Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities Research

www.advancejournals.org
Open Access Scientific Publisher

Research Article

INNOVATION IN TEACHING AMONG ELEMENTARY TEACHERS AT COTO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, DISTRICT OF LAMBUNAO EAST, DIVISION OF ILOILO, PHILIPPINES

Rome B. Moralista[1]
[1]West Visayas State University-Calinog, Campus Calinog, Iloilo, Philippines

Correspondence should be addressed to **Rome B. Moralista**

Received June 16, 2016; Accepted June 22, 2016; Published June 28, 2016;

Cite This Article: Moralista, R.(2016). Innovation in Teaching among Elementary Teachers at Coto Elementary School, District of Lambunao East, Division of Iloilo, Philippines. Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities Research, 2(1).

ABSTRACT

This study utilized the descriptive method of research. The respondents of the study were the six (6) elementary teachers teaching grade I to grade VI at Coto Elementary School, District of Lambunao East, Division of Iloilo, Philippines for school year 2014-2015. Complete enumeration was used in selecting sample respondents. The researcher-made questionnaire dully validated by panel of experts that would measure the extent of innovation in teaching; it consisted of 15 items per category. The respondents were made to identify their innovation in teaching being implemented. The levels of innovation in teaching were determined in a Likert Scal: Strongly Agree; Agree; Neither Agree Nor Disagree; Disagree; and Strongly Disagree. The statistical tools were the mean; standard deviation; and analysis of variance (ANOVA). The significance level was set at .05. It was found out that teachers respondents' extent of teaching innovation is very high in all variables such as curriculum, instructional materials and classroom instruction and no significant difference that existed in the extent of implementation of innovation in teaching of elementary teachers in terms of curriculum; instructional materials; and classroom instruction.

KEYWORDS: Innovation; Teaching; Elementary Teachers; Coto Elementary School, District of Lambunao East, Division of Iloilo, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

The present century is dedicated to embrace a knowledge-based society in which required competencies strive to follow the extremely fast development of tools that are needed for enhanced work and Life Long Learning. But, the structure of teacher education is not suitable to handle the extent of changes progressing in our daily lives influencing the next generation of learners. Thus, there needs to be a sustainable flow of innovation continuously shaping public education in order to bring up a generation that can stand up to requirements within the future workforce. Schools and education systems operate very much in a globalized village with nations' educational systems being compared through international testing. The present school improvement practices improve a school but don't always improve learning in the school. From this, serious disparities develop between different groups of students. In addressing the issues facing schools, an innovative spirit seems to be absent. Policy makers and system administrators are often wary of innovation in education.

According to Alexander [2], innovation in basic education has been variously identified with learning technologies, pedagogical approaches, organisational processes and grant opportunities.

Roberts [8] stated those responses to globalisation and the agenda of government, from government laws, to frequent appearances in school vision statements, and as a rhetorical participant in organisational change.

Conole, de Laat, Dillon and Darby [4] and Alexander [2] cited that the connecting theme of innovation in basic education contexts seems to be significant change, and its potential to transform practice, the appropriation by learners of social software technologies of interaction and collaboration is identified as a "disruptive" type of innovation such that "we are reaching a turning point in the way technology is used for learning.

McLoughlin and Lee [7] agree that user-centred and Web 2.0 technologies represent an innovative shift for online learning.

According to Charette [3] innovation on teaching mirrors the track record of information technology projects in the business and government sectors, where there is evidence that failure has a "long, dismal history", and breakdowns or unexpected result have arguably become a normal part of the experience of working with large academic institution which are introducing teaching innovations.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study aimed to find out the teaching innovation among elementary teachers at Coto Elementary School, District of Lambunao East, Division of Iloilo, Philippines for the school year 2014-2015. Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions: to what extent are the teaching innovations being implemented and is there a significant difference on the responses of the respondents?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study utilized the descriptive method of research. The respondents of the study were the six (6) elementary teachers teaching grade I to grade VI at Coto Elementary School, District of Lambunao East, Division of Iloilo, Philippines for school year 2014-2015. Complete enumeration was used in selecting sample respondents. The researcher-made questionnaire dully validated by panel of experts that would measure the extent of innovation in teaching; it consisted of 15 items per category. To compute for the reliability of the whole test, the Spearman-Brown Prophecy formula was applied. The alpha coefficients of reliability for all six dimensions are relatively high: Curriculum (.95); Instruction (.95) and Teacher Classroom Instruction (.95) according to Smith; hence, was considered reliable. The scale of 1 to 5 was used, five being the highest and one is the lowest. The respondents were made to identify their innovation in teaching being implemented. The levels are Strongly Agree*; Agree*; Neither Agree Nor Disagree; Disagree; and Strongly Disagree. The statistical tools were the mean; standard deviation; and analysis of variance (ANOVA). The significance level was set at .05.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The result showed that teachers respondents' extent of teaching innovation is very high in all variables such as curriculum, instructional materials and classroom instruction (Ms=4.2800; 4.3333; 4.4400; 4.4667; 4.3067; and 4.6933) .

The result showed a parallel findings with a correlation has been established between the level of institutional research and the quality of education [8]. Research informs teaching in many ways. It is the interaction between teaching and research that drives universities. Research makes professors better teachers, while teaching makes them better researchers. Effective research can create a combined effect on the quality of teaching and learning: directly through involving students in research at the university, and/or through the study of instructional practices, which is known as scholarship of teaching and learning [9] [6] and indirectly through 3 higher academic level of teaching by the research faculty.

Table 1: *Means and SDs of the Extent in the Teaching Innovation of School Teachers*

Teacher Respondents				
	Curriculum	Instructional Materials	Classroom Instruction	Description
Mean	4.4667	4.3067	4.6933	Very High
Std. Deviation	.30912	.43614	.25647	
Mean	4.2480	4.2507	4.3973	Very High
Std. Deviation	.48209	.60775	.43268	
Mean	4.2844	4.2600	4.4467	Very High
Std. Deviation	.46086	.57651	.42024	

The ANOVA results revealed the absence of significant difference that existed in the extent of implementation of innovation in teaching of elementary teachers in terms of curriculum (p=.2070, instructional materials (p=.776); and classroom instruction (p=.109). Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the extent of implementation of innovation in teaching of elementary teachers is accepted.

This implies that postmodern teacher education programs educate teachers to embrace student-centered instruction/facilitation of learning, teacher-developed curriculum based on research and knowledge of students' needs, and a variety of assessments, including "authentic" assessment [1]. They foster an awareness of the various external factors that impact teaching and learning, as well as the entire schooling process. These factors are interpreted in the context of how they evolve over time by constant interactions with internal factors pertinent to individual schools or schools of education. In contrast, the modern teacher education program uses traditional approaches to professional training focused on the perceived status quo (e.g., teacherdirected instruction, prescribed curricula, basic/core knowledge, and frequent use and reliance upon standardized summative assessment of student learning).

Table 2: *ANOVA Result on the Difference in the Extent of Implementation of Innovation in Teaching of Elementary Teachers*

Teaching Innovation		F	Sig.	Description	Decision
Curriculum	Between Groups	1.693	.207	Not Sig.	Accept Ho
	Within Groups				
	Total				
Instructional Materials	Between Groups	.083	.776	Not Sig.	Accept Ho
	Within Groups				
	Total				
Classroom Instruction	Between Groups	2.795	.109	Not Sig.	Accept Ho
	Within Groups				
	Total				

CONCLUSION AND INNOVATION

The school administrators and teachers were found out to be "very high" in teaching innovation interms of curriculum; instructional materials; and classroom instruction and there was no significant difference in the teaching innovation of elementary teachers interms of curriculum; instructional materials; and classroom instruction. It is recommended that the teaching innovation of elementary teachers in-terms of curriculum, instructional materials, and classroom instruction are all "very high" and it should be maintained. Finally, teaching innovation of elementary teacher's vary in different categories.

REFERENCES

[1] Airasian, P. W. (2005). Classroom assessment: Concepts and applications (5th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill. de Alba, A., Gonzalez-Gaudiano, E., Lankshear, C., & Peters, M. (2000). Curriculum in the postmodern condition. New York: Peter Lang.

[2] Alexander, B. (2006). Web 2.0: A new wave of innovation for teaching and learning? Educause Review, 41(2), 32–44.

[3] Charette, R. (2005). Why software fails. IEEE Spectrum.

[4] Conole, G. (2007). Distilling lessons from across different types of elearning interventions. In WWWrong: What Went Wrong? What Went Right? Exchanging Experiences in Technology Enhanced Learning, 17 or 18 September, Crete, Greece.

[5] Conole, G., de Laat, M., Dillon, T. and Darby, J. (2008). 'Disruptive technologies', 'pedagogical innovation': What's new? Findings from an in-depth study of students' use and perception of technology. Computers & Education, 50, 511–524.

[6] Huber, M., & Morreale, S. (Eds.) (2002). Disciplinary styles in the scholarship of teaching and learning: Exploring common ground. Merrifield, VA: AAHE. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED478800

[7] McLoughlin, C. & Lee, M. (2007). Future learning landscapes: Transforming pedagogy through social software. Innovate, 4(5).

[8] Roberts, G. (2004). The new covert curriculum: a critical actor-network approach to learning technology policy. In Proceedings of the fourth international conference on networked learning, Lancaster University and the University of Sheffield.

[9] Shulman, L. (2000). From Minsk to Pinsk: Why a scholarship of teaching and learning? The Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 1(1). Retrieved from https://www.fresnostate.edu/academics/csalt/documents/ Shulman2000.pdf

[10] Zaman, M. (2004). Review of the academic evidence on the relationship between teaching and research in higher education. London: Department for Education and Skills.