

# ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)



**ISRG PUBLISHERS**

Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci

**ISSN: 2583-7672 (Online)**

Journal homepage: <https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjahss>

Volume – IV Issue - II (March – April) 2026

Frequency: Bimonthly



## CONTENT KNOWLEDGE, PEDAGOGICAL COMPETENCE AND WELL BEING OF LANGUAGE TEACHERS: BASIS FOR AN INTEGRATED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

**JAIME V. DE LA ROSA III**

Cagayan State University-Aparri Campus Aparri, Cagayan

| **Received:** 05.04.2026 | **Accepted:** 12.04.2026 | **Published:** 20.04.2026

\*Corresponding author: JAIME V. DE LA ROSA III

### Abstract

*Language teaching requires the integration of content knowledge, pedagogical competence, and teacher well-being, yet these are often examined separately, limiting understanding of their interaction. This study determined their levels, examined differences and relationships among language teachers, identified challenges, and proposed an integrated professional development framework.*

*A descriptive–correlational design with triangulation involved 60 public-school teachers in Buguey District, Cagayan. Data came from questionnaires, interviews, and document analysis and were analyzed through descriptive statistics, t-test, ANOVA, Pearson correlation, and thematic analysis. Findings revealed high to very high levels across variables, with variations in assessment, ICT integration, and work-life balance, and significant relationships among the three.*

*The study concluded that effective language teaching depends on the combined influence of knowledge, competence, and well-being. Despite positive results, challenges such as workload and limited institutional support persist. These findings informed the development of Project I-LEAD to enhance teaching effectiveness and teacher well-being.*

**Keywords:** content knowledge, pedagogical competence, teacher well-being, professional development, language teachers

### INTRODUCTION

The teaching profession plays a vital role in national development and in achieving quality education. Worldwide, teacher well-being and accountability are recognized as key factors shaping instructional effectiveness, student achievement, and the long-term stability of education systems. According to UNESCO (2023) and the World Bank (2022), persistent issues such as teacher shortages, migration, and work-related stress continue to impede the

achievement of Sustainable Development Goal 4, which seeks to provide inclusive and equitable education for all. When teachers face low morale, inadequate support, and overwhelming workloads, the quality of instruction declines, adversely affecting student learning, especially in English and other language-related subjects.

In the Philippine context, these global issues are clearly evident. Results from the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2018 and 2022 show continued low performance among Filipino learners. The Second Congressional Commission on Education (EDCOM II, 2023) links these gaps to concerns in teacher welfare, workload, and accountability. Teacher migration further worsens the situation, causing shortages—especially in English—while remaining teachers face heavier responsibilities, increased stress, and reduced professional satisfaction.

At the regional level, these challenges are magnified in Region II, particularly in Cagayan province where rural disparities remain evident. Many teachers serve in geographically isolated and disadvantaged areas with limited access to professional development, welfare programs, and psychosocial support. Field monitoring reports indicate that English teachers frequently handle large classes, multiple subject loads, and ancillary functions beyond their teaching assignments. These conditions contribute to emotional fatigue, reduced instructional preparation, and diminished classroom engagement. The absence of structured well-being programs, mentoring systems, and institutional recognition mechanisms further intensifies burnout and attrition, underscoring the interdependence between teacher welfare and accountability in maintaining instructional effectiveness.

In Buguey District, Cagayan, where this study is focused, the situation is particularly pronounced. The district comprises both coastal and inland schools, including Licerio Antiporda Sr. National High School, Pattao National High School, Maddalero National High School, and their rural extensions. Many English teachers in these schools experience high workloads, irregular class scheduling, and limited access to continuous professional learning. Interviews conducted during district monitoring revealed that some teachers are compelled to handle subjects outside their specialization or assume additional administrative tasks due to migration-related vacancies. These local realities illustrate how teacher well-being and accountability are challenged within the district's educational context. Teachers' psychological health, work-life balance, and professional satisfaction are continuously tested by the demands of the profession and by the instability caused by migration and attrition.

To address these recurring challenges, several national laws and education policies provide a legal foundation for safeguarding teacher welfare and accountability. Republic Act No. 4670, or the *Magna Carta for Public School Teachers*, ensures the rights of educators to just compensation, humane working conditions, and professional growth. Republic Act No. 10533, the *Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013*, mandates that qualified and accountable teachers implement the K to 12 Curriculum with efficiency and dedication. Likewise, Republic Act No. 9155, the *Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001*, institutionalizes shared governance and participatory accountability in school management. Complementary to these statutes are Department of Education issuances such as DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017 (*Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers*); DepEd Order No. 8, s. 2015 (*Classroom Assessment Policy*); DepEd Order No. 39, s. 2022 (*National Mental Health Program for Teachers*); and DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016 (*Learning Resource Management and Development System*). These policies collectively emphasize teacher quality, well-being, accountability, and continuous professional development. The MATATAG Curriculum Reform

(DepEd, 2023) further underscores the government's commitment to strengthening teacher support and instructional excellence.

Despite existing policy safeguards, gaps in implementation persist in rural and migration-affected schools such as those in Buguey District, where teachers face limited access to wellness initiatives, inequitable workloads, and insufficient recognition, contributing to stress and attrition. Moreover, the absence of localized mechanisms to monitor teacher well-being alongside accountability further exacerbates these challenges, and while prior studies have examined well-being, job satisfaction, or migration separately, limited evidence explains their combined effect on English instruction. Thus, this study addresses this gap by examining how teacher well-being and accountability interact to influence instructional delivery in public schools in Buguey District, Cagayan, with the aim of generating evidence for policy interventions that enhance teacher welfare, strengthen accountability, and improve instructional quality, ultimately supporting a more equitable and sustainable education system.

### Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to determine the level of content knowledge, pedagogical competence, and well-being of language teachers and to examine the differences and relationships among these variables when grouped according to selected profile characteristics. It further sought to identify the challenges experienced by language teachers that affect their content knowledge, pedagogical competence, and well-being, and to develop an integrated professional development framework based on the findings of the study. The study was conducted among language teachers for School Year 2025–2026.

Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the teacher-respondents in terms of the following variables:
  - a. Personal
  - b. Professional
2. What is the level of content knowledge of language teachers in terms of;
  - a. Language structure?
  - b. Language pedagogy
  - c. Assessment and evaluation
3. What is the level of pedagogical competence of language teachers in terms of;
  - a. Institutional planning
  - b. Teaching strategies
  - c. Learner engagement
  - d. Use of ICT tools in language teachers in terms of;
4. What is the level of well-being of teachers in terms of;
  - a. Emotional
  - b. Professional / occupational
  - c. Social
  - d. Work-life balance

5. Is there a significant difference between the content knowledge, pedagogical competence and well-being of language teachers when grouped according to profile variables?
6. Is there a significant relationship between;
  - a. Content knowledge and pedagogical competence
  - b. Content knowledge and teacher well-being
  - c. Pedagogical competence and teacher well-being
7. What challenges do language teachers experience affect their content knowledge and pedagogical competence and well-being?
8. What intervention plan can be developed based on the findings of this research?

## METHODOLOGY

This section consists of the different methods and procedures as well as the instrumentalities utilized in processing this study.

### Research Design

This study employed a descriptive–correlational research design with methodological triangulation to determine the levels of content knowledge, pedagogical competence, and well-being of language teachers and to examine the differences and relationships among these variables when grouped according to selected profile characteristics for School Year 2025–2026. The descriptive approach was used to present teachers’ profiles and levels of the key variables, while the correlational approach determined significant relationships and differences among them. Methodological triangulation strengthened the study through the use of survey questionnaires, interviews, and documentary analysis of records such as PDS and IPCRF. The study also identified challenges affecting these variables, and the findings served as the basis for developing an Integrated Professional Development Framework for Language Teachers.

### Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in Buguey District under the Schools Division Office of Cagayan, Region II, during School Year 2025–2026. The district, located in a first-class coastal municipality in northeastern Cagayan, consists of both urban and rural schools, providing a diverse context for examining language teachers’ professional experiences. This locale was appropriate due to the varied personal and professional profiles of teachers, differences in teaching assignments, and unequal access to professional development opportunities across geographically near and remote schools. Such diversity allowed for a comprehensive analysis of the levels, differences, and relationships among content knowledge, pedagogical competence, and well-being, as well as the challenges affecting these variables. The findings from this setting served as the basis for developing an Integrated Professional Development Framework aimed at enhancing teachers’ competence and well-being.

### Respondents and Sampling Technique

The study involved 60 public-school language teachers from elementary and secondary schools in Buguey District, Schools Division of Cagayan, Region II. Selected through stratified random sampling based on urban and rural school locations, respondents

were directly engaged in language instruction. Data were supported through semi-structured interviews and documents such as PDS and IPCRF, ensuring triangulation and validity. Participants were licensed teachers of English or Filipino with at least one year of experience during SY 2025–2026. Excluded were non-language teachers, those on leave, or newly hired educators, ensuring relevant and reliable data for the study.

### Research Instruments

The study used a structured questionnaire as the primary instrument to collect quantitative data on teachers’ content knowledge, pedagogical competence, and well-being. It included sections on profiles, instructional competencies, well-being dimensions, and challenges, measured using a five-point Likert scale. A semi-structured interview guide served as a secondary tool to validate and enrich survey data through participants’ insights, analyzed thematically. Documentary analysis of PDS and IPCRF further supported data validation. The questionnaire underwent expert validation and pilot testing, achieving acceptable reliability. The integration of these methods ensured credible, comprehensive data and supported the development of an Integrated Professional Development Framework.

### Data Gathering Procedure

Data collection followed a systematic and ethical process. Approvals were secured from university and division authorities, and coordination with school officials was ensured. Teacher-respondents were oriented on the study’s purpose, and informed consent was obtained. Validated questionnaires were distributed to selected English and Filipino teachers from urban and rural schools with clear instructions. To ensure credibility, triangulation was applied through semi-structured interviews and analysis of PDS and IPCRF records. Completed data were reviewed, transcribed, and analyzed using appropriate statistical and thematic methods. Findings were then used as the basis for developing an Integrated Professional Development Framework for Language Teachers.

### Data Analysis

Data from the validated questionnaire were coded and analyzed using SPSS through descriptive and inferential statistics. Frequency and percentage described respondents’ profiles, while mean and standard deviation measured levels of content knowledge, pedagogical competence, well-being, and challenges. Independent samples t-test and one-way ANOVA tested differences across profile variables, with post hoc tests applied when needed. Pearson *r* assessed relationships among key variables. All hypotheses were tested at the 0.05 significance level. The results served as the basis for developing an Integrated Professional Development Framework for Language Teachers.

### Ethical Consideration

The study strictly followed ethical standards to protect participants’ rights, privacy, and safety in line with Cagayan State University Aparri and DepEd guidelines. Necessary approvals were secured, and participation was voluntary with informed consent obtained. Respondents were informed of the study’s purpose and their right to withdraw anytime. Confidentiality and anonymity were ensured through coded data and secure storage. Ethical protocols were also observed in interviews and document analysis, with all findings presented in aggregate form and no personal identifiers disclosed throughout the research process.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Below are the results and study's interpretation of all data that were gathered, tabulated and analyzed.

### 1. Profile of the Teacher-Respondents

#### Teacher's Personal Profile

Table 1a. Frequency and percentage distribution of the teachers in terms of their Personal profile

Profile Variables	Frequency (n=)	Percentage
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	12	20.00
Female	48	80.00
<b>Age</b>		
20–29	21	35.00
30–39	27	45.00
40–49	10	16.67
50–59	2	3.33
<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>34.42</b>	
<b>S.D.</b>	<b>7.45</b>	
<b>Highest Educational Attainment</b>		
Bachelor's Degree	6	10.00
With Master's Units	15	25.00
Master's Degree	20	33.33
With Doctoral Units	6	10.00
Doctoral Degree	13	21.67

Table 1a presents the distribution of the respondents in terms of their personal profile, including sex, age, and highest educational attainment.

In terms of sex, the majority of the respondents are female with 48 or 80.00 percent, while 12 or 20.00 percent are male. In terms of age, the highest proportion belongs to the 30–39 age group with 27 or 45.00 percent, followed by 20–29 with 21 or 35.00 percent, and 40–49 with 10 or 16.67 percent. The lowest proportion is in the 50–59 age group with 2 or 3.33 percent. The computed weighted mean age is 34.42 with a standard deviation of 7.45.

In terms of highest educational attainment, the highest proportion of respondents have completed a Master's Degree with 20 or 33.33 percent, followed by those with Master's Units with 15 or 25.00 percent, and those with Doctoral Degree with 13 or 21.67 percent. The lowest proportions are those with Bachelor's Degree and Doctoral Units, both with 6 or 10.00 percent each.

#### Teacher's Professional profile

Table 1b. Frequency and percentage distribution of the teachers in terms of their Professional Profile

Profile Variables	Frequency (n=)	Percentage
<b>Rank/Teaching Position</b>		

Teacher I	12	20.00
Teacher II	11	18.33
Teacher III	33	55.00
Master Teacher I	2	3.33
Master Teacher II	2	3.33
<b>Years of Teaching Experience</b>		
Less than 5 years	18	30.00
5–10 years	24	40.00
11–15 years	9	15.00
16–20 years	5	8.33
More than 20 years	4	6.67
<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>9.30</b>	
<b>S.D.</b>	<b>7.83</b>	
<b>Teaching Level</b>		
Elementary	0	0.00
Secondary	60	100.00
<b>Language Subject Taught:</b>		
English	43	71.67
Filipino	17	28.33
<b>Number of seminars/trainings attended related to language teaching in the last three years</b>		
None	4	6.67
1-2	7	11.67
3-5	23	38.33
More than 5	26	43.33
<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3</b>	

Table 1b presents the respondents' professional profile in terms of rank, years of teaching experience, teaching level, language subject taught, and number of related seminars or trainings attended in the last three years. Most respondents are Teacher III (55.00%), followed by Teacher I (20.00%) and Teacher II (18.33%), while Master Teacher I and II comprise the least (3.33% each). In terms of experience, most have 6–10 years (40.00%), followed by less than 5 years (30.00%), with a mean of 9.30 years (SD = 7.83). All respondents teach at the secondary level (100.00%), with most handling English (71.67%) and the rest Filipino (28.33%). For trainings attended, most have more than five (43.33%), followed by 3–5 (38.33%), 1–2 (11.67%), and none (6.67%), with a mean of 3.

### 2. Teacher's level of content knowledge

#### Language structure

Table 2a. Teacher's level of content knowledge in terms of Language structure

Statement	Weighted	Descriptive
-----------	----------	-------------

	Mean	Value
I have a strong understanding of grammar rules in the language I teach.	4.80	Very High
I can clearly explain sentence structures and syntax to learners.	4.75	Very High
I understand word formation and morphology in the target language.	4.83	Very High
I can identify and correct common language errors accurately.	4.78	Very High
I explain language rules using appropriate examples.	4.80	Very High
I adjust explanations based on learners' proficiency levels.	4.78	Very High
I apply language rules correctly in classroom instruction.	4.72	Very High
<b>Category Mean</b>	<b>4.78</b>	<b>Very High</b>

Table 2a presents the weighted mean and descriptive interpretation of the teachers' level of content knowledge in terms of language structure. The overall weighted mean of 4.78, interpreted as Very High, indicates a strong level of understanding. The highest weighted mean of 4.83 (Very High) was obtained by "I understand word formation and morphology in the target language," while the lowest weighted mean of 4.72 (Very High) was recorded for "I apply language rules correctly in classroom instruction."

The implication is that teachers are capable of explaining language concepts effectively, although there is slight variation in the application of language rules during instruction. This indicates that differences exist in how language knowledge is applied in classroom situations.

The finding means that teachers demonstrate strong knowledge of language structure, including grammar and word formation. These findings are supported by Richards (2017), who emphasized the importance of strong language knowledge in effective instruction. Similarly, Farrell (2018) highlighted that reflective teaching and adaptability are essential in applying language knowledge in diverse classroom contexts.

Table 2b. Teacher's level of content knowledge in terms of Language pedagogy

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
I understand how learners acquire language skills.	4.67	Very High
I am familiar with effective approaches in language teaching.	4.65	Very High
I select appropriate methods for teaching language concepts.	4.63	Very High

I adapt my teaching strategies to diverse learners.	4.78	Very High
I integrate listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills effectively.	4.73	Very High
I apply learner-centered approaches in language teaching.	4.73	Very High
I reflect on my teaching practices to improve language learning.	4.70	Very High
<b>Category Mean</b>	<b>4.70</b>	<b>Very High</b>

Table 2b presents the weighted mean and interpretation of teachers' level of content knowledge in terms of language pedagogy. The overall weighted mean of 4.70, interpreted as Very High, indicates a strong level of pedagogical knowledge. The highest weighted mean of 4.78 was obtained by "I adapt my teaching strategies to diverse learners," while the lowest weighted mean of 4.63 was recorded for "I select appropriate methods for teaching language concepts."

The results imply that teachers are highly capable of adapting instruction to diverse learners, although there is slight variation in selecting appropriate methods for specific language concepts. This indicates differences in the application of pedagogical knowledge in instructional contexts. Overall, teachers demonstrate a very high level of competence in language pedagogy. These findings are supported by Black and Wiliam (2018), Brookhart (2017), and Heritage (2018), who emphasized the importance of aligning instructional strategies with learner needs and effective teaching practices.

#### Assessment and evaluation

Table 2c. Teacher's level of content knowledge in terms of Assessment and evaluation

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
I design assessments aligned with language learning objectives.	4.80	Very High
I use varied tools to assess language skills.	4.73	Very High
I assess learners' language performance fairly.	4.77	Very High
I interpret assessment results accurately.	4.48	High
I provide feedback that improves language learning.	4.62	Very High
I use assessment results to adjust instruction.	4.60	Very High
I align assessment tasks with instructional goals.	4.63	Very High
<b>Category Mean</b>	<b>4.66</b>	<b>Very High</b>

Table 2c presents the weighted mean and interpretation of teachers' level of content knowledge in terms of assessment and evaluation. The overall weighted mean of 4.66, interpreted as Very High, indicates a strong level of knowledge. The highest weighted mean of 4.80 was obtained by "I design assessments aligned with language learning objectives," while the lowest weighted mean of 4.48, interpreted as High, was recorded for "I interpret assessment results accurately."

The results imply that teachers are highly capable of designing aligned assessments, although there is variation in interpreting assessment results. This suggests differences in the use of assessment data for instructional decisions. Overall, teachers demonstrate strong knowledge in assessment and evaluation. These findings are supported by Black and Wiliam (2018), Brookhart (2017), and Heritage (2018), who emphasized the importance of assessment design, feedback, and data interpretation in improving learning outcomes.

### Summary

Table 2d. Teacher's level of content knowledge

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
Language structure	4.78	Very High
Language pedagogy	4.70	Very High
Assessment and evaluation	4.66	Very High
<b>Composite Mean</b>	<b>4.71</b>	<b>Very High</b>

Table 2d presents the summary of the teachers' level of content knowledge across language structure, language pedagogy, and assessment and evaluation. The overall composite mean of 4.71, interpreted as Very High, indicates a strong level of content knowledge. The highest weighted mean of 4.78 (Very High) was obtained in language structure, while the lowest weighted mean of 4.66 (Very High) was recorded in assessment and evaluation.

The implication is that teachers demonstrate stronger competence in language structure compared to assessment practices. This indicates variation in the level of competence across the three dimensions, with relatively lower emphasis on assessment and evaluation.

The finding means that teachers possess a very high level of content knowledge in language teaching across all dimensions. These findings are supported by Luckin et al. (2022), who emphasized the importance of integrating knowledge, pedagogy, and assessment in effective teaching. Similarly, Zhao (2021) highlighted that strong teacher knowledge contributes to improved instructional quality and learner outcomes.

### 3. Teacher's level of pedagogical competence Institutional planning

Table 3a. Teacher's level of pedagogical competence in terms of Institutional planning

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
I prepare lesson plans aligned with curriculum standards.	4.90	Very High
I set clear and measurable lesson objectives.	4.87	Very High

I organize learning activities logically.	4.83	Very High
I manage instructional time effectively.	4.60	Very High
I plan lessons based on learners' needs.	4.68	Very High
I align instructional activities with assessments.	4.72	Very High
I revise lesson plans based on learner performance.	4.65	Very High
<b>Category Mean</b>	<b>4.75</b>	<b>Very High</b>

Table 3a presents the weighted mean and descriptive interpretation of the teachers' level of pedagogical competence in terms of institutional planning. The overall weighted mean of 4.75, interpreted as Very High, indicates a strong level of competence. The highest weighted mean of 4.90 (Very High) was obtained by "I prepare lesson plans aligned with curriculum standards," while the lowest weighted mean of 4.60 (Very High) was recorded for "I manage instructional time effectively."

The implication is that teachers demonstrate stronger competence in curriculum-aligned planning compared to time management. This indicates variation in the application of planning skills, particularly in managing instructional time during lesson implementation.

The finding means that teachers possess a very high level of pedagogical competence in institutional planning. These findings are supported by Darling-Hammond et al. (2020), who emphasized that effective instructional planning and alignment with standards enhance teaching quality. Similarly, Hattie (2021) highlighted that teacher clarity and structured planning significantly influence student achievement.

### Teaching strategies

Table 3b. Teacher's level of pedagogical competence in terms of Teaching strategies

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
I use varied strategies to teach language concepts.	4.72	Very High
I modify strategies based on learners' responses.	4.67	Very High
I use examples and illustrations effectively.	4.83	Very High
I promote critical thinking during lessons.	4.75	Very High
I apply interactive teaching strategies.	4.83	Very High
I differentiate instruction to address learner differences.	4.68	Very High
I evaluate the effectiveness of my teaching strategies.	4.67	Very High

<b>Category Mean</b>	<b>4.74</b>	<b>Very High</b>
----------------------	-------------	------------------

Table 3b presents the weighted mean and descriptive interpretation of the teachers' level of pedagogical competence in terms of teaching strategies. The overall weighted mean of 4.74, interpreted as Very High, indicates a strong level of competence. The highest weighted mean of 4.83 (Very High) was obtained by "I use examples and illustrations effectively" and "I apply interactive teaching strategies," while the lowest weighted mean of 4.67 (Very High) was recorded for "I modify strategies based on learners' responses" and "I evaluate the effectiveness of my teaching strategies."

The implication is that teachers demonstrate stronger competence in applying interactive strategies and using examples compared to modifying and evaluating strategies. This indicates variation in how teaching strategies are implemented and assessed during instruction.

The finding means that teachers possess a very high level of pedagogical competence in teaching strategies. These findings are supported by Hattie (2021), who emphasized that interactive strategies and teacher clarity improve learning outcomes. Similarly, Darling-Hammond et al. (2020) highlighted that responsive and differentiated strategies enhance instructional quality.

#### Learner engagement

Table 3c. Teacher's level of pedagogical competence in terms of Learner engagement

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
I encourage active learner participation.	4.90	Very High
I motivate learners to use the target language.	4.90	Very High
I create a positive learning environment.	4.90	Very High
I respond constructively to learners' ideas.	4.78	Very High
I promote collaboration among learners.	4.82	Very High
I sustain learners' interest during lessons.	4.83	Very High
I manage classroom interactions effectively.	4.83	Very High
<b>Category Mean</b>	<b>4.85</b>	<b>Very High</b>

Table 3c presents the weighted mean and interpretation of teachers' pedagogical competence in terms of learner engagement. The overall weighted mean of 4.85, interpreted as Very High, indicates strong competence. The highest weighted mean of 4.90 was obtained by items on encouraging participation, motivating learners, and creating a positive learning environment, while the lowest weighted mean of 4.78 was recorded for responding constructively to learners' ideas.

The results imply strong competence in promoting engagement strategies, although responding to learner input may be further strengthened. Overall, teachers demonstrate very high pedagogical competence. These findings are supported by Hiver, Al-Hoorie,

and Mercer (2021), who emphasized the role of motivation and positive classroom interaction in enhancing learner engagement and communication.

#### Use of ICT tools

Table 3d. Teacher's level of pedagogical competence in terms of use of ICT tools

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
I use digital tools to support language instruction.	4.62	Very High
I integrate multimedia resources in teaching.	4.77	Very High
I am confident in using educational technology.	4.65	Very High
I use online platforms to enhance learning.	4.58	Very High
I apply ICT tools in language assessment.	4.50	Very High
I select appropriate technology for lesson objectives.	4.65	Very High
I continuously improve my ICT skills for teaching.	4.58	Very High
<b>Category Mean</b>	<b>4.62</b>	<b>Very High</b>

Table 3d presents the weighted mean and interpretation of teachers' pedagogical competence in the use of ICT tools. The overall weighted mean of 4.62, interpreted as Very High, indicates strong competence. The highest weighted mean of 4.77 was obtained in integrating multimedia resources, while the lowest weighted mean of 4.50 was recorded in applying ICT tools in language assessment.

The results imply stronger competence in multimedia integration compared to ICT use in assessment, indicating variation in application across teaching practices. Overall, teachers demonstrate very high ICT competence. These findings are supported by Viberg et al. (2020) and Ifenthaler (2022), who emphasized the importance of digital tools in enhancing teaching, learning, and instructional effectiveness.

#### Summary

Table 3e. Teacher's level of pedagogical competence

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
Institutional planning	4.75	Very High
Teaching strategies	4.74	Very High
Learner engagement	4.85	Very High
Use of ICT tools	4.62	Very High
<b>Composite Mean</b>	<b>4.74</b>	<b>Very High</b>

Table 3e presents the summary of the teachers' level of pedagogical competence across institutional planning, teaching strategies, learner engagement, and use of ICT tools. The overall composite mean of 4.74, interpreted as Very High, indicates a strong level of pedagogical competence. The highest weighted

mean of 4.85 (Very High) was obtained in learner engagement, while the lowest weighted mean of 4.62 (Very High) was recorded in the use of ICT tools.

The implication is that teachers demonstrate stronger competence in learner engagement compared to the use of ICT tools. This indicates variation across the four dimensions, with relatively lower emphasis on ICT integration.

The finding means that teachers possess a very high level of pedagogical competence across all dimensions. These findings are supported by Mishra and Koehler (2020), who emphasized the integration of pedagogy and technology in effective teaching. Their work also highlighted that combining instructional strategies and learner engagement enhances learning outcomes. Furthermore, Voogt et al. (2021) noted that teachers' pedagogical competence influences the quality of instructional practices and learner achievement.

#### 4. Teacher's level of well-being Emotional

Table 4a. Teacher's level of well-being in terms of Emotional

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
I feel emotionally stable while performing my duties.	4.62	Very High
I manage work-related stress effectively.	4.48	High
I remain motivated despite teaching challenges.	4.50	Very High
I maintain a positive attitude toward teaching.	4.58	Very High
I feel confident in handling my responsibilities.	4.58	Very High
I cope well with emotional demands at work.	4.53	Very High
I remain calm during work-related difficulties.	4.65	Very High
<b>Category Mean</b>	<b>4.56</b>	<b>Very High</b>

Table 4a presents the weighted mean and descriptive interpretation of the teachers' level of well-being in terms of emotional aspects. The overall weighted mean of 4.56, interpreted as Very High, indicates a strong level of emotional well-being. The highest weighted mean of 4.65 (Very High) was obtained by "I remain calm during work-related difficulties," while the lowest weighted mean of 4.48 (High) was recorded for "I manage work-related stress effectively."

The implication is that teachers demonstrate stronger competence in maintaining composure during difficulties compared to managing work-related stress. This indicates variation in emotional well-being, particularly in stress management.

The finding means that teachers possess a very high level of emotional well-being. These findings are supported by Collie (2021), who emphasized that emotional well-being supports teacher motivation and effectiveness. Similarly, Hascher and Waber (2021) highlighted that emotionally stable teachers contribute to positive classroom environments. Furthermore, Hoy

(2020) noted that emotional resilience influences teachers' professional performance and classroom engagement.

#### Professional / occupational

Table 4b. Teacher's level of well-being in terms of Professional / occupational

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
I am satisfied with my role as a teacher.	4.62	Very High
I feel valued in my profession.	4.55	Very High
I find fulfillment in my teaching responsibilities.	4.52	Very High
I feel supported in my professional growth.	4.43	High
I feel secure in my teaching position.	4.45	High
I am motivated to continue teaching.	4.48	High
<b>Category Mean</b>	<b>4.51</b>	<b>Very High</b>

Table 4b presents the weighted mean and descriptive interpretation of the teachers' level of well-being in terms of professional or occupational aspects. The overall weighted mean of 4.51, interpreted as Very High, indicates a strong level of professional well-being. The highest weighted mean of 4.62 (Very High) was obtained by "I am satisfied with my role as a teacher," while the lowest weighted mean of 4.43 (High) was recorded for "I feel supported in my professional growth."

The implication is that teachers demonstrate stronger levels of job satisfaction compared to perceived support for professional growth. This indicates variation in professional well-being, particularly in areas related to development support.

The finding means that teachers possess a very high level of professional well-being. These findings are supported by Collie (2021), who emphasized that job satisfaction contributes to sustained teaching effectiveness. Similarly, Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2020) highlighted that support for professional growth influences teachers' well-being and performance. Furthermore, Watt (2021) noted that motivation and professional fulfillment are key factors in teacher commitment and retention.

#### Social

Table 4c. Teacher's level of well-being in terms of Social

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
I have positive relationships with colleagues.	4.80	Very High
I receive support from school administrators.	4.70	Very High
I feel respected in my workplace.	4.67	Very High
I collaborate effectively with other teachers.	4.83	Very High

I feel a sense of belonging in my school.	4.67	Very High
I communicate well with colleagues.	4.80	Very High
I feel socially supported at work.	4.52	Very High
<b>Category Mean</b>	<b>4.71</b>	<b>Very High</b>

Table 4c presents the weighted mean and descriptive interpretation of the teachers' level of well-being in terms of social aspects. The overall weighted mean of 4.71, interpreted as Very High, indicates a strong level of social well-being. The highest weighted mean of 4.83 and 4.80 (Very High) were obtained by "I collaborate effectively with other teachers" and "I communicate well with colleagues," while the lowest weighted mean of 4.52 (Very High) was recorded for "I feel socially supported at work."

The implication is that teachers demonstrate stronger competence in collaboration and communication compared to perceived social support. This indicates variation in social well-being, particularly in the level of support experienced in the workplace.

The finding means that teachers possess a very high level of social well-being. These findings are supported by Schultheiss (2020), who emphasized that positive workplace relationships enhance teacher well-being and collaboration. Similarly, Day (2020) highlighted that supportive professional relationships contribute to teacher effectiveness. Furthermore, Gu (2021) noted that collegial support and a sense of belonging strengthen teachers' well-being and professional engagement.

#### Work-life balance

Table 4c. Teacher's level of well-being in terms of Work-life balance

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
I balance work and personal responsibilities well.	4.62	Very High
I have enough time for rest and leisure.	4.20	High
My workload allows me to maintain well-being.	4.38	High
I manage work demands without feeling overwhelmed.	4.28	High
I separate work time from personal time.	4.40	High
I have time for family and social activities.	4.52	Very High
I am satisfied with my work-life balance.	4.52	Very High
<b>Category Mean</b>	<b>4.42</b>	<b>High</b>

Table 4c presents the weighted mean and descriptive interpretation of the teachers' level of well-being in terms of work-life balance. The overall weighted mean of 4.42, interpreted as High, indicates a high level of work-life balance. The highest weighted mean of 4.52 (Very High) was obtained by "I have time for family and social

activities" and "I am satisfied with my work-life balance," while the lowest weighted mean of 4.20 (High) was recorded for "I have enough time for rest and leisure."

The implication is that teachers demonstrate stronger capacity in managing family and social time compared to having sufficient time for rest and leisure. This indicates variation in work-life balance, particularly in rest and recovery.

The finding means that teachers possess a high level of work-life balance. These findings are supported by Collie (2021), who emphasized that work-life balance contributes to teacher well-being and job performance. Similarly, Smith (2020) highlighted that limited rest and recovery time can affect employee well-being and productivity. Furthermore, Demerouti (2021) noted that balancing work demands and personal life is essential in preventing burnout and sustaining professional effectiveness.

#### Summary

Table 4d. Teacher's level of well-being

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
Emotional	4.56	Very High
Professional / occupational	4.51	Very High
Social	4.71	Very High
Work-life balance	4.42	High
<b>Composite Mean</b>	<b>4.55</b>	<b>Very High</b>

Table 4e presents the summary of the teachers' level of well-being across emotional, professional or occupational, social, and work-life balance. The overall composite mean of 4.55, interpreted as Very High, indicates a strong level of well-being. The highest weighted mean of 4.71 (Very High) was obtained in social well-being, while the lowest weighted mean of 4.42 (High) was recorded in work-life balance.

The implication is that teachers demonstrate stronger well-being in social aspects compared to work-life balance. This indicates variation across the four dimensions, particularly in managing personal time and rest.

The finding means that teachers possess a very high level of overall well-being. These findings are supported by Collie (2021), who emphasized that teacher well-being supports motivation and instructional effectiveness. Similarly, Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2020) highlighted that well-being influences teacher performance and professional commitment. Furthermore, Demerouti (2021) noted that balancing work and personal demands is essential in sustaining well-being and preventing burnout.

#### 5. Comparison between the content knowledge, pedagogical competence and well-being of language teachers when grouped according to profile variables

Table 5a. Comparison between the level of content knowledge of the language teachers when grouped according to profile variables

Variables	t/fvalue	p-value	Statistical Inference
Sex	2.799	0.007	Significant
Age	3.557	0.020	Significant

Highest Educational Attainment	6.760	0.000	<b>Significant</b>
Rank/Teaching Position	1.972	0.112	<b>Not Significant</b>
Years of Teaching Experience	1.972	0.112	<b>Not Significant</b>
Language Subject Taught:	-1.218	0.228	<b>Not Significant</b>
Number of seminars/trainings attended related to language teaching in the last three years	4.468	0.007	<b>Significant</b>

Table 5a presents the comparison statistics on the level of content knowledge of language teachers when grouped according to selected profile variables. The results show that sex ( $p = 0.007$ ), age ( $p = 0.020$ ), highest educational attainment ( $p = 0.000$ ), and number of seminars or trainings attended ( $p = 0.007$ ) have significant differences at the 0.05 level, while other variables were not significant.

The implication is that differences in content knowledge are evident across sex, age, educational attainment, and training exposure. This indicates that these variables contribute to variation in teachers' knowledge, particularly in language structure, pedagogy, and assessment.

The finding means that teachers' level of content knowledge significantly differs based on selected profile variables. These findings are supported by Voyer and Voyer (2020), who emphasized that differences in competencies may exist across groups. Similarly, Desimone (2021) highlighted that continuous professional development enhances teachers' knowledge. Furthermore, Svincent-Lancrin (2022) noted that teacher qualifications and training influence instructional competence.

Table 5b. Comparison between the level of pedagogical competence of the language teachers when grouped according to profile variables

Variables	t/fvalue	p-value	Statistical Inference
Sex	2.113	0.039	<b>Significant</b>
Age	1.605	0.198	<b>Not Significant</b>
Highest Educational Attainment	4.546	0.003	<b>Significant</b>
Rank/Teaching Position	1.245	0.303	<b>Not Significant</b>
Years of Teaching Experience	1.245	0.303	<b>Not Significant</b>
Language Subject Taught:	-2.219	0.030	<b>Significant</b>
Number of seminars/trainings attended related to language teaching in	3.307	0.027	<b>Significant</b>

the last three years			
----------------------	--	--	--

Table 5b presents the comparison statistics on the level of pedagogical competence of language teachers when grouped according to selected profile variables. The results show that sex ( $p = 0.039$ ), highest educational attainment ( $p = 0.003$ ), language subject taught ( $p = 0.030$ ), and number of seminars or trainings attended ( $p = 0.027$ ) have significant differences at the 0.05 level, while age, rank, and years of experience were not significant.

The implication is that pedagogical competence varies across sex, educational attainment, subject taught, and training exposure. This indicates that these variables influence teachers' competence in institutional planning, teaching strategies, learner engagement, and use of ICT tools.

The finding means that teachers' level of pedagogical competence significantly differs based on selected profile variables. These findings are supported by Linda Darling-Hammond et al. (2020), who emphasized that teacher qualifications influence instructional effectiveness. Similarly, Desimone (2021) highlighted that professional development enhances teaching competence. Furthermore, Farrell (2022) noted that teaching context and specialization shape instructional practices.

Table 5c. Comparison between the level of well-being of the language teachers when grouped according to profile variables

Variables	t/fvalue	p-value	Statistical Inference
Sex	2.687	0.009	<b>Significant</b>
Age	3.750	0.016	<b>Significant</b>
Highest Educational Attainment	7.101	0.000	<b>Significant</b>
Rank/Teaching Position	1.581	0.192	<b>Not Significant</b>
Years of Teaching Experience	1.581	0.192	<b>Not Significant</b>
Language Subject Taught:	-1.881	0.065	<b>Not Significant</b>
Number of seminars/trainings attended related to language teaching in the last three years	5.208	0.003	<b>Significant</b>

Table 5c presents the comparison statistics on the level of well-being of language teachers when grouped according to selected profile variables. The results show that sex ( $p = 0.009$ ), age ( $p = 0.016$ ), highest educational attainment ( $p = 0.000$ ), and number of seminars or trainings attended ( $p = 0.003$ ) have significant differences at the 0.05 level, while rank, years of experience, and language subject taught were not significant.

The implication is that teachers' level of well-being varies across sex, age, educational attainment, and training exposure. This indicates that these variables influence teachers' emotional, professional, social, and work-life well-being.

The finding means that teachers' level of well-being significantly differs based on selected profile variables. These findings are supported by Collie (2021), who emphasized that teacher well-

being varies across individual and professional characteristics. Similarly, Hascher and Waber (2021) highlighted that career stage and professional experiences influence well-being. Furthermore, Desimone (2021) noted that professional development contributes to improved teacher well-being and job satisfaction.

### 6. Correlation between Content knowledge and pedagogical competence

Table 6. Correlation between the teacher's Content knowledge and pedagogical competence

Variables	r-value	p-value	Statistical Inference
Language Structure	0.8599	0.000	Significant
Language Pedagogy	0.8750	0.000	Significant
Assessment & Evaluation	0.9184	0.000	Significant
Overall Content knowledge	0.9420	0.000	Significant

Table 6 presents the correlation between teachers' content knowledge and pedagogical competence. The results show that language structure ( $r = 0.8599$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), language pedagogy ( $r = 0.8750$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), assessment and evaluation ( $r = 0.9184$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), and overall content knowledge ( $r = 0.9420$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) all have significant relationships at the 0.05 level, indicating strong positive correlations.

The implication is that higher levels of content knowledge are associated with higher levels of pedagogical competence. This indicates that teachers' mastery of language structure, pedagogy, and assessment contributes to their effectiveness in instructional practices.

The finding means that teachers' content knowledge is significantly related to their pedagogical competence. These findings are supported by Shulman's concept of pedagogical content knowledge as applied in recent studies, which emphasizes the integration of subject knowledge and teaching practices. Similarly, Hattie (2021) highlighted that teacher expertise strongly influences instructional effectiveness. Furthermore, Darling-Hammond et al. (2020) noted that strong content knowledge enhances teaching quality and learner outcomes.

### Correlation between Content knowledge and teacher well-being

Table 7. Correlation between the teacher's Content knowledge and teacher well-being

Variables	r-value	p-value	Statistical Inference
Language Structure	0.6133	0.000	Significant
Language Pedagogy	0.6896	0.000	Significant
Assessment & Evaluation	0.7210	0.000	Significant
Overall Content knowledge	0.7208	0.000	Significant

Table 7 presents the correlation between teachers' content knowledge and teacher well-being. The results show that language structure ( $r = 0.6133$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), language pedagogy ( $r = 0.6896$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), assessment and evaluation ( $r = 0.7210$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), and overall content knowledge ( $r = 0.7208$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) all have significant relationships at the 0.05 level, indicating moderate to strong positive correlations.

( $r = 0.7210$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), assessment and evaluation ( $r = 0.7210$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), and overall content knowledge ( $r = 0.7208$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) all have significant relationships at the 0.05 level, indicating moderate to strong positive correlations.

The implication is that higher levels of content knowledge are associated with higher levels of teacher well-being. This indicates that teachers' mastery of language structure, pedagogy, and assessment contributes to improved emotional, professional, and overall well-being.

The finding means that teachers' content knowledge is significantly related to their well-being. These findings are supported by Collie (2021), who emphasized that teacher competence is linked to well-being and job satisfaction. Similarly, Renshaw (2020) highlighted that professional competence enhances teachers' confidence and reduces stress. Furthermore, Hargreaves (2021) noted that teacher expertise contributes to professional fulfillment and sustained well-being.

### Correlation between Pedagogical competence and teacher well-being

Table 8. Correlation between Pedagogical competence and teacher well-being

Variables	r-value	p-value	Statistical Inference
Instructional Planning	0.7337	0.000	Significant
Teaching Strategies	0.6899	0.000	Significant
Learner Engagement	0.6142	0.000	Significant
Use of ICT Tools	0.7080	0.000	Significant
Overall Pedagogical competence	0.7417	0.000	Significant

Table 8 presents the correlation between pedagogical competence and teacher well-being. The results show that instructional planning ( $r = 0.7337$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), teaching strategies ( $r = 0.6899$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), learner engagement ( $r = 0.6142$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), use of ICT tools ( $r = 0.7080$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), and overall pedagogical competence ( $r = 0.7417$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) all have significant relationships at the 0.05 level, indicating moderate to strong positive correlations.

The implication is that higher levels of pedagogical competence are associated with higher levels of teacher well-being. This indicates that competencies in planning, teaching strategies, learner engagement, and ICT integration contribute to improved emotional, professional, and overall well-being.

The finding means that teachers' pedagogical competence is significantly related to their well-being. These findings are supported by Hargreaves (2021), who emphasized that effective teaching practices contribute to teacher well-being. Similarly, Day (2020) highlighted that instructional competence enhances teacher motivation and job satisfaction. Furthermore, Gu (2021) noted that strong pedagogical practices support teacher resilience and professional well-being.

### 7. Challenges experienced by the language teachers that affect their content knowledge and pedagogical competence and well-being

Table 9. Challenges experienced by the language teachers that affect their content knowledge and pedagogical competence and well-being

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
Heavy teaching workload	3.67	High
Limited access to instructional resources	3.72	High
Insufficient professional development opportunities	3.57	High
Time constraints for lesson preparation	3.42	Moderate
Difficulty integrating ICT tools	3.17	Moderate
Emotional stress related to teaching	3.27	Moderate
Work-life imbalance	3.38	Moderate
<b>Category Mean</b>	<b>3.45</b>	<b>Moderate</b>

Table 9 shows that language teachers experience a moderate level of challenges, with an overall weighted mean of 3.45. The most serious concern is limited access to instructional resources (3.72), followed by heavy workload (3.67) and insufficient professional development opportunities (3.57), while difficulty in ICT integration is the least (3.17). These results suggest that structural and institutional issues, particularly resources, workload, and training, are the major challenges faced by teachers. Such conditions may negatively affect their content knowledge, pedagogical competence, and well-being, consistent with studies emphasizing the importance of adequate resources, manageable workload, and continuous professional development.

#### 8. PROPOSED SCHOOL-BASED INTERVENTION PLAN

##### PROJECT I-LEAD (Integrated Language Educators Advancement and Development)

###### Rationale

Based on the findings of the study, the following policy recommendations are proposed through a school-based

intervention program. The results revealed that language teachers demonstrate very high levels of content knowledge and pedagogical competence, and generally high to very high levels of well-being. However, specific areas require further enhancement, particularly in assessment and evaluation, integration of ICT tools, and work-life balance.

These challenges are further influenced by limited instructional resources, heavy teaching workload, and insufficient professional development opportunities. While teachers are able to perform their roles effectively, the sustainability of their competence and well-being is affected by contextual and institutional constraints. This indicates that professional development and teacher support systems are not yet fully integrated and consistently implemented at the school level.

In response, PROJECT I-LEAD is proposed to provide a structured, holistic, and sustainable professional development framework for language teachers. The program focuses on strengthening assessment literacy, enhancing ICT integration, improving instructional practices, and promoting teacher well-being through coordinated school-based initiatives, continuous support mechanisms, and systematic monitoring.

###### Objectives of PROJECT I-LEAD

1. To enhance teachers' competence in assessment and evaluation through targeted training on designing valid assessments and interpreting results.
2. To strengthen teachers' skills in integrating ICT tools in language instruction through hands-on workshops and continuous technical support.
3. To improve teachers' instructional planning and teaching strategies through capacity-building on lesson design and differentiated instruction.
4. To promote teacher well-being by implementing programs on stress management and work-life balance.
5. To increase access to instructional resources by providing relevant teaching materials and digital tools.
6. To provide continuous professional development through Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, mentoring, and coaching.
7. To establish a structured school-based support system for monitoring and improving teachers' competence and well-being.

Areas of Concern	Parts of Intervention Plan	Community (Partners/Stakeholders)	Financial (Sources of Funds)	Organizational(Support Mechanism)	Key Indicators of Success
<b>A. Preparation</b>	1. Program Review a. Objectives b. Roles and Responsibilities	School Heads Language Teachers Master Teachers PTA Officers	MOOE LGU Support	Creation of School-Based Language PD Committee Designation of Language Coordinators	Approved program objectives Defined roles and responsibilities Functional PD Committee
<b>B. Planning</b>	Strategic Planning for Language Teachers' Development	School PD Committee District Supervisors Language Coordinators External Trainers	MOOE SEF (LGU Funds)	Integration in School Improvement Plan (SIP) and Annual Implementation Plan (AIP)	Approved intervention plan Inclusion in SIP and AIP Alignment of trainings with identified needs

<b>C. Implementation</b>	Capacity Building and Support Mechanisms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment Literacy Training</li> <li>• ICT Integration Workshops</li> <li>• Instructional Planning Enhancement</li> <li>• Well-being and Stress Management Programs</li> </ul>	Teachers and Master Teachers Division External Private Trainers Experts Partners	MOOE LGU Support Donations/Grants	Conduct of LAC Sessions Peer Coaching and Mentoring Flexible Scheduling Provision of Teaching Resources	Increased teacher participation Improved assessment and ICT skills Enhanced pedagogical competence Improved teacher well-being
<b>D. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	1. SWOT Analysis 2. Monitoring and Evaluation Tools	School Monitoring Team School Heads District Supervisors	MOOE	Establishment of Monitoring System Feedback and Evaluation Mechanism	Regular monitoring reports Identified strengths and gaps Improved program implementation
<b>E. Future Strategic Plans</b>	Sustainability and Expansion of Program	DepEd Division Office LGU Professional Organizations Teacher Learning Communities	SEF Grants Partnerships	Institutionalization of PD Policies Strengthening Learning Communities Long-term partnerships	Sustained teacher participation Expanded access to training Improved instructional quality Enhanced learner outcomes

## Conclusion

The study concluded that language teachers demonstrated generally high to very high levels of content knowledge, pedagogical competence, and well-being, although these were not uniformly developed across all areas, with assessment and evaluation, ICT integration, and work-life balance identified as relatively weaker dimensions. Significant positive relationships were established between content knowledge, pedagogical competence, and well-being, indicating that teachers who are more knowledgeable and pedagogically competent tend to experience higher levels of professional satisfaction and stability; however, competence alone does not eliminate challenges related to limited resources, heavy workload, and insufficient professional development. Moreover, while most profile variables did not result in differences, selected factors such as educational attainment and training exposure influenced outcomes, highlighting the role of continuous professional growth. Overall, the findings emphasized that the issue lies not in the lack of teacher competence but in its uneven support and development, thereby underscoring the need for a comprehensive and sustained intervention such as Project I-LEAD to strengthen instructional practices and promote teacher well-being.

## Recommendations

In light of the study's findings and conclusions, it is recommended that school administrators implement sustained professional development programs like Project I-LEAD to enhance teachers' assessment and ICT competencies, while language teachers engage in continuous learning and reflective practice. Support systems for teacher well-being should be strengthened through workload management and wellness initiatives. The Department of

Education (DepEd), curriculum planners, and Local Government Units (LGUs) should ensure equitable access to quality training, resources, and digital infrastructure. The Parents and Teachers Association (PTA) and professional organizations should also support teacher initiatives and development. Finally, future researchers are encouraged to conduct intervention-based studies to further improve teachers' competence and well-being across contexts.

### Declaration of no Conflict of Interest

The author hereby declares no conflict of interest in the conduct of this study. It is also declared that this article is his original work.

## REFERENCES

1. Al-Seghayer, K. (2021). *Integrating technology in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Allen, T. D. (2020). Work-family balance and organizational outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 121*, 103–115.
3. Andrews, S. (2020). Teacher language awareness. *Language Teaching, 53*(1), 1–16.
4. Avalos, B. (2021). Teacher professional development in teaching and teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 101*, 103–115.
5. Avidov-Ungar, O., & Forkosh-Baruch, A. (2018). Professional identity of teacher educators in the digital era. *Professional Development in Education, 44*(5), 703–718.
6. Baecher, L. (2020). Lesson planning in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 54*(2), 456–470.

7. Bakker, A. B. (2020). Work engagement and performance. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 7, 389–411.
8. Bautista, A. (2025). Teacher professional development in Asia. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 26(1), 1–15.
9. Bernardo, A. B. I. (2025). Teacher development in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 104(1), 45–60.
10. Biber, D. (2023). Corpus linguistics and grammar teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 44(2), 245–262.
11. Blömeke, S. (2022). Teacher competence development. *Educational Research Review*, 35, 100–115.
12. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2018). *Classroom assessment and pedagogy*. Routledge.
13. Bond, M., Bedenlier, S., Marín, V. I., & Händel, M. (2023). Student engagement in digital learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 71(1), 45–68.
14. Borg, S. (2020). Teacher cognition in language teaching. *Language Teaching*, 53(3), 1–15.
15. Borg, S. (2023). *Language teacher cognition and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
16. Brookhart, S. M. (2017). *How to give effective feedback to your students* (2nd ed.). ASCD.
17. Caprara, G. V. (2022). Teachers' self-efficacy and professional outcomes. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34(2), 765–789.
18. Cochran-Smith, M. (2021). Teacher education and practice. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 72(3), 251–266.
19. Collie, R. J. (2021). Teacher well-being and motivation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 103, 103–121.
20. Cruz, J. P. (2025). Teacher well-being in Philippine schools. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 45(2), 210–225.
21. Darling-Hammond, L. (2020). Teacher quality and student achievement. *Educational Policy*, 34(1), 3–21.
22. Darling-Hammond, L. (2023). *Effective professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.
23. Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(2), 97–140.
24. Day, C. (2022). Teacher identity and resilience. *Teachers and Teaching*, 28(5), 567–583.
25. DeKeyser, R. (2024). *Skill acquisition in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.
26. DeLuca, C. (2021). Assessment literacy. *Educational Assessment*, 26(1), 1–15.
27. Desimone, L. (2024). Professional development effectiveness. *Educational Researcher*, 53(1), 25–38.
28. Demerouti, E. (2021). Job demands-resources theory and work-life balance. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 43, 129–134.
29. Dizon, G. (2021). ICT integration in language teaching. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 34(5), 567–589.
30. Elder, C. (2020). Language proficiency standards. *Language Testing*, 37(3), 321–336.
31. Ellis, R. (2021). *Task-based language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
32. Ertmer, P. A. (2023). Teacher beliefs and technology integration. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 71(3), 789–805.
33. Faez, F. (2021). Teacher proficiency and instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 55(2), 456–472.
34. Farrell, T. S. C. (2025). *Reflective practice in language teaching*. Routledge.
35. Fathi, J. (2024). Emotional regulation in teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 119, 103–120.
36. Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2022). Student engagement. *Review of Educational Research*, 92(1), 1–45.
37. Freeman, D. (2024). *Teacher learning and development*. Oxford University Press.
38. Fulcher, G. (2020). *Language testing and assessment*. Routledge.
39. Giraldo, F. (2021). Language assessment literacy. *Language Testing*, 38(2), 245–260.
40. Goe, L. (2023). Teacher effectiveness research. *Educational Measurement Issues and Practice*, 42(1), 5–14.
41. Graves, K. (2023). *Course design in language teaching*. Heinle.
42. Greenier, V. (2024). Teacher well-being in language education. *System*, 118, 102–120.
43. Grossman, P. (2022). Teaching practice and improvement. *Teachers College Record*, 124(3), 1–25.
44. Guskey, T. R. (2022). *Evaluating professional development*. Corwin Press.
45. Han, J. (2023). Teacher competence and well-being. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 120, 103–118.
46. Harding, L. (2025). *Validity in language assessment*. Routledge.
47. Hascher, T. (2021). Teacher well-being and engagement. *Educational Research Review*, 34, 100–115.
48. Hattie, J. (2021). *Visible learning: The sequel*. Routledge.
49. Hsieh, F. (2021). Teacher knowledge and performance. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 105, 103–118.
50. Huang, X. (2021). Teaching competence and stress. *Educational Psychology*, 41(3), 345–360.
51. Inbar-Lourie, O. (2024). Classroom-based assessment. *Language Testing*, 41(2), 189–205.
52. Jennings, P. A. (2020). Mindfulness for teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 90(1), 1–35.
53. Johnson, K. E. (2025). *Language teacher education*. Routledge.
54. Kennedy, M. (2022). Models of teacher development. *Educational Researcher*, 51(4), 245–256.
55. Kennedy, M. (2024). Teaching competence. *Review of Educational Research*, 94(1), 1–30.
56. Kessler, G. (2020). Technology in language teaching. *Language Teaching*, 53(1), 1–15.
57. Kim, L. E. (2022). Teacher well-being meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34(2), 765–789.
58. Klassen, R. M. (2020). Teacher self-efficacy and well-being. *Educational Psychology Review*, 32(1), 1–30.
59. König, J. (2021). Teacher knowledge and instruction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 98, 103–115.
60. Kremmel, B. (2023). Classroom language assessment. *Language Testing*, 40(1), 123–140.
61. Kyriakides, L. (2021). Teacher effectiveness factors. *Educational Research Review*, 33, 100–115.
62. Lai, C. (2022). Engagement in language learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(2), 245–260.

63. Larsen-Freeman, D. (2021). *Complexity theory in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
64. Li, L. (2024). Teacher well-being and teaching quality. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 122*, 103–125.
65. Macaro, E. (2022). *Teaching strategies in language education*. Oxford University Press.
66. Martin, F. (2021). Student engagement in online learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 69*(1), 123–145.
67. McCallum, F. (2020). Teacher well-being review. *Educational Review, 72*(3), 1–20.
68. Mercer, S. (2025). *Psychology of language teaching*. Routledge.
69. Mishra, P. (2025). Technology-enhanced pedagogy. *Educational Technology, 65*(2), 45–60.
70. Nation, I. S. P. (2024). *Language teaching strategies*. Routledge.
71. Nguyen, H. (2021). Teacher attrition. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 102*, 103–118.
72. Opfer, V. D. (2020). Professional learning systems. *Review of Educational Research, 90*(3), 1–35.
73. Opfer, V. D. (2023). Systems-based teacher development. *Educational Researcher, 52*(2), 145–156.
74. O'Connor, K. (2025). Teacher resilience. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 125*, 103–130.
75. O'Loughlin, K. (2022). *Language assessment practices*. Cambridge University Press.
76. Paine, L. (2023). Teacher confidence and performance. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 118*, 103–120.
77. Pappa, S. (2025). Teacher well-being and effectiveness. *Educational Psychology Review, 37*(1), 1–25.
78. Perera, H. N. (2023). Teacher well-being profiles. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 121*, 103–118.
79. Pressley, T. (2023). Teacher stress post-pandemic. *Educational Researcher, 52*(4), 245–256.
80. Ramos, J. (2022). Teacher stress in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Education, 101*(2), 89–105.
81. Redecker, C. (2020). Digital competence framework. European Commission.
82. Richards, J. C. (2020). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
83. Richards, J. C. (2022). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
84. Sabio, C. (2024). Teacher competence in the Philippines. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 44*(3), 345–360.
85. Salmela-Aro, K. (2022). Teacher burnout and engagement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 114*(2), 345–360.
86. Schmidt, W. (2020). Teacher knowledge studies. *Journal of Teacher Education, 71*(2), 123–135.
87. Shulman, L. S. (2023). Pedagogical reasoning. *Harvard Educational Review, 93*(1), 1–20.
88. Skaalvik, E. M. (2021). Teacher stress and burnout. *Educational Psychology, 41*(5), 1–15.
89. Sokal, L. (2022). Teacher stress and workload. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 110*, 103–118.
90. Tan, C. (2024). Holistic teacher development. *Educational Review, 76*(2), 1–15.
91. Timperley, H. (2020). Professional learning cycles. *Educational Research Review, 29*, 100–115.
92. Tondeur, J. (2024). Technology integration in education. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 72*(1), 1–20.
93. Toropova, A. (2024). Working conditions and teacher well-being. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 123*, 103–120.
94. Tsui, A. (2021). *Expertise in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
95. Wang, M. (2024). Teaching quality and well-being. *Educational Psychology Review, 36*(2), 1–25.
96. Wright, T. (2022). Language teacher expertise. *Language Teaching Research, 26*(3), 345–360.
97. Xie, X. (2020). Teacher competence and well-being. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 94*, 103–118.
98. Zee, M. (2021). Teacher self-efficacy. *Educational Psychology Review, 33*(3), 1–30.