email	Ensure security and privacy of online communication	4.47
Digital etiquette	Observe proper conduct and ethics online	4.62
Digital etiquette	Promote a positive and inclusive online space	4.48
Digital etiquette	Maintain professionalism in online work	4.45
Digital etiquette	Model responsible online discussion participation	4.39
Digital etiquette	Teach responsibility and appropriate online conduct	4.34
Collaboration	Strengthen teacher–learner digital interaction	4.63
Collaboration	Promote active work using real-time editing tools	4.42
Collaboration	Enable shared creation of projects and assignments	4.40
Collaboration	Promote peer-to-peer learning via collaborative tools	4.32
Collaboration	Coordinate groups with collaborative applications	4.31
Collaboration	Teach ethics for shared digital resources	4.28
Misinformation	Share online information responsibly	4.60
Misinformation	Evaluate source credibility before sharing	4.58
Misinformation	Explain distinctions between opinion and fact	4.58
Misinformation	Demonstrate fact-checking of news and information	4.39
Misinformation	Use tools to examine online-content accuracy	4.29

The extended indicator analysis shows the distinct demands grouped under single capability labels. In email and online communication, teachers reported strong facility with professional Filipino messages, parent contact, and discussion organization; however, security and privacy were rated somewhat lower. The difference matters because safe communication is not solely a technical concern: it includes considering how student work, class announcements, and personal information are handled in group spaces. A high communication score therefore should not be read as proof that all relevant data-protection practices have been mastered.

Digital etiquette similarly combined high endorsement of respectful conduct with weaker endorsement of explicitly teaching responsibility. Modeling a norm and systematically teaching that norm are not interchangeable. An instructional unit on digital discourse would need observable learner practice—for example, comparing constructive and hostile replies, rewriting an ambiguous message, or justifying whether material should be reposted. The study does not verify whether such routines were conducted, but the contrast between its individual indicators helps identify a tractable classroom question for later research.

In the collaboration domain, supporting participation and interaction received higher ratings than coordinating work, teaching shared-resource ethics, and managing group spaces. Each lower-rated practice requires explicit organization of roles, deadlines, commenting rules, accountability for revisions, and quality control. These demands may be especially visible in writing assignments where students jointly compose a narrative or response to literature. The results support professional dialogue about how collaboration is structured; they do not establish which particular application or platform is superior.

Misinformation-related items displayed an equally important separation. Avoiding the sharing of unverified information was rated favorably, but conducting active fact-checking and using digital tools to test accuracy were scored lower. This distinction can guide assessment: instructors can demonstrate a check using a known claim, ask students to find original sources, compare dates and author credentials, and document their reasoning. Such a sequence would provide observable evidence of evaluation skills rather than a broad assertion that learners know not to spread misinformation. A future study could directly score this task and compare outcomes across instructional approaches.

3.8 Additional item-level detail: communicative tasks in Filipino

Table 10. Filipino communication indicators

Domain	Additional digitally supported practice (English rendering)	Reported mean
Speaking	Develop learners' Filipino vocabulary through digital speaking tasks	4.53
Speaking	Use digital platforms to support clarity of speaking	4.43
Speaking	Use interactive platforms to practise oral Filipino	4.39
Speaking	Build confidence in technology-assisted oral presentations	4.36
Speaking	Foster participation in online presentations and discussions	4.36
Speaking	Build interview and oral discussion skills collaboratively	4.34
Writing	Develop clarity and logic of ideas through digital writing	4.42
Writing	Encourage creative writing through digital storytelling	4.40
Writing	Use collaborative writing for peer editing and feedback	4.36
Writing	Support organization and flow of writing	4.36
Writing	Develop academic writing in Filipino through digital skills	4.33
Writing	Publish different kinds of Filipino writing online	4.32

Domain	Additional digitally supported practice (English rendering)	Reported mean
Writing	Encourage writing for publication in digital spaces	4.32
Listening	Teach listening etiquette in virtual classes and forums	4.79
Listening	Support note-taking from digital audio and video	4.72
Listening	Identify main ideas and important details in audio	4.58
Listening	Encourage focused listening in online lectures	4.56
Listening	Use interactive activities for listening comprehension	4.53
Listening	Demonstrate understanding during online exchanges	4.50
Reading	Use digital reading platforms to build comprehension	4.72
Reading	Expand vocabulary through online reading material	4.64
Reading	Use interactive reading tools for understanding	4.58
Reading	Identify main ideas and supporting details online	4.47
Reading	Use digital annotation and note-taking while reading	4.47
Reading	Teach critical reading with digital texts	4.39
Reading	Interpret and evaluate different forms of digital text	4.33
Expression	Use digital platforms to articulate emotion and ideas	4.62
Expression	Choose appropriate language for emotions online	4.52
Expression	Express views confidently via digital media	4.45
Expression	Encourage interactive digital emotional communication	4.43
Expression	Creatively express emotion with diverse digital tools	4.37
Expression	Listen and respond empathetically online	4.37
Expression	Develop responsible, empathetic digital speakers	4.34

These additional communication items illustrate why domain averages alone may conceal important pedagogical distinctions. In speaking, teachers gave stronger endorsements to pronunciation, intonation, audio/video support, and vocabulary development than to interview and online discussion practice. Presentation activities can be individually rehearsed, whereas productive dialogue requires spontaneous response, attention to audience, and social turn-taking. Because the study did not assess students' oral performance, its ratings cannot show whether either set of activities yielded transferable competence.

In writing, the strongest reported indicators related to grammar, spelling, and using writing tools, with somewhat lower values for peer editing, academic organization, and digital publication. These are distinct phases of composing. Effective digital writing instruction might assess the first draft, quality of peer comments, revision decisions, final text, and reflection on audience; doing so would clarify whether the platform supports actual language development. The source's teacher perceptions indicate where such evaluation might be especially valuable but cannot substitute for it.

Listening indicators were highly rated across the board, from online listening etiquette to recognizing the main idea and taking notes. Yet these items measure reported pedagogical value, not the correctness of pupils' answers. A direct assessment could compare summaries of audio segments, the ability to identify conflicting claims, and accurate retrieval of supporting detail. Linking repeated recordings to structured questions would distinguish access to audio from demonstrated comprehension. Similarly, reading tools and e-books were rated favorably, but critical reading and evaluation of digital texts received relatively more modest scores. Those contrasts suggest that locating and consuming material may be more routine than actively evaluating it.

Within the expression domain, the distinctions between respectful opinion sharing, confident self-expression, empathy, and creative digital storytelling again show that communication is a set of related outcomes. Schools can make these outcomes observable by defining rubrics for clarity, linguistic appropriateness, supportive response, evidence use, and audience awareness. Such a rubric-based approach would allow the study's descriptive findings to inform a researchable intervention while maintaining the boundary between reported teacher opinions and measured student achievement.

4. Discussion

4.1 Digital communication competence as a multidimensional practice

The study's principal contribution is the separation of everyday communication proficiency from more demanding forms of collaborative and critical digital practice. High ratings for social media, email, and courteous digital interaction suggest teachers considered themselves capable of conducting routine communication through networked tools. Lower ratings for collaborative-tool use and misinformation evaluation indicate priorities for capability development at the intersection of technology, language teaching, and media judgment.

This differentiated picture is consistent with the multidimensional understanding of competence in DigComp 2.2: effective participation depends on critical evaluation of information and meaningful collaboration as much as on message exchange (Vuorikari et al., 2022). The reported mean for evaluating and avoiding misinformation is especially relevant to Filipino-language instruction, where students must evaluate rhetorical claims, competing interpretations, and the credibility of texts circulated online. However, the current survey recorded self-appraisal of teaching practices, not an authentic performance task in which teachers verified real materials.

The stability of domain ranks across large, medium, and small schools is analytically interesting but should not be overstated. School-size categories were administrative groupings rather than measured indicators of bandwidth, hardware availability, family access, or digital-resource quality. With only three respondents from small schools, inferences about that subgroup are particularly fragile. Future research could distinguish teachers' perceived capabilities from actual access and observed teaching practices, then evaluate how these features vary by school context.

4.2 Listening and reading as accessible uses of digital material

Listening and reading received the highest perceived-effectiveness ratings. These findings are credible as descriptions of teacher

experience with repeatable audio resources, interactive texts, and presentation media. Digital formats facilitate replay, annotation, and adaptation, all of which may support language instruction when paired with clear learning objectives. The results do not reveal how often learners participated in these activities or whether they achieved measurable comprehension gains.

UNESCO (2023) emphasized that technology's educational role should be appraised in relation to learning goals and contextual constraints. In applying that principle to this study, the meaningful question is not whether podcasts or digital texts are viewed favorably, but which listening and reading tasks generate reliable evidence of understanding. Future classroom research could compare learner explanations, inferential-question performance, vocabulary retention, and discussion quality before and after structured digital tasks while maintaining appropriate comparison conditions.

The relatively favorable rating for expression of emotions and ideas also deserves qualification. Respectful online expression was highly endorsed, yet the selected digital-storytelling item was weaker. A responsible and constructive online environment does not automatically ensure effective composition, nuanced personal narrative, or empathic dialogue. Those learning outcomes require explicit criteria, formative feedback, and opportunities for revision.

4.3 Writing and collaborative production as improvement priorities

Writing was the lowest-rated communication domain even though its reported mean remained favorable on the thesis scale. Rather than interpreting this result as failure, schools can treat it as a diagnostic prompt to explore the quality of digital-writing pedagogy. A classroom may use writing platforms only to submit finished work or, alternatively, may exploit commenting, version histories, peer response, and revision. The present survey does not discriminate between these arrangements.

A useful next-stage design would describe actual writing tasks, collect successive drafts, use a transparent rubric for content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and audience awareness, and track the kind and timing of teacher feedback. Such data would allow researchers to evaluate learning processes rather than infer achievement from teacher endorsement of tools. It would also provide stronger evidence about whether structured collaboration is related to writing quality.

The comparatively low teacher-capability rating for collaborative tools reinforces the relevance of this priority. Shared documents and real-time editing can be pedagogically valuable only when contributions are coordinated and students understand how to critique respectfully, cite material, and act on feedback. Professional development should therefore include the design of collaborative assignments, moderation of peer discussion, assessment of contributions, and data privacy—not merely software navigation.

4.4 Statistical interpretation and evidence boundaries

The study employed Kendall's W to summarize concordance of item rankings. This is appropriate in principle for agreement among multiple rankings, although the calculation requires attention to tied ranks and to the correct number of ranked indicators. The thesis questionnaire specifies 9–11 items per domain, whereas its concordance tables list smaller and varying indicator counts. The study does not provide the full individual ranking sheets necessary to resolve this discrepancy. Journal presentation should therefore retain the reported W and χ^2 values with an explicit qualification until study calculations are reviewed.

All ten domain-level tests were classified as significant in the thesis. Statistical significance in this setting addresses non-random agreement of rank orders rather than a material difference in learner skills. Moreover, five-point response-scale means were treated descriptively and without confidence intervals. Highly favorable averages may also reflect acquiescence or common-method effects because the same professional group appraised its practices and their perceived benefits. These issues should be disclosed rather than disguised through causal language.

For stronger future evidence, paired individual digital-competence measures and assessed student communication outcomes could support an association analysis, while longitudinal or comparison-group designs could evaluate intervention effects more directly. A journal-specific statistical review should inspect how ties were handled, verify participant and item denominators, and check the reported instrument reliability coefficients against the original data.

4.5 Local educational implications

At the school level, findings suggest a layered response. General digital communication skills can be maintained through existing collaboration; more targeted support can address fact-checking, shared-document pedagogy, and assessment of student writing. School heads can create structured lesson-study cycles in which Filipino teachers co-design digital tasks, observe implementation, examine actual learner products, and refine feedback practices. This is an implication suggested by the patterns, not an intervention evaluated in the study.

Because information verification was a comparatively lower-scoring capability, a practical response is to embed source evaluation in Filipino reading and oral-argument tasks. Students can compare competing accounts, identify the origin and date of materials, distinguish opinion from evidence, and explain why a source deserves trust. Such instruction would connect digital literacy to language competence rather than position it as a standalone technology unit.

Attention to inclusive access remains essential. Teachers may report strong proficiency while students encounter differences in connectivity, devices, quiet study spaces, or language resources. The present sample did not measure these conditions. Digital assignments should therefore retain accessible formats and alternatives for learners with limited network access, while later evaluations gather direct evidence about participation and learning outcomes.

4.6 Priorities for a more decisive follow-up evaluation

A follow-up study could translate the present descriptive findings into three distinct sets of indicators. For teacher capability, an observation protocol could record whether lesson objectives are explicit, digital materials are evaluated for trustworthiness, feedback is timely, and learners participate in structured collaboration. For language outcomes, common rubrics could assess written composition, listening comprehension, speaking organization, and critical reading. For opportunity to learn, a brief access survey could document which learners can use platforms reliably and which require alternative formats. Collecting each kind of evidence would avoid treating one source of teacher ratings as a proxy for every desired result.

Because writing was the lowest-rated communication outcome, a focused classroom inquiry might compare the quality of initial and revised Filipino compositions within the same clearly defined assignment sequence. Students could submit an initial draft, receive structured teacher or peer feedback, revise using a documented set of criteria, and explain what they changed. Trained evaluators could score texts without knowing the drafting stage, with inter-rater agreement reported. A comparison group or other suitable design would still be necessary before changes could confidently be attributed to any particular digital application. This suggestion develops an evaluable question from the results; it is not a procedure that the study carried out.

An accompanying misinformation-literacy assessment could ask students to examine a short online claim, identify its original source, compare it with independent corroboration, and present a Filipino explanation of whether they would circulate it. The same task could be administered before and after explicit evaluation instruction. Such work would unite language reasoning with digital responsibility and produce scored evidence at the point where the present thesis reports lower teacher-capability means. It would also help distinguish teachers' ability to advise caution from their ability to demonstrate verifiable source evaluation.

Finally, the study could benefit from clear reporting of denominators and uncertainty. Each school category should have an explicit teacher count, eligibility definition, response rate, and documentable grouping rule. Scale-development reports should distinguish expert validity review from quantitative reliability evidence and specify whether ranks reflect individual respondents, pooled school categories, or indicator means. These methodological improvements are not merely technical; they determine whether a favorable rating can support comparisons or recommendations beyond the participating schools.

5. Conclusion

The study reported favorable teacher ratings for digital literacy and its perceived role in Filipino communication in Sagñay-area secondary schools. Social-media and email practices were strongest among teacher-capability domains, whereas collaborative tools and misinformation evaluation ranked lower. Among perceived communication effects, listening and reading received the highest ratings and writing the lowest. The three school-size groups showed broadly concordant item rankings across all ten reported tests.

These findings support a targeted professional-learning agenda but do not independently establish that technology use improved student outcomes. The school groupings, respondent numbers, self-report measures, and rank-based tests impose important limits on inference. Confirmation of eligibility rules, reliability statistics, concordance calculations, and ethics documentation should precede journal submission.

Subsequent studies should integrate authentic digital-teaching observations and directly scored Filipino speaking, writing, listening, and reading outputs. Such designs can test whether changes in teacher practice correspond to measurable learning progress and can provide stronger evidence for local digital-literacy policy.

References

[1] UNESCO. (2023). Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education—A tool on whose terms? UNESCO. https://www.unesco.org/gem-report/en/publication/technology

[2] Vuorikari, R., Kluzer, S., & Punie, Y. (2022). DigComp 2.2: The Digital Competence Framework for Citizens—With new examples of knowledge, skills and attitudes. Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2760/115376

[3] UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2018). A global framework of reference on digital literacy skills for indicator 4.4.2. UNESCO. https://www.uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/medias/fichiers/2025/08/ip51-global-framework-reference-digital-literacy-skills-2018-en.pdf