



**ETCOR** Educational Research Center  
PHILIPPINES

Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
ISSN 2945-3577



**The Exigency**  
ISSN 1908-3181

## Management of Change among Tertiary Teachers in a Government University in China

Zhiying Zhong

Emilio Aguinaldo College, Manila, Philippines

Corresponding Author email: [Zzhiying520@gmail.com](mailto:Zzhiying520@gmail.com)

**Received:** 22 December 2022

**Revised:** 18 January 2023

**Accepted:** 27 January 2023

**Available Online:** 03 March 2023

**Volume II (2023), Issue 1, ISSN: 2945-3577**

### Abstract

**Aim:** The researcher studied how the teachers at Guangdong Business and Technology University manage change based on the present situation in the country.

**Methodology:** This study utilized the descriptive – comparative research design with 275 teachers as respondents. Statistical test of data includes frequency count and percentage, weighted mean, t- test and/or ANOVA.

**Results:** Teacher respondents are very much ready to manage the change for the teaching and learning based on teaching-related factors which ranked first, as well as on teaching-related factors which ranked second, and on technology-related factors which ranked third. It is noticeable that technology-related factor was the least assessed factors as regards their readiness to manage the change. Generally, an over-all mean value of 3.52 reveals that teachers are very much ready to manage the change for the teaching and learning. Based on the result, teacher respondents strongly agree on their level of motivation on their teaching and learning performance. The result reveals that teachers are highly motivated in performing their job as teachers based on their own assessment.

**Conclusion:** Majority of the respondents are female teachers in middle age aiming to earn their doctoral degree and have been in the university for not more than five years. Teachers believed that they are very much ready to manage the change for the teaching and learning. They also seem to be less ready in terms of accessing professional development opportunities that focus on continuous improvement of digital-age teaching skills. The use of variety of assessment strategies applying the technology and the implementation of alternative strategies in the classroom seems to be less managed by the teachers. They also have relatively the same assessment on how ready they are to manage the change in the teaching and learning regardless of their sex, age, educational level they have attained, and the length of stay in the institution.

**Keywords:** Management, Change, Tertiary Teachers, Government University, China

### INTRODUCTION

One of the things that really sets apart outstanding teacher from the average is their ability to initiate and manage change. In these challenging times that the world is experiencing particularly in China where people are aware that the spread of the pandemic started in the country, there is a need for teachers to manage change. Schools, colleges, and universities were definitely affected in the country because of the pandemic. The challenge now is how would teachers at different levels manage the change considering the current situation that the country is facing.

So, teachers need to take on board that not everybody will want to adopt the changes a school leader may suggest. Not everyone will have the same attitude and beliefs as them. It is really important that they appreciate these things. But one thing teachers can be sure of is that as a teacher-leader, you will have to implement change, whether these are the external changes foisted on us by a government, changes made by exam boards, or just the changes and improvements that teachers can see are necessary to improve things within their own school or area of responsibility. Thus, the conduct of this study.

It is well-accepted fact that change is not always accepted easily and experienced teachers are often criticized for being resistant to change (Fullan & Hargreaves, 2016). Many reasons were listed in the literature for such resistance (Fullan & Hargreaves, 2016). One is that teachers feel that they are left out and do not feel ownership of the ideas imposed. They generally are not given chance to provide input when policies are constructed even though they are the individuals who are expected to implement changes. Another reason is that reforms



**ETCOR** Educational Research Center  
**PHILIPPINES**

Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

challenge teachers' old views of teaching, learning, and assessment. Some teachers worry that the innovation will not work or will make the matters worse (Fullan & Hargreaves, 2016). Fullan (2019) indicates that the failure of many reform movements has been attributed to the neglect by reformers of teachers' perceptions. Thus, teachers' role is critical to the success of reforms. In other words, without support and commitment from teachers, there will be little or no chance for any reform effort to succeed. Especially when reforms are top-down as those in Turkey, the role of the teacher becomes more important because he or she is the final agent who determines whether these top-down initiatives will enter the classrooms. In fact, if a proposed change is recognized by teachers as addressing an important need, then it is more likely to be implemented (Ayas, et al., 2017; Dizon & Sanchez, 2020; Fullan, 2019).

Conceptions of teacher leadership are trending away from formal titles and positions to embrace a more informal, integrated approach. In an analysis of 54 empirical studies of teacher leadership conducted between 2004 and 2018, Wenner and Campbell (2016) defined teacher leaders as "teachers who maintain classroom-based teaching responsibilities, while also taking on leadership responsibilities outside of the classroom". Collinson (2019) described these teachers as "informal leaders who 'walk ahead', model learning and innovation, and develop relationships and networks to extend their own learning and influence others". Angelle and DeHart (2019) exemplified teacher leadership as sharing knowledge of pedagogy and classroom management with colleagues, willingness to accept leadership opportunities when asked, and routinely stepping beyond required teaching duties to serve students and the school. Whether teacher leaders hold formal titles and official positions or simply step up when needed, teacher leadership in today's schools is essential. Poekert, Alexandrou and Shannon (2016) recently asserted that teacher leadership is "one approach with empirical evidence demonstrating its viability as a solution for sustaining systemic teacher quality and school improvement efforts" (p. 310). Wenner and Campbell (2016) called it "an important component of school reform" (p. 2). Even so, the concept of teacher leadership remains elusive. Helderbran (2020) observed, "Despite the many calls for teacher leadership over the years, the message has not reached teachers themselves in any large measure".

One reason teacher leadership remains elusive may be related to growing agreement among scholars that teacher leadership is a stance, or way of thinking and being, rather than a set of behaviors. Poekert, et al. (2016) described teacher leadership change as "a stance that is responsive to the needs of students and motivates colleagues toward improving their performance". Smulyan (2016) articulated that a teacher leadership change stance is grounded in three assumptions: a) teaching is a profession, b) teaching is a political act, and c) teaching is a collaborative process. In this way, teacher leadership stance is comprised of dispositions, or beliefs, attitudes, and values about teaching, learning, and leadership (Sanchez, et al., 2022). The notion of teacher leadership as a stance is supported by teachers themselves. Practicing teachers enrolled in a two-year leadership academy described teacher leadership as "neither positional nor role bound, but can be practiced by any teacher, at any time, and in any place – including the classroom." These teachers considered a stance-based view of teacher leadership "liberating as it allowed them to maintain their identity as a teacher while preparing to be leaders" (Carver, 2016).

While recognizing teacher leadership change as a stance signals a breakthrough in our collective understanding of teacher leadership, understanding how teachers progress from teacher-to-teacher leader remains unclear.

This brings us to a more important question, how does one, a teacher, progress from being a plain teacher to a teacher leader? There are three factors on how a teacher becomes a teacher leader: gradual, recursive development, expanded influence over time, and opportunities for discussion, practice, and reflection.

On gradual, recursive development- The progression from teacher-to-teacher leader is a gradual, recursive process that occurs over a period of months and years. Smulyan (2016) called this progression "organic rather than imposed". Poekert, et al. (2016) described it as "[instances] of emergence" and "organized complexity". The progression is not steady and linear because most teachers do not set out to be leaders. Rather, teacher leaders emerge in a recursive (i.e., one step forward, two steps back) progression over time as they work to fulfill their teaching responsibilities (Furtado & Anderson, 2019; Poekert, et al., 2016; Sanchez & Sarmiento, 2020). Collinson (2019) described the progression as "a continuously evolving process of learning and refining ideals" that begins with developing deep knowledge of content and pedagogy. In other words, teachers first seek to improve their teaching practice, progressing over time to contributing to and influencing their schools, districts, and profession (Collinson, 2019; Nicolaidou, 2018). Often, the progression from teacher-to-teacher leader occurs implicitly, as part of "an ongoing process integrated in the normal working day" (Nicolaidou, 2018).



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**

Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

On expanded influence over time - The progression from teacher-to-teacher leader can be observed as teachers transition from influencing a few people to influencing many people, similar to most work setting even in various industries (Sanchez, 2022). Huang (2016) asserted that teacher leadership is private when a small group of teachers collaborates toward a common vision; teacher leadership becomes public when "a concrete mission/curriculum is developed, and teaching artefacts are created for more teachers to collaborate institutionally and professionally" (p. 232). Collinson (2019) explained that as teachers experiment with innovations to help students, they increasingly find ways to share successful practices with colleagues, usually starting with one colleague at a time before taking the risk to present to groups in a school, a school system or at a conference.

This expanded influence of change can occur across a variety of contexts. Poekert, et al. (2016) found that Florida teachers grew as teachers, as researchers, as leaders, and personally through participation in a professional development initiative between a large, urban school district and the state university system. Furtado and Anderson (2019) noted that California teachers enrolled in a graduate-level action research course over 15 weeks' time increasingly influenced one another by engaging intellectually, reflecting on their teaching practice, and coming to see leading and learning as interrelated processes. Fairman and Mackenzie (2019) reported that Maine teacher leaders "emerged in a somewhat organic or informal way as teachers searched for practical means to tackle issues of concern in the classroom or school".

On opportunities for discussion, practice and reflection - Informal collaboration, professional development, and graduate studies support the progression from teacher-to-teacher leader by providing "multiple opportunities for conversation, practice, and reflection" (Smulyan, 2016). Thoughtfully examining teaching, learning, and leadership allows teachers to "explore diverse viewpoints and new options for thinking and behaving" (Carver, 2016). Through practice, teachers increase their pedagogical knowledge and skills (Coleman, Gallagher, & Job, 2019) and develop leadership skills such as facilitating, mentoring, and presenting (Mongillo, Lawrence, & Hong, 2019). Through reflection, teachers make connections to their own experiences (Aharonian, 2016), refine their self-perceptions of teacher leadership (Smulyan, 2016), and begin acting as leaders. For example, as teachers become leaders, they "find, accept or create ways to help others" and "ignore traditional boundaries and move freely across communities of practice" (Collinson, 2019). Carver (2016) found that over the course of a two-year, instructionally focused seminar series, participating teachers came to view themselves as resources for other teachers, re-conceptualized teacher leadership to include activities both within and beyond the classroom, and came to "embrace a leadership identity".

Also, there are certain factors that can influence this progression.

On knowledge and skills - The progression from teacher-to-teacher leader builds from a solid foundation of pedagogical knowledge and skills. Deep knowledge of teaching, learning, and students gives teachers credibility among their peers, which expands their ability to influence others (Carver, 2016; Collinson, 2019; Riveros, Newton, & da Costa, 2018). One study of high school science teachers in Missouri revealed that teachers were most likely to recognize teacher leadership when it occurred through formally - assigned leadership roles and responsibilities (Hanuscin, Rebellow & Sinha, 2019; Salendab & Dapitan, 2021), but informal and emerging teacher leaders can also exert influence. A study of teachers in Michigan found that both formal and informal teacher leadership efforts, including collaborative planning, instructional coaching, and job -embedded professional development, influenced teaching peers to modify their teaching practices to better meet students' learning needs (Topolinski, 2020).

On dispositions -Although pedagogical knowledge and skills provide an essential foundation for teacher leadership, research suggests that dispositions (i.e., core beliefs, attitudes, and values) comprise a teacher's stance, or way of thinking and being (Collinson, 2019; Huang, 2016; Rogers, 2021). Moreover, personal dispositions are the foundation from which teacher leadership skills develop (Riveros et al., 2018). Marques (2015) named flexibility, care, a sense of community, creativity, inspiration, facilitation, and honesty as critical characteristics of leadership because they foster open communication, approachability, free exchange of ideas, and empowerment. The teachers in Carver's (2016) study also described teacher leadership in terms of dispositions, including professional risk-taking, lifelong learning, being a team player, and having a passion for making a difference. Collinson (2019) added humility as a disposition of teacher leadership.

These dispositional descriptions help to explain why 75% of the science teachers in Hanuscin et al.'s (2019) study described teacher leadership as a combination of knowledge and skills, plus personal qualities. This triple combination suggests that both nurture (i.e., teaching experience and professional development) and nature (i.e., dispositions) influence the progression from teacher-to-teacher leader.



**ETCOR** Educational Research Center  
**PHILIPPINES**

Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

On motivation to support students and colleagues - Motivation is a disposition that particularly distinguishes leaders from non - leaders (Rogers, 2015). A study of six award - winning teaching teams in Taiwan found that "key" teacher leaders possess a strong desire to support student welfare and learning, which motivates them to take action on behalf of students. Other teachers are willing to follow, but they rely on key teacher leaders' agency, vision, and encouragement (Huang, 2016). Several studies show that teacher leaders are highly motivated to support student learning and increase student achievement (Helterbran, 2018; Smulyan, 2016; Wenner & Campbell, 2016). For example, Hildebrandt and Eom (2019) found that teachers were motivated to pursue National Board Certification, a credential closely associated with teacher leadership, to improve their teaching practice, earn additional income, increase opportunities for collaboration, self-validate their teaching practice, and receive external validation of their teaching practice.

Teacher leaders are also highly motivated to collaborate with and support their colleagues around issues of teaching and learning (Coleman, et al., 2019; Cosenza, 2018; Pentang, 2021). Fairman and Mackenzie (2019) identified nine specific ways that teacher leaders work alone and alongside colleagues to improve student learning: engaging in professional development; experimenting with and reflecting on teaching practices; sharing ideas, supporting, and collaborating with colleagues; re-culturing the school; building organizational capacity; engaging in schoolwide improvement; collaborating with parents and the community; and professionally sharing their work. Teacher leaders' motivation to support both students and colleagues reiterates the notion of a teacher leadership stance. Master of teacher leadership graduates in one online program expressed a preference for "formal leadership that retains the role of teacher within in" (Lowery- Moore, Lattimer, & Villate, 2016). Carver (2016) found that teachers "valued roles that allowed them to work with colleagues and also continue teaching full - or part-time".

On taking actions - Motivation is significant to the progression from teacher to teacher leader because high motivation almost always results in taking action. For one group of motivated California teachers "taking action meant taking personal responsibility for the goals and outcomes of the school and doing something about it...to be proactive beyond their normal duties instead of being passive and taking direction from administrators" ( Cosenza, 2015). Because taking action frequently involves working with others, strong collegial relationships support teacher leadership efforts. For the teachers in Collinson's (2019) study, relationship building occurred at the school and district levels through peer collaborations and team teaching, and beyond the school and district through community involvement, formal and informal community partnerships, and grant writing. In this way, collegial relationships support taking action, and taking action builds collegial relationships.

In considering how teachers progress from teacher-to-teacher leader, it is helpful to conceptualize taking action as a matter of degree. Roby (2009) defined five levels of contribution related to teacher leadership. Non-contributors and part-time contributors are followers all or most of the time; frequent contributors actively engage in school efforts, but sometimes in superficial or negative ways; influential and respected contributors engage proactively, consistently, and constructively; and respected contributors also demonstrate extensive professional knowledge, high self - confidence, and a moral sense of obligation to students, colleagues, and the school. Rogers (2021) distinguished teacher leaders' motivation and action, stating that leaders put out more effort than their counterparts who do not venture very far outside the boundaries of their prescribed work assignments. Leaders think beyond the day-to- day 'work in the trenches' and take risks, both emotional and career, by becoming involved, taking stands, seeking to contribute, and speaking up. Leaders make themselves vulnerable to criticism and failure. This extra effort and risk take energy and presumes that core 'survival' issues, i.e. lower level needs and maintenance factors, are already secure. It is also apparent that leaders are driven predominantly from inside, though there are obvious external rewards for success.

Roby's (2019 ) varying levels of teacher contribution and Rogers' (2015 ) comparison of leaders' and non - leaders' motivations and actions reiterate the gradual, recursive progression toward teacher leadership, as well as how teacher leaders' influence expands over time.

On age and years of teaching experience - Deep knowledge of teaching, learning, and students; dispositions such as approachability, humility, and willingness to take professional risks; and high motivation to support students and colleagues influence the progression from teacher to teacher leader by encouraging teachers to take action. In addition, developmental factors including age and years of teaching experience have been shown to influence both teacher motivations toward leadership and colleague's perceptions of leadership.

There is increasing "recognition of the need for systemic transformation in education", which will result in redefinitions of the roles of teachers, students, and schools (Watson & Reigeluth, 2018). As education transforms,



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**

Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

teachers will need to adjust their teaching methods to reflect the change from an industrial age society to an information age society (Watson & Reigeluth, 2018). The "traditional, rigid, 'one size fits all' design of schools [will likely change to] more personalized, student-centered designs to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse student population" (Education Development Center, 2019).

Since then, a number of studies have been conducted to investigate the effects of the management of change or reforms or whether approaches had been implemented in the classrooms (Ayas et al., 20017). Nevertheless, they all report that the changes introduced have not been implemented in schools effectively. The factors identified in the literature as affecting the implementation of the changes were the university entrance exam which is a high stakes test, inadequate facilities in schools, low quality of students, ineffective in- service training etc.

It is true that change cannot be successfully implemented simply by the production of policy documents and curriculum standards. Research has shown that the teacher is the key factor in any reform in education (Armstrong, 2018). Teachers' knowledge and perceptions of change serve as critical factors that impact their decisions about implementing (Putnam & Borko, 1996). As Goh (1999) indicates, successful implementation of any innovation or change lies in the hands of teachers because 'at the end of the day, it is these teachers who will determine whether innovations will eventually be carried out inside the classroom'. Fullan and Hargreaves (1996) also argue that there is a "need to first focus on how teachers make sense of the mandates and policies because there will be no educational reform until after teachers interpret the policies and make decisions based on their beliefs about the new demands".

Building on research findings from a previously -conducted study, this article offers a visual model conceptualizing eight teachers' progression from teacher to teacher leader, including the factors and conditions that influenced their progress and their varying self-perceptions as teachers and as leaders.

In one study, teacher leaders who participated in a leadership cohort for three consecutive years revealed that their conceptions of teacher leadership evolved over time from a set of behaviors and skills, to a commitment and ongoing process across many contexts, to a way of thinking and positioning oneself within the field of education ( Smulyan, 2016).

In a study of teacher leader perceptions across seven different states, Angelle and DeHart (2019) found that elementary teachers and less experienced teachers were more likely than middle school teachers, high school teachers, and experienced teachers to recognize acts of teacher leadership by their colleagues. Hildebrandt and Eom (2019) reported that teachers in their 30s were more motivated than teachers in other age groups to pursue National Board Certification for financial gain and external validation. Roby (2009) also noted that years of teaching experience or number of years teaching in a particular school may affect teachers' perceptions of leadership. One influential contributor (second highest level) in his study reflected, "Involved in community and district, but because of number of years teaching; I am still not a respected contributor." Similarly, a respected contributor (highest level) wrote, "Years of experience at my school is the primary factor in leadership contribution" (Discussion, para. 3). Smulyan (2016) observed that around the third year of teaching, or once tenured, teachers become "eager for opportunities to deepen their understanding of teaching and learning and to take on responsibilities beyond the confines of their own classrooms" (p. 11).

These studies suggest that younger, less experienced teachers and elementary-level teachers are more likely to be motivated toward teacher leadership; but older, more experienced teachers are more likely to be recognized as teacher leaders by their colleagues. This dichotomy presents one obstacle emerging teacher leaders might face during the progression from teacher-to-teacher leader. The next section explores obstacles hindering the progression from teacher to teacher leader in greater detail.

The current study is based on the transformational leadership theory as advanced by Bernard Bass in 2008.

Accordingly, transformational leadership can be defined on the effect that it has on the subjects. More specifically, transformational leaders are those who stimulate and inspire subjects to realize extraordinary outcomes thereby developing their own leadership capacities. Transformational leaders assist followers grow and develop into leaders. This is achieved by paying attention to individual followers' needs, including empowering them as well as matching the goals of individual followers, the leader, the group and the larger organization.

More recently, Bass has argued that authentic transformational leadership is anchored in three moral foundations which are based on four components (Changing Minds, 2018). The moral aspects are: the leader's moral



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**

Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

character; the ethical values contained in the leader's vision, articulation and program as well as the moral standing of the processes of social ethical choice and action that leaders as well as followers engage in and pursue collectively. On the other hand, the transformational leadership components include intellectual stimulation; individualized consideration; inspirational motivation and idealized influence (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

In intellectual stimulation, transformational leaders challenge the status quo and lay emphasis on creativity among followers. In particular, the leader urges followers to find new ways of doing things and new opportunities to learn. Regarding individualized consideration, the transformational leader offers support and encouragement to the individual subjects. In an effort to promote supportive relationships, transformational leaders keep lines of communication open in a bid to make followers have the freedom to exchange ideas as well as allow leaders offer direct recognition of the unique contributions of each follower.

Inspirational motivation means that transformational leaders have clear vision that they are able to articulate to followers (Changing Minds, 2018). Accordingly, transformational leaders are also able to assist subjects feel the same passion and motivation to achieve certain goals. Concerning idealized influence, the transformational leader acts as a role model for subjects. And, because followers trust and respect the leader, they emulate and internalize his or her ideas.

Transformative leadership is an ethically based leadership model that integrates a commitment to values and outcomes by optimizing the long-term interests of stakeholders and society, and honoring the moral duties that organizations owe to their stakeholders (Caldwell et al., 2019). Transformative leadership thus integrates ethical mandates, behavioral assumptions, and standards of excellence that are important in leading effectively. Transformative leadership as a reciprocal process whereby one or more individuals engage with others in a way that leaders and followers raise one another to a higher level of motivation and morality (Shield, 2018). Transformative leadership is therefore value based in a given social context that can bring about changes that are needed in society. Transformative leadership incorporates charisma to create compelling morally-based personal relationships that inspire and empower others in pursuit of a noble purpose (Caldwell, et al., 2019). Transformative leadership creates a personal connection and displays moral principles that help followers to examine their lives, fulfill their potential, and create a better world.

Change in leadership does not reside in an individual but in the relationship between individuals (Ryan, 2016). The transformative leadership model is characterized by a shared vision in pursuit of a grand ideal to touch hearts, to create personal relationships that bring about the best in others, and to change the world. It is the leadership that inspires and creates connections with others, redirecting their lives in pursuit of a changed society. Transformative leadership resonates when leaders treat individuals with a commitment to their welfare, growth, and wholeness (Caldwell, et al., 2019). Transformative leadership is perceived as authentic and genuine because it possesses the ability to touch hearts, inspire great sacrifice and demonstrate courage to change the world.

To attain excellence in education, there must be effective school leadership change (Brown, 2006). Exemplary leadership that points out the necessity for change and then helps to make that change happen is transformative leadership. A transformative leader provides guidance, direction, and influence for others to bring about fundamental change (Brown, 2006). Transformative leaders commit people to action, convert followers to leaders, and influence people as agents of change. Transformative leadership is characterized by its activist agenda and its overriding commitment to social justice, equality, and a democratic society (Theoharis, 2009). Transformative leaders inspire and transform individual followers to develop a level of concern about the condition of humanity at large (Ncube, 2018). Transformative leadership has the capacity to translate intention into reality and sustain it (Caldwell, et al., 2019). Choosing to offer supplementary services to those who most need them is an example of transformative leadership. Transformative leaders connect with followers, earn their support, trust, and commitment –and bring out the best in them –which creates sustainable connection and leadership.

## Objective

The researcher studied how the teachers at Guangdong Business and Technology University manage change based on the present situation in the country. Since teachers are one of the key stakeholders in the university, the researcher would like to determine how can they manage change in this situation in the country with



**ETCOR** Educational Research Center  
**PHILIPPINES**

Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

the end goal of making possible action plans to prepare teachers on how to manage the change in the new situation.

Specifically, the following were answered:

1. What is the demographic profile of the teachers at Guangdong Business and Technology University in terms of the following:
  - 1.1. sex;
  - 1.2. age;
  - 1.3. educational attainment; and
  - 1.4. length of teachers' stay in university?
2. What is the readiness of teachers at Guangdong Business and Technology University to manage the change for the teaching and learning based on the following:
  - 2.1. technology- related factors;
  - 2.2. teaching-related factors; and
  - 2.3. students' learning factors?
3. Is there a difference in the teachers of Guangdong Business and Technology University managing change based on their profile?
4. What is the assessment of teachers at Guangdong Business and Technology University's level of motivation to perform teaching and learning?
5. What action plan can be done for teachers in the university to manage the change?

## METHODS

### Research Design

This study utilized the descriptive - comparative research design. Descriptive - comparative research is an approach in research where a variable is described through the use of numeral data (Bieger & Gerlach, 2016). Specifically, the researcher has included the comparative where the two variables (not manipulated) and establishes a formal procedure to compare and conclude that one is better than the other. Lastly, the analysis used in this paper described the nature of an object by separating it into parts. Its purpose is to discover the nature of things. In other words, the researcher should determine the composition, structure, sub-structure that occur as units within the larger structure. He also determines the individual parts and units integrated into an internal system. He should consider the forces that hold them together and the strains that tend to destroy the system part. He analyses on what makes system work and regulate.

### Research Locale

This study was done in Guangdong Business and Technology University.

### Respondents of the Study

The respondents of the study were taken from the 967 teachers of Guangdong Business and Technology University . Using the Qualtrics Calculator at 5% margin of error, 275 teachers served as respondents in this study.

### Data Gathering Procedures

Data were gathered after the validation of the questionnaire. The researcher collected from the teachers from Guangdong Business and Technology University. The questionnaire was distributed to the respondent teachers in the study by the researcher. After the data gathering, it was collated for the data analysis by the statistician. The collated data was forwarded to the statistician for data analysis.

### Statistical Test Of Data

The following were used for the analysis of the data gathered in the study: Frequency Count and Percentage – This was used by the researcher in the analysis of the data profile in terms of sex, age, length of service and educational qualification. Weighted Mean – This was used by the researcher in determining the magnitude of the responses of the teacher respondents on the assessment of the teacher respondents on their



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**  
 Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

management of change during this time. t- test and/or ANOVA – This was used by the researcher in the analysis of the comparison of the assessment of the teacher respondents when their profile is taken as test factors.

**Decision Criteria**

All the statistical analyses in study used the 5% level of significance.

**RESULTS and DISCUSSION**

**Demographic Profile of the Respondents**

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the teacher respondents in terms of sex, age, educational attainment, and length of stay in university.

**Table 1**  
**Frequency Distribution of the Respondents' Profile**

Demographic Profile	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	129	46.7 %
Female	147	53.3 %
<b>Total</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>100 %</b>
<b>Age</b>		
Less than 25 years old	37	13.4 %
25-35 years old	44	15.9 %
36-45 years old	88	31.9 %
46-55 years old	88	31.9 %
More than 55 years old	19	6.9 %
<b>Total</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>100 %</b>
<b>Educational Attainment</b>		
Bachelor's Degree	37	13.4 %
w/ Master's units	55	19.9 %
Master's degree	65	23.6 %
w/ Doctoral units	100	36.2 %
Doctoral degree	19	6.9 %
<b>Total</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>100 %</b>
<b>Length of Stay in the University</b>		
Less than 3 years	111	40.2 %
3-5 years	123	44.6 %
6-10 years	42	15.2 %
<b>Total</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>100 %</b>

**Sex.** One hundred twenty nine (129) or 46.7% of the teacher respondents are male while one hundred forty seven (147) or 53.3% are female. This indicates that majority of the teacher respondents are female.

**Age.** Thirty-seven (37) or 13.4% of the teacher respondents are less than 25 years old, forty-four (44) or 15.9 % are within 25 -35 years old, eighty eight (88) or 31.9% are 36 -45 years old and 46 -55 years old respectively, and nineteen (19) or 6.9 % are more than 55 years old. This goes to show that most of the teacher respondents are more than 35 years old but not over 55 years old.

**Educational Attainment.** Thirty-seven (13.4%) of the teacher respondents are bachelor's degree holders, fifty-five (55) or 19.9% have earned Master's units, sixty five (65) or 23.6% are Master's degree holders, one hundred (100) or 36.2% have earned Doctoral units, and nineteen (19) or 6.9% are holders of Doctoral degree. The result shows that most of the teachers have already earned units in their Doctoral degree program.

**Length of Stay in the University.** One hundred eleven (111) or 40.2% have been in the university for less than 3 years, one hundred twenty-three (123) or 44.6% for about 3 -5 years, and forty two (42) or 15.2% for





**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**  
 Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

about 6 -10 years. This goes to show that most of the teachers have been in the university for not more than five years

Table 2 presents the assessment of the teacher respondents from Guangdong Business and Technology University on their readiness to manage change for the teaching and learning based on technology-related factors.

**Table 2**  
**Respondents' Assessment on their Readiness to Manage the Change for the Teaching and Learning Based on Technology-Related Factors**

<b>Technology-Related Factors</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>QD</b>	<b>Int.</b>	<b>Rank</b>
<i>As a teacher in the university, I manage change by . . .</i>					
1. troubleshooting technological systems and applications when something happens during my teaching.	3.55	0.62	SA	VMR	4
2. seeing the use of digital tools to grade formative and summative assessments.	3.49	0.53	A	MR	6
3. assuming a leadership role in demonstrating a vision of technology integration to my colleagues in teaching.	3.72	0.47	SA	VMR	1
4. using technology to analyze assessment of data.	3.58	0.53	SA	VMR	2
5. staying abreast with emerging trends regarding the effective use of technology in class.	3.42	0.62	A	MR	9
6. accessing technology systems to support teaching and learning.	3.45	0.72	A	MR	7
7. accessing professional development opportunities focusing on continuous improvement of digital-age teaching skills.	3.38	0.66	A	MR	10
8. accessing role models for the effective use of technology.	3.50	0.56	A	MR	5
9. discussing the use of technology with teachers in our school.	3.43	0.60	A	MR	8
10. advocating for school policies to support implementation of a technology-infused curriculum.	3.56	0.56	SA	VMR	3
<b>Composite Mean</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>VMR</b>	

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Strongly Agree(SA)/Very Much Ready(VMR); 2.51-3.50 Agree(A)/Moderately Ready(MR); 1.51-2.50 Seldom True of Me(STM)/Somewhat Ready(SR); 1.00-1.50 Not True of Me(NTM)/Not Ready(NR)

As shown in Table 2, teacher respondents strongly agree that as teachers in the university, they manage change by assuming a leadership role in demonstrating a vision of technology integration to their colleagues in teaching with the highest assessment of 3.72 interpreted as to a very much ready. Similarly, they strongly agree that in using technology to analyze assessment of data, advocating for school policies to support implementation of a technology-infused curriculum, and troubleshooting technological systems and applications when something happens during their teaching with the mean values of 3.58, 3.56, and 3.55 respectively interpreted also as to very much ready. On the other hand, teacher respondents agree that they manage change by accessing role models for the effective use of technology, seeing the use of digital tools to grade formative and summative assessments, accessing technology systems to support teaching and learning, discussing the use of technology with teachers in their school, and staying abreast with emerging trends regarding effective use of technology in class with the mean values of 3.50, 3.49, 3.45, 3.43, and 3.42 respectively all interpreted as moderately ready. Though they also agree in accessing professional development opportunities focusing on continuous improvement of digital-age teaching skills. However, it was given the lowest assessment of 3.38 interpreted as moderately ready. A composite mean value of



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**  
 Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

3.51 indicates that teacher respondents are very much ready to manage change for the teaching and learning based on technology-related factors.

Table 3 presents the assessment of the teacher respondents from Guangdong Business and Technology University on their readiness to manage change for the teaching and learning based on teaching-related factors.

**Table 3**  
**Respondents' Assessment on their Readiness to Manage the Change for the Teaching and Learning Based on Teaching-Related Factors**

Teaching-Related Factors <i>As a teacher in the university, I manage change by . . .</i>	Mean	SD	QD	Int.	Rank
1. managing a class in which each student is pursuing their own personalized learning activities.	3.54	0.53	SA	VMR	4.5
2. crafting good questions for my students.	3.69	0.53	SA	VMR	1
3. using a variety of assessment strategies applying the technology.	3.45	0.60	A	MR	9
4. implementing alternative strategies in the classroom.	3.38	0.58	A	MR	10
5. motivating students who show low interest in school work.	3.54	0.63	SA	VMR	4.5
6. modelling innovative thinking to my students.	3.50	0.62	A	MR	8
7. adapting my instructional plans to incorporate digital tools and resources.	3.52	0.57	SA	VMR	7
8. developing personal responsibility for lifelong learning in my students.	3.57	0.63	SA	VMR	2
9. controlling disruptive behavior in the classroom.	3.55	0.58	SA	VMR	3
10. modelling responsible social interactions in online communities to my students.	3.53	0.57	SA	VMR	6
<b>Composite Mean</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>VMR</b>	

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Strongly Agree(SA)/Very Much Ready(VMR); 2.51-3.50 Agree(A)/Moderately Ready(MR); 1.51-2.50 Seldom True of Me(STM)/Somewhat Ready(SR); 1.00-1.50 Not True of Me(NTM)/Not Ready(NR)

As shown in Table 3, teacher respondents strongly agree that as teachers in the university, they manage change by crafting good questions for their students with the highest assessment of 3.69 interpreted as very much ready. Similarly, they strongly agree in developing personal responsibility for lifelong learning in their students, controlling disruptive behavior in the classroom, managing a class in which each student is pursuing their own personalized learning activities, motivating students who show low interest in school work, modelling responsible social interactions in online communities to their students, and adapting their instructional plans to incorporate digital tools and resources with the mean values of 3.57, 3.55, 3.54, 3.54, 3.53 and 3.52 respectively all interpreted as very much ready. On the other hand, respondents agree on modeling innovative thinking to their students, and using a variety of assessment strategies applying the technology with the mean values of 3.50 and 3.45 respectively interpreted as moderately ready. Though teachers also agree on implementing alternative strategies in the classroom, however it was given the lowest assessment of 3.38 interpreted as moderately ready. A composite mean value of 3.53 reveals that teacher respondents are very much ready to manage change in terms of teaching-related factors.



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**  
 Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

Table 4 presents the assessment of the teacher respondents from Guangdong Business and Technology University on their readiness to manage change for the teaching and learning based on learning-related factors.

**Table 4**

**Respondents' Assessment on their Readiness to Manage the Change for the Teaching and Learning Based on Learning-Related Factors**

Learning-Related Factors		Mean	SD	QD	Int.	Rank
<i>As a teacher in the university, I manage change by . . . .</i>						
1.	Creating learning tasks for my students that require them to collaborate with students in other schools.	3.57	0.56	SA	VMR	2
2.	Assisting my students to plan strategies that will guide their own inquiry.	3.47	0.63	A	MR	8
3.	Providing an alternative explanation or example when students are confused.	3.55	0.61	SA	VMR	3.5
4.	Calming a student who is disruptive or noisy that affects other students.	3.63	0.57	SA	VMR	1
5.	Getting students to believe they can do well in school work.	3.55	0.55	SA	VMR	3.5
6.	Instructing students in the use of technology or gadgets.	3.54	0.53	SA	VMR	5
7.	Helping my students value learning.	3.48	0.66	A	MR	7
8.	Encouraging students to reflect on their learning using digital collaborative tools.	3.46	0.61	A	MR	9
9.	Evaluating student work that is provided in a variety of media/formats.	3.45	0.63	A	MR	10
10.	Engaging students in exploring real-world issues using digital tools and resources.	3.51	0.62	SA	VMR	6
<b>Composite Mean</b>		<b>3.52</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>VMR</b>	

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Strongly Agree(SA)/Very Much Ready(VMR); 2.51-3.50 Agree(A)/Moderately Ready(MR); 1.51-2.50 Seldom True of Me(STM)/Somewhat Ready(SR); 1.00-1.50 Not True of Me(NTM)/Not Ready(NR)

As shown in Table 4, teacher respondents strongly agree that as teachers in the university, they manage change by calming a student who is disruptive or noisy that affects other students with the highest assessment of 3.63 interpreted as very much ready. Similarly, they strongly agree on creating learning tasks for their students that require them to collaborate with students in other schools, providing an alternative explanation or example when students are confused, getting students to believe they can do well in school work, instructing students in the use of technology or gadgets, and engaging students in exploring real-world issues using digital tools and resources with the mean values of 3.57, 3.55, 3.55, 3.54, and 3.51 respectively all interpreted as very much ready. On the other hand, teacher respondents agree on helping their students value learning, assisting their students to plan strategies that will guide their own inquiry, and encouraging students to reflect on their learning using digital collaborative tools with the mean values of 3.48, 3.47, and 3.49 respectively all interpreted as moderately ready. Though teachers also agree on evaluating students in exploring real-world issues using digital tools and resources, however, it was given the lowest assessment of 3.45 interpreted as moderately ready. A composite mean value of 3.52 shows that teacher respondents are very much ready to manage the change in terms of learning-related factors.

Table 5 presents the summary of the assessment of teacher respondents from Guangdong Business and Technology University on their readiness to manage change for the teaching and learning.



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**  
 Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

**Table 5**

**Summary of the Respondents' Assessment on their Readiness to Manage the Change for the Teaching and Learning**

Factors	Mean	SD	QD	Int.	Ranking
1. Technology-Related Factors	3.51	0.20	SA	VMR	3
2. Teaching-Related Factors	3.53	0.21	SA	VMR	1
3. Learning Related Factors	3.52	0.20	SA	VMR	2
<b>Over-all Mean</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>VMR</b>	

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Strongly Agree (SA)/ Very Much Ready (VMR); 2.51-3.50 Agree (A)/ Moderately Ready (MR); 1.51-2.50 Seldom True of Me (STM)/Somewhat Ready (SR); 1.00-1.50 Not True of Me (NTM)/Not Ready (NR)

Based from the result above, teacher respondents are very much ready to manage the change for the teaching and learning based on teaching-related factors which ranked first, as well as on teaching-related factors which ranked second, and on technology-related factors which ranked third. It is noticeable that technology-related factor was the least assessed factors as regards their readiness to manage the change. Generally, an over-all mean value of 3.52 reveals that teachers are very much ready to manage the change for the teaching and learning.

Table 6 presents the differences in the assessment of the teacher respondents on their readiness to manage change when they are grouped according to sex.

**Table 6**  
**Differences in the Assessment of the Respondents on their Readiness to Manage Change when they are Grouped According to Sex**

Factors	Sex	Mean	SD	Computed t-value	Sig	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
1. Technology-Related	Male	3.52	0.21	0.78	0.44	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	3.50	0.20				
2. Teaching-Related	Male	3.53	0.21	0.11	0.92	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	3.52	0.20				
3. Learning-Related	Male	3.53	0.20	0.58	0.56	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	3.51	0.21				
Over-all	Male	3.52	0.12	0.81	0.42	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	3.51	0.13				



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**

Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

As shown in Table 6, teacher respondents have obtained a computed t-value of 0.78 in terms of technology-related factors with the significance value of 0.44. Since the significance value is higher than the set 0.05 level of significance, null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significant difference in the assessment of the teacher respondents when they are grouped according to sex. This goes to show that male and female teacher respondents have relatively the same assessment on their readiness to manage the change in terms of technology-related factors.

In terms of teaching-related factors, teacher respondents have obtained a computed t-value of 0.11 with the significance value of 0.92. Since the significance value is higher than the set 0.05 level of significance, null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significant difference in the assessment of the teacher respondents when they are grouped according to sex. The result indicates that male and female teacher respondents have relatively the same assessment on their readiness to manage the change in terms of teaching-related factors.

In terms of learning-related factors, teacher respondents have obtained a computed t-value of 0.58 with the significance value of 0.56. Since the significance value is higher than the set 0.05 level of significance, null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significant difference in the assessment of the teacher respondents when they are grouped according to sex. This is taken to mean that male and female teacher respondents have relatively the same assessment on their readiness to manage the change in terms of learning-related factors.

Generally, teacher respondents have obtained an overall computed t-value of 0.81 with the significance value of 0.42. Since the significance value is higher than the set 0.05 level of significance, null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significant difference in the assessment of the teacher respondents when they are grouped according to sex. The result reveals that male and female teacher respondents have relatively the same assessment on their readiness to manage the change.

Table 7 presents the differences in the assessment of the teacher respondents on their readiness to manage change when they are grouped according to age.



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**

Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

**Table 7**  
**Differences in the Assessment of the Respondents on their Readiness to Manage Change when they are Grouped According to Age**

Factors	Age	Mean	SD	Computed F-value	Sig	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
1. Technology-Related	<25 y/o	3.50	0.19	0.36	0.84	Accepted	Not Significant
	25-35 y/o	3.53	0.23				
	36-45 y/o	3.52	0.19				
	46-55 y/o	3.49	0.20				
	>55 y/o	3.48	0.26				
2. Teaching-Related	<25 y/o	3.54	0.21	0.21	0.93	Accepted	Not Significant
	25-35 y/o	3.52	0.21				
	36-45 y/o	3.52	0.21				
	46-55 y/o	3.52	0.22				
	>55 y/o	3.56	0.14				
3. Learning-Related	<25 y/o	3.51	0.22	1.54	0.19	Accepted	Not Significant
	25-35 y/o	3.57	0.21				
	36-45 y/o	3.50	0.22				
	46-55 y/o	3.51	0.19				
	>55 y/o	3.59	0.14				
Over-all	<25 y/o	3.51	0.11	0.62	0.65	Accepted	Not Significant
	25-35 y/o	3.54	0.14				
	36-45 y/o	3.51	0.13				
	46-55 y/o	3.51	0.12				
	>55 y/o	3.55	0.12				

As shown in Table 7, teacher respondents have obtained a computed F-value of 0.36 in terms of technology-related factors with the significance value of 0.84. Since the significance value is higher than the set 0.05 level of significance, null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significant difference in the assessment of the teacher respondents when they are grouped according to age. This goes to show that teacher respondents have relatively the same assessment on their readiness to manage the change in terms of technology-related factors regardless of their age.

In terms of teaching-related factors, teacher respondents have obtained a computed F-value of 0.21 with the significance value of 0.93. Since the significance value is higher than the set 0.05 level of significance, null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significant difference in the assessment of the teacher respondents when they are grouped according to age. This indicates that teacher respondents have relatively the same assessment on their readiness to manage the change in terms of teaching-related factors regardless of their age.

In terms of learning-related factors, teacher respondents have obtained a computed F-value of 1.54 with the significance value of 0.19. Since the significance value is higher than the set 0.05 level of significance, null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significant difference in the assessment of the teacher respondents when they are grouped according to age. This is taken to mean that teacher respondents have relatively



the same assessment on their readiness to manage the change in terms of learning- related factors regardless of their age.

Generally, teacher respondents have obtained an over -all computed F-value of 0.62 with the significance value of 0.65. Since the significance value is higher than the set 0.05 level of significance, null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significant difference in the assessment of the teacher respondents when they are grouped according to age. The result reveals that teacher respondents have relatively the same assessment on their readiness to manage the change regardless of their age.

Table 8 presents the differences in the assessment of the teacher respondents on their readiness to manage change when they are grouped according to educational attainment.

**Table 8**

**Differences in the Assessment of the Respondents on their Readiness to Manage Change when they are Grouped According to Educational Attainment**

Factors	Educational Attainment	Mean	SD	Compu ted F-value	Sig	Decision on Ho	Interpr etati on
Technology -Related	Bachelor's degree	3.50	0.24	1.21	0.31	Accepted	Not Significant
	w/ Master's units	3.47	0.20				
	Master's degree	3.53	0.20				
	w/ Doctoral units	3.50	0.19				
	Doctoral degree	3.57	0.22				
Teaching- Related	Bachelor's degree	3.54	0.19	1.10	0.36	Accepted	Not Significant
	w/ Master's units	3.50	0.18				
	Master's degree	3.50	0.23				
	w/ Doctoral units	3.55	0.20				
	Doctoral degree	3.48	0.23				
Learning- Related	Bachelor's degree	3.51	0.21	0.44	0.78	Accepted	Not Significant
	w/ Master's units	3.55	0.17				
	Master's degree	3.52	0.23				
	w/ Doctoral units	3.51	0.20				
	Doctoral degree	3.53	0.22				
Over- all	Bachelor's degree	3.52	0.13	0.11	0.98	Accepted	Not Significant
	w/ Master's units	3.51	0.11				
	Master's degree	3.52	0.13				
	w/ Doctoral units	3.52	0.12				
	Doctoral degree	3.52	0.14				

As shown in Table 8, teacher respondents have obtained a computed F-value of 1.21 in terms of technology-related factors with the significance value of 0.31. Since the significance value is higher than the set 0.05 level of significance, null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significant difference in the assessment of the teacher respondents when they are grouped according to educational attainment. This goes to show that



**ETCOR Educational Research Center PHILIPPINES**  
Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
ISSN 2945-3577



**The Exigency**  
ISSN 1908-3181

teacher respondents have relatively the same assessment on their readiness to manage the change in terms of technology-related factors regardless of their educational attainment.

In terms of teaching-related factors, teacher respondents have obtained a computed F-value of 1.10 with the significance value of 0.36. Since the significance value is higher than the set 0.05 level of significance, null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significant difference in the assessment of the teacher respondents when they are grouped according to educational attainment. The result indicates that teacher respondents have relatively the same assessment on their readiness to manage the change in terms of teaching-related factors regardless of their educational attainment.

In terms of learning-related factors, teacher respondents have obtained a computed F-value of 0.44 with the significance value of 0.78. Since the significance value is higher than the set 0.05 level of significance, null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significant difference in the assessment of the teacher respondents when they are grouped according to educational attainment. This is taken to mean that teacher respondents have relatively the same assessment on their readiness to manage the change in terms of learning-related factors regardless of their educational attainment.

Generally, teacher respondents have obtained an over-all computed F-value of 0.11 with the significance value of 0.98. Since the significance value is higher than the set 0.05 level of significance, null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significant difference in the assessment of the teacher respondents when they are grouped according to educational attainment. The result reveals that teacher respondents have relatively the same assessment on their readiness to manage the change regardless of educational level they have attained.

Table 9 presents the differences in the assessment of the teacher respondents on their readiness to manage change when they are grouped according to length of stay in the university.

**Table 9**  
**Differences in the Assessment of the Respondents on their Readiness to Manage Change when they are Grouped According to Length of Stay in the University**

Factors	Length of Stay in the University	Mean	SD	Computed F-value	Sig	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
1. Technology-Related	<3 years	3.49	0.20	0.90	0.41	Accepted	Not Significant
	3-5 years	3.53	0.21				
	6-10 years	3.50	0.20				
2. Teaching-Related	<3 years	3.54	0.19	0.74	0.48	Accepted	Not Significant
	3-5 years	3.51	0.22				
	6-10 years	3.51	0.19				
3. Learning-Related	<3 years	3.50	0.22	0.88	0.42	Accepted	Not Significant
	3-5 years	3.54	0.20				
	6-10 years	3.52	0.18				
Over-all	<3 years	3.51	0.11	0.47	0.63	Accepted	Not Significant
	3-5 years	3.53	0.14				
	6-10 years	3.51	0.11				

As shown in Table 9, teacher respondents have obtained a computed F-value of 0.90 in terms of technology-related factors with the significance value of 0.41. Since the significance value is higher than the set 0.05 level of significance, null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significant difference in the assessment of the teacher respondents when they are grouped according to length of stay in the university. This goes to show that teacher respondents have relatively the same assessment on their readiness to manage the change in terms of technology-related factors regardless of their length of stay in the university.





**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**  
 Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

In terms of teaching-related factors, teacher respondents have obtained a computed F-value of 0.74 with the significance value of 0.48. Since the significance value is higher than the set 0 .05 level of significance, null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significant difference in the assessment of the teacher respondents when they are grouped according to length of stay in the university. The result indicates that teacher respondents have relatively the same assessment on their readiness to manage the change in terms of teaching-related factors regardless of their length of stay in the university.

In terms of learning-related factors, teacher respondents have obtained a computed F-value of 0.88 with the significance value of 0.42. Since the significance value is higher than the set 0 .05 level of significance, null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significant difference in the assessment of the teacher respondents when they are grouped according to length of stay in the university. This could mean that teacher respondents have relatively the same assessment on their readiness to manage the change in terms of learning-related factors regardless of their length of stay in the university.

Generally, teacher respondents have obtained an over-all computed F-value of 0.47 with the significance value of 0.63. Since the significance value is higher than the set 0.05 level of significance, null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significant difference in the assessment of the teacher respondents when they are grouped according to length of stay in the university. The result reveals that teacher respondents have relatively the same assessment on their readiness to manage the change regardless of their length of stay in the university.

Table 10 presents the assessment of the respondents on their level of motivation to perform teaching and learning.

**Table 10**  
**Respondents' Assessment on their Level of Motivation to Perform Teaching and Learning**

Teachers' Motivation	Mean	SD	QD	Int.
Level of Motivation to Perform Teaching and Learning	3.64	0.48	SA	HM
<b>Average Mean</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>0.48</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>HM</b>

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Strongly Agree(SA)/Highly Motivated(HM); 2.51-3.50 Agree(A)/Moderately Motivated(MM); 1.51-2.50 Seldom True of Me(STM)/Somewhat Motivated(SM); 1.00-1.50 Not True of Me(NTM)/Not Motivated(NM)

As shown in Table 10, teacher respondents strongly agree on their level of motivation on their teaching and learning performance with the mean value of 3.64. The result reveals that teachers are highly motivated in performing their job as teachers.

**Conclusion**

Based on the findings, the following have been concluded:

1. Majority of the respondents are female teachers in middle age aiming to earn their Doctoral degree, and have been in the university for not more than five years.
2. Teachers believed that they are very much ready to manage the change for the teaching and learning.
3. Teachers seems to be less ready in terms of accessing professional development opportunities that focus on continuous improvement of digital-age teaching skills.
4. The use of variety of assessment strategies applying the technology and the implementation of alternative strategies in the classroom seems to be less managed by the teachers.



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**

Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

5. Teachers have relatively the same assessment on how ready they are to manage the change in the teaching and learning regardless of their sex, age, educational level they have attained, and the length of stay in the institution.

### Recommendations

In view of the summary of findings and the conclusions, the researcher highly / recommends the following:

1. While most of the teachers are pursuing their graduate studies and have already earned units in their doctoral degree program, it may be necessary to review the existing professional development program for teachers to ensure that teachers will be encouraged to finish what they have started.
2. Provide adequate training for the teachers especially when the change involves shifts in technologies to help them master the new way of doing things particularly in the teaching and learning processes.
3. Teachers need to be assured that technology can make their teaching interesting, easier, more fun for them and students, more motivating and more enjoyable.
4. For a successful integration of technology in the teaching and learning processes, the school must provide support, funding, training, and facilities as these are key factors that will influence teachers for a successful adoption and integration of technology into teaching.

### REFERENCES

- Aharonian, N. (2016). I thought to myself: "What a long way I've come": Teacher writing for professional learning. *Teacher Development*, 20 (2), 213 -228.
- Angelle, P. S., & DeHart, C. A. (2015). Teacher perceptions of teacher leadership: Examining differences by experience, degree, and position. *NASSP Bulletin*, 95 (2), 141 -160.
- ARG (Assessment Reform Group). (2019). *Testing, motivation, and learning*. Cambridge, England: University of Cambridge Faculty of Education.
- Armstrong, P. A. (2018). *What teachers expect in reform: Making their voices heard*. Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Ayas, A. P., Akdeniz, A., Çepni, S., Baki, A., Cimer A., & Cimer, S. (2017). Hizmetiçi Egitimin Etkililiği Temel Arastırması (BEP2/04 - CQ) Sonuç Raporu, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, Projeler Koordinasyon Merkezi Başkanlığı Temel Eğitim Projesi.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2018). *Transformational Leadership Theory*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2016). *Transformational Leadership Theory* (2nd ed). London. Routledge.
- Black, P., & William, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice*, 5(1), 7-74.
- Bol, L., Nunnery, J., Stephenson, P., & Mogge, K. (2000). Changes in teachers' assessment practices in the new American schools restructuring models. *Teaching and Change*, 7(2), 127 -146.
- Borko, H., Flory, M., & Cumbo, K. (1993). *Teachers' Ideas and Practices About Assessment and Instruction. A Case Study of the Effects of Alternative Assessment in Instruction, Student Learning, and Accountability Practice*. CSE Technical Report 366. Los Angeles: Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST).
- Brown, M. K. (2006). *Leadership for social justice and equity: Evaluating a transformative framework and*



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**

Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

andragogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(5), 700 -745.

Caldwell, C., Dixon, R., Floyd, L., Chaudoin, J., Post, J., & Cheo kas, G. (2019). Transformative leadership: Achieving unparalleled excellence. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 109(2), 175 -187. doi:10.1007/s10551 -011-1116 -2

Camburn, E. M., Kimball, S. M., & Lowenhaupt, R. (2008). Going to scale with teacher leadership: Lessons learned from a districtwide literacy coach initiative. In M. M. Mangin & S.R. Stoelinga (Eds.), *Effective teacher leadership: Using research to inform and reform* (pp. 120 -143). New York: Teachers College Press.

Cannata, M., McCrory, R., Sykes, G., Anagno stopoulos, D., & Frank, K. A. (2018). Exploring the influence of National Board certified teachers in their schools and beyond. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(4), 463 -490.

Carver, C. L. (2016). Transforming identities: The transition from teacher to leader during teacher leader preparation. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 11 (2), 158 -180.

Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession (2009). *Teacher Leadership Skills Framework*.

Changing Minds (2018). Bass' Transformational Leadership Theory.

Cimer, S. O., Cakir, I., & Cimer A. (2018). Teachers' views on the effectiveness of in-service courses on the new curriculum in Turkey, *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(1), 31 -41.

Coleman, M. R., Gallagher, J. J., & Job, J. (2019 ). Developing and sustaining professionalism within gifted education. *Gifted Child Today*, 35(1), 27 -36.

Collinson, V. (2019). Leading by learning, learning by leading. *Professional Development in Education*, 38(2), 247 -266.

Cosenza, M. N. (2018). Teacher leadership development in PDSs: Perceptions of 22 veteran teachers. *School – University Partnerships*, 6(1), 47 -58.

Cosenza, M. N. (2015). Defining teacher leadership: Affirming the Teacher Leader Model Standards. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 24(2), 79 -99.

Danielson, C. (2017). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Danielson, C. (2016). *Teacher leadership that strengthens professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Demir, R., Ozturk, N., & Dokme, I. (2019). The views of the teachers taking in- service training about alternative measurement and evaluation techniques: The sample of primary school teachers. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 2347-2352.

Difference Between (2015, June 30). *Difference between model and theory*.

Dizon, E. C., & Sanchez, R. D. (2020). Improving Select Grade 7 Filipino Students' Reading Performance Using the Eclectic Model. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices*, 2(2), 216-221.

Dozier, T. K. (2017). Turning good teachers into great leaders. *Educational Leadership*, 65 (1), 54 -58.

Fairman, J. C., & Mackenzie, S. V. (2019). Spheres of teacher leadership action for learning. *Professional*



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**

Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

Development in Education, 32 (2), 229 -246

- Fram, S. M. (2018). The constant comparative analysis method outside of grounded theory. *The Qualitative Report*, 18(1), 1 -25.
- Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (1996). *What's worth fighting for in your school?* New York, Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. London, Cassell.
- Fullan, M., & Hargreaves A. (Eds.) (1992). *Understanding teacher development*. London, Cassell.
- Furtado, L., & Anderson, D. (2019). The reflective teacher leader: An action research model. *Journal of School Leadership*, 22 (3), 531 - 568.
- Gardner, J. (2006). *Assessment and learning*. London, Sage.
- Goh, C. (1999). Nationwide curriculum innovation: How do we manage change? In C. Kennedy, P. Doyle, & C. Goh (Eds.), *Exploring change in English language teaching* (pp. 5 -18), Oxford: Macmillan Heinemann.
- Hanuscin, D. L., Rebello, C. M., & Sinha, S. (2019). Supporting the development of science teacher leaders: Where do we begin? *Science Educator*, 21(1), 12 -18.
- Harris, A., (2015). Teacher Leadership: More than a feel good factor? *Journal of Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4 (3), 201 - 209.
- Helterbran, V. R. (2018). Teacher leadership: Overcoming 'I am just a teacher' syndrome. *Education*, 131 (2), 363 -371.
- Hildebrandt, S. A., & Eom, M. (2019). Teacher professionalization: Motivational factors and the influence of age. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 416 -423.
- Huang, T. (2016). Linking the private and public: Teacher leadership and teacher education in the reflexive modernity. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 39 (2), 222 -237.
- Hunzicker, J. L. (2019). Professional development and job-embedded collaboration: How teachers learn to exercise leadership, *Professional Development in Education*, 38(2), 267 -289.
- Hunzicker, J. L. (2018). Attitude has a lot to do with it: Dispositions of emerging teacher leadership. *Teacher Development*, 17(4), 538-561.
- Hunzicker, J. L. (2020). Informal teacher leadership in Action: Indicators and illustrations. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 7(4), 391-415.
- Hunzicker, J. L. (2017). Using Danielson's framework to develop teacher leaders. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 53(1), 12-17.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2007). Short on power, long on responsibility. *Educational Leadership*, 65 (1), 20 -25.
- Johnson, S. M., & Donaldson, M. L. (2007). Overcoming the obstacles to leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 65(1), 8 -13.



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**

Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

- Kendra, C. (2020). What Is Transformational Leadership? How Transformational Leadership Inspire.
- Kilinc, A. C., Cemalaglu, N., & Savas, G. (2015 ). The relationship between teacher leadership, teacher professionalism, and perceived stress. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 58, 1-26.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lattimer, H. (2007). To help and not hinder. *Educational Leadership*, 65(1), 70 -73.
- Laverty, S. M. (2003). Hermeneutic phenomenology and phenomenology: A comparison of historical and methodological considerations. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 2 (3), 21 - 35.
- Lieberman, A., & Friedrich, L. (2007) Teachers, writers, leaders. *Educational Leadership*, 65 (1), 42 -47.
- Loftus, S., & Higgs, J. (2018) Researching the individual in workplace research. *Journal of Education and Work*, 23 (4), 377 -388.
- Lowery- Moore, H., Latimer, R. M., & Villate, V. M. (2016). The essence of teacher leadership: A phenomenological inquiry of professional growth. *International Journal of Teacher Leadership*, 7(1), 1 -16.
- Mangin, M. M. (2008). The influence of organizational design on instructional teacher leadership. In M. M. Mangin & S.R. Stoelinga (Eds.), *Effective teacher leadership: Using research to inform and reform* (pp. 77 -98). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Margolis, J., & Huggins, K. S. (2019). Distributed but undefined: New teacher leader roles to change schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 22 (5), 953 -981.
- Marques, J. (2015). The changed leadership landscape: What matters today. *Journal of Management Development*, 34(10), 1310-1322.
- Mc Millan, J. H. (2007). *Formative classroom assessment: Research, theory and practice*. New York Teacher's College Press.
- Metin, M., & Ozmen, H. (2018 ). Determination of science and technology teachers' in- service education (inset) needs on performance assessment. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 18(3), 819-838.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2020). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Moller, G., & Pankake, A. (2006). *Lead with me: a principal's guide to teacher leadership*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Mongillo, G., Lawrence, S. A., & Hong, C. E. (2019). Empowering leaders in a master's in literacy program: Teacher candidates' self-efficacy and self-perception as literacy leaders. *Action in Teacher Education*, 34, 551 -565.
- Morrison, K. (2018). Complexity theory, school leadership and management: Questions for theory and practice. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 38(3), 374 -393.
- Morse, J. M., & Richards, L. (2002). *Readme first for a user's guide to qualitative methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc
- Ncube, L. B. (2018). Transformative leadership philosophy. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4(3), 77 -82 .



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**

Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

doi:1002/jls.20182

- Nicolaidou, M. (2018). Do primary school teachers in Cypriot schools see themselves as leaders? Echoing practitioners' voices on levers and barriers. *Teacher Development*, 14(2), 225 -239.
- Pentang, J. T. (2021). The concept of curriculum and its foundation. *The Educator's Link*, 1(6), 9.
- Poekert, P., Alexandrou, A., & Shannon, D. (2016). How teachers become leaders: An internationally validated theoretical model of teacher leadership development. *Research in Post - Compulsory Education*, 21 (4), 307 -329.
- Putnam, R., & Borko, H. (1996). Learning to teach. In D. Berliner, & R. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 673 - 708), New York, Macmillian.
- Putnam, R., & Borko, H. (1996). Learning to teach. In D. Berliner, & R. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 673 - 708), New York, Macmillian.
- Reason, C., & Reason, L. (2007). Asking the right questions. *Educational Leadership*, 65 (1), 36 -40.
- Riveros, A., Newton, P., & da Costa, J. (2018). From teachers to teacher-leaders: A case study. *International Journal of Teacher Leadership*, 4(1), 1 -15.
- Riley, K., & Louis, K. S. (2000). *Leadership for change and school reform: International perspectives*. London, Routledge Falmer.
- Roby, D. E. (2009). Teacher perceptions of levels of professional contribution to the school. *College Student Journal*, 43(3), 852 - 859.
- Rogers, J. (2021). Aspiring to leadership: Identifying teacher - leaders. *Medical Teacher*, 27 (7), 629 - 633.
- Ross, J. A., Hannay, L., & Hogaboam -Gray, A. (2000). Teacher perceptions of the impact of secondary school reform on student assessment in an Ontario high school. *A Series of Brief Reports*.
- Ryan, J. (2006). Inclusive leadership and social justice for schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 1 (5), 3 -17.
- Salendab, F. A., & Dapitan, Y. C. (2021). School Heads' Administrative Supervision: Its Relation to the Program Accreditation of Private Higher Education Institutions (PHEIs) in Region XII. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education*, 12(13), 194-202.
- Sanchez, A. M. P. (2022). HR Practitioners' Perceptions on Boosting Employees' Loyalty and Commitment: Inputs for a 21st Century-Responsive Human Resource System. *International Journal of Open-access, Interdisciplinary and New Educational Discoveries of ETCOR Educational Research Center (iJOINED ETCOR)*, Vol. I, Issue 4, 89-102.
- Sanchez, R., & Sarmiento, P. J. (2020). Learning together hand-in-hand: An assessment of students' immersion program in a schools division. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 9(1), 85-97.
- Sanchez, R., Sarmiento, P. J., Pangilinan, A., Guinto, N., Sanchez, A. M., & Sanchez, J. J. (2022). In the Name of Authentic Public Service: A Descriptive Phenomenological Study on the Lives of Filipino Teachers in Select Coastal Villages. *International Journal of Open-access, Interdisciplinary and New Educational Discoveries of ETCOR Educational Research Center (iJOINED ETCOR)*, 1(1), 35-44.



**ETCOR** Educational Research Center  
**PHILIPPINES**

Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**ISSN 1908-3181**

- Scouller, K. (1996). Influence of assessment method on students? Learning approaches, perceptions and preferences: The assignment essay versus the short answer examination. Paper presented at the HERDSA Conference on Different Approaches: Theory and Practice in Higher Education, Perth, Western Australia.
- Shield, C. M. (2003). Good intentions are not enough: Transformative leadership for communities of difference. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow.
- Smulyan, L. (2016). Stepping into their power: The development of a teacher leadership stance. *Schools: Studies in Education*, 13(1), 8-28.
- Stake, R. E. (2000). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 435 -454). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stiggins, R. J., & Conklin, N. (1992). *In teachers' hands: Investigating the practices of classroom assessment*. State University of New York press.
- Stiggins, R. (2000). *Student-involved classroom assessment* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice -Hall.
- Theoharis, G. (2009). *The school leaders our children deserve: Seven keys to equity, social justice, and school reform*. New York, NY: Teachers College.
- Topolinski, C. C. (2020). *The influence of teacher leadership and professional learning on teachers' knowledge and change of instructional practices in low performing schools.* (Doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University).
- Wade, C., & Ferriter, B. (2007). Will you help me lead? *Educational Leadership*, 65 (1), 65 -68.
- Walsh, I., Holton, J. A., Lotte, B., Fernandez, W., Levina, N., & Glaser, B. (2015). What grounded theory is: A critically reflective conversation among scholars. *Organizational Research Methods*, 18(4), 620 -628.
- Wenner, J. A., & Campbell, T. (2016). The theoretical and empirical basis of teacher leadership: A Review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(2), 1 -38.
- Wilson, A. (2016). From professional practice to practical leader: Teacher leadership in professional learning communities. *International Journal of Teacher Leadership*, 7(2), 45 -62.
- York-Barr, J., & Duke, K. (2004). What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings from two decades of scholarship. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(3), 255 -31.