



ISSN Print: 2394-7500
ISSN Online: 2394-5869
Impact Factor: 5.2
IJAR 2019; 5(12): 250-256
www.allresearchjournal.com
Received: 22-10-2019
Accepted: 24-11-2019

Jene L Alpuerto
Masters Degree (English
Major) NORSU Dumaguete
City Campus -Philippines
Doctoral Degree: CPSU-MP -
Philippines

Self-efficacy of grade one teachers in teaching actional competencies using the mother tongue

Jene L Alpuerto

Abstract

This study explored the interconnectedness between teachers' beliefs, and the strategies used in teaching the chosen components of actional competence whether the teachers' self-efficacy, teaching experience, and their number of in-service trainings, have impact on pupils' performance.

The findings reveal that majority of the teacher-respondents are middle-age adults and have taught over ten (10) years. In general, they were exposed to very minimal trainings and have the belief that their self-efficacy level is only Quite a bit. The strategy often used by the teachers is asking questions. Other communicative competence strategies that would greatly contribute to learning formal and informal English expressions seem to be not often used by most of the teacher respondents. The performance of the pupils in the English subject as shown in their report cards belongs to the Developing level. On the other hand, the result of the researcher-made test revealed that the pupil respondents have little knowledge of the appropriate response to different situations. This study reveals further the influential role of the grade-one teachers' self-efficacy in determining successful pupil performance. Teachers' beliefs affect not only their teaching but also filter new input.

With these results, teachers and pupils' performances are very much affected by the change in curriculum and must be given utmost consideration if the goal of the department of education is to achieve better results. Therefore, in order for teachers to perform better they must be given more opportunities to attend seminars related to the thrusts of the new curriculum. English teachers teaching grade-one classes should have the skill on how to break down complex, challenging tasks into something more manageable. Teachers should have developed within them high levels of self-efficacy, the power to achieve a certain proficiency level regardless of their age and number of years in service and they should also be proficient in teaching their pupils formal and informal English expressions. If the teachers continue to be optimistic about their teaching tasks, they will be instrumental in the academic growth of their pupils. They can also explore the reasons why some of the pupils are performing below the ideal standards. They can further examine what they can do to enhance their self-efficacy, creativity and innovation in the implementation of the new curriculum.

Keywords: self-efficacy, actional competence, mother tongue

Introduction

The current K-12 educational climate is driven by an overriding concern for student achievement and what promotes it. The role of teachers and their self-efficacy in teaching students are central to this concern. Having an effective curriculum ascertains the fulfillment of the said concern.

The new basic education program, the K-12 curriculum institutionalizing Mother-Tongue Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) was implemented in all schools in the Philippines starting last school year 2012 - 2013. It aims to provide children with an opportunity to learn in a language they understand starting on the first day of school before English is taught to them.

While the tenets related to MTB-MLE are sound, the sudden change of the curriculum has created difficulties for teachers. Many are not yet ready to adhere to the changes brought about by the new curriculum. As a matter of fact, informal conversations with teachers and information gathered from district/division meetings revealed that many grade one teachers fear that the new curriculum might develop among them a low level of self-efficacy.

Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) [8] assert that teacher efficacy is a teacher's "judgment of his or her capabilities to bring about desired outcomes of student engagement and learning, even among those students who may be difficult or unmotivated." Self-efficacy

Correspondence Author:
Jene L Alpuerto
Masters Degree (English
Major) NORSU Dumaguete
City Campus -Philippines
Doctoral Degree: CPSU-MP -
Philippines

was originally defined by Bandura (1977) ^[1] as a specific type of expectancy concerned with a person's beliefs in his or her ability to perform a certain action or set of behaviors required producing an outcome.

The researcher of this study is a grade-one teacher in the division where this study was conducted. Like many other grade-one teachers in her division, the researcher has many questions on how to implement the changes brought by the new curriculum without feeling a low level of self-efficacy. Many teachers find themselves very effective in many ways. However, there are those who consider themselves ineffective and incompetent in some, such as how well they can deal with challenging circumstances and how they can overcome them. Moreover, they need to know how well they can provide appropriate tasks for very capable students. The need to implement alternative strategies in the classroom, establish routines to maintain activities affected by the sudden change in the curriculum, and the adjustments in the lessons are areas have yet to be explored. In addition, the need for teachers to know how to teach actional competence to the pupils has led to the conduct of this study.

This paper sought to assess the grade one teachers' self-efficacy in teaching the chosen components of Actional Competence of Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei and Thurrell (1995) ^[14], using the mother-tongue as medium of instruction in the Division of Guihulngan City. It also intended to determine the frequency of strategies used by the teachers in teaching the formal and informal English expressions.

Methodology

This research used the descriptive research methodology. Descriptive research usually employs the survey technique which is organized, attempt to analyze, interpret, and report the present status of social institution, group or data. Its purpose is to get groups classified, generalized and interpreted data for the guidance of practice in the immediate future.

The respondents of the study were 40 teachers coming from the different elementary schools of Guihulngan South District, in the division of Guihulngan City, Negros Oriental. These teachers were chosen at random. Pupils from these teachers were also included as secondary respondents of this study. This study employed the questionnaire as the main tool for data gathering. The questionnaire is made up of two parts: Part I, is the profile of the teacher respondents in terms of age, years in service, seminars attended relevant to MTB, and teaching strategies. Part II consists of the standardized test on the respondents' self-efficacy to be rated with Not at All (1.00 - 2.99), Very Little (3.00 - 4.99), Some Degree (5.00 - 6.99), Quite a Bit (7.00 - 8.99), and A Great Deal (9.00 and above) of which the source is acknowledged.

A researcher-made test was also administered to the pupils who were in the classes of teacher respondents in School Year 2012 - 2013. The researcher-made test has 20 items. These items were validated by the teachers of the other district who were not included in the study but who belonged to the same division. The questions include greetings and leave-takings, making introductions, identifying oneself, and expressing and acknowledging gratitude.

The secondary data such as pupils' grades in the English subject in School Year 2012 - 2013 and the District Unified

Test Program Result conducted in School Year 2012 - 2013 were also used in the study.

A letter of request was personally handed to the District-in-Charge of Guihulngan South District, Guihulngan City Division. Moreover, a letter of request was also sent to the different schools covered by the study. Administration of the questionnaires was done personally by the researcher to ensure proper conduct and establish rapport among the respondents. The data were then collected and tabulated statistically.

The statistical treatment of data included frequency count simple percentage, weighted mean and Pearson Product-Moment Coefficient of Correlation.

The weighted mean of the respondents' self-efficacy test was interpreted using the following scale:

1:00 - 2.99	Not at All
3.00 - 4.99	Very Little
5.00 - 6.99	Some Degree
7.00 - 8.99	Quite a Bit
9.00 and above	A Great Deal

The respondents' responses on the researcher-made test were also interpreted using the following scale:

3.26 - 4.00	Formal
2.51 - 3.25	Informal
1.76 - 2.50	Intimate
1.00 - 1.76	Casual

Table 1: Age Profile of the Respondents

Age	F	%
below 30	1	2.5
31-35	7	17.5
36-40	10	25.0
41-45	10	25.0
46-50	6	15.0
51-55	4	10.0
56-60	2	5.0
Total	40	100 %

Table 1 reveals that the youngest respondent is below 30 years old and the oldest are between 56-60 years old. Fifty per cent of the respondents have ages from 36-45 years old. Most of the respondents of the study are in the prime of their teaching profession. This implies that the respondents still have the capacity to deal well with the dynamism of their pupils.

Table 2: Respondents' Years in Service

Years	F	%
5-9	11	27.5
10-14	13	32.5
15-19	10	25.0
20-24	4	10.0
25-29	2	5.0
Total	40	100%

As shown in the table found on the preceding page, majority of the respondents have work experience within the 10-14 age bracket. Only 2 respondents are in the 25-29 years in service. From the data, the respondents are not really fresh graduates and neither are they new to the service. This implies that these teacher respondents are already experienced teachers and that they would not find it hard to implement the new curriculum.

Table 3: Number of Seminars Attended by the Respondents Relevant to MTB

Number	f	%
2-3	30	75
4-5	4	10
6-7	4	10
8-9	0	
10-11	2	5
Total	40	100%

As gleaned from the table, majority have only attended 2-3 seminars relevant to MTB. Only a few were given opportunities to attend more seminars. This implies that if not all teachers are given the same opportunity to attend more seminars related to the thrusts of the curriculum, then the K-12 curriculum would not be successfully implemented. This supports Hunzicker’s idea in the study conducted by Stone (2012) [12] that changing a teacher’s beliefs requires new information be presented repeatedly over time, to the point that the person begins to feel disequilibrium between current beliefs and new information.

Table 4: Strategies in Teaching Actional Competencies and Frequency of Use

	Strategies	w \bar{x}	Description
1	asking questions	4.40	Always
2	cooperation with other learners	4.10	Usually
3	gestures	4.05	Usually
4	use of contextual clues	3.85	Usually
5	synonyms	3.78	Usually
6	guessing the meaning of words	3.45	Usually
7	imagery	3.23	Often
8	memory strategies	3.00	Often
9	rehearsal	2.88	Often
10	Simulation/role play	2.53	Sometimes
11	frequent contact with native Speakers	2.45	Sometimes

Among the 11 strategies presented, asking questions is most utilized by the respondents wherein the descriptive level is “Always”. One goal of the teachers in teaching is to know whether the pupils have acquired the knowledge and have comprehended what has been taught. Questioning is one of the most influential teaching strategies because of its potential to promote comprehension and learning. Children develop critical thinking skills through the questions facilitated by the teacher.

Simulation or role play and contact with native speakers are described as only used sometimes since only very few have the chance to talk with native speakers. Furthermore, simulation or role play is only used sometimes since it is time consuming on the part of the teacher and grade-one pupils considering the fact that the English subject in the K-12 Curriculum is only given a time allotment of thirty minutes.

Table 5: Respondents’ Self-Efficacy Level Based on TSES

	Questions on Teachers’ Beliefs	w \bar{x}	Description
1	How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?	6.68	Some Degree
2	How much can you do to help your students think critically?	6.88	Some Degree
3	How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	7.30	Quite a Bit
4	How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?	7.25	Quite a Bit
5	To what extent can you make your expectations clear about students’ behavior?	6.95	Quite a Bit
6	How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?	7.30	Quite a Bit
7	How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?	7.58	Quite a Bit
8	How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	7.28	Quite a Bit
9	How much can you do to help students value learning?	7.63	Quite a Bit
10	How much can you gauge students’ comprehension of what you have taught?	7.10	Quite a Bit
11	To what extent can you craft good questions to your students?	7.25	Quite a Bit
12	How much can you do to foster student creativity?	8.10	Quite a Bit
13	How much can you do to keep children follow classroom rules?	7.83	Quite a Bit
14	How much can you do to improve the understanding of the student who is failing?	7.25	Quite a Bit
15	How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	7.20	Quite a Bit
16	How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	7.25	Quite a Bit
17	17. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?	7.30	Quite a Bit
18	18. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	6.95	Some Degree
19	19. How much can you keep a few problem students from ruining the entire lesson?	7.18	Quite a Bit
20	20. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	7.30	Quite a Bit
21	21. How well can you respond to defiant students?	7.20	Quite a Bit
22	22. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	7.00	Quite a Bit
23	23. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?	7.25	Quite a Bit
24	24. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?	7.40	Quite a Bit

Table 5 shows the respondents' self-efficacy level based on the TSES. The highest weighted mean self-efficacy of the respondents is 7.40 and the lowest is 6.68. Nevertheless, all the respondents belong to the descriptive level Quite-a-bit, an indication that teachers need to further develop their self-efficacy level, their power to achieve the highest scale which is A-Great-Deal if their goal is to improve their pupils' academic performance. This is so because teacher efficacy, (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) ^[8], is a teacher's judgment of his or her capabilities to bring about desired outcomes of student engagement and learning, even among those students who may be difficult or unmotivated.

Extent of the Individual Respondents' Self-Efficacy

Table 6: Extent of the Individual Respondents' Self-efficacy

Teacher NO.	w _x	Self-Efficacy Level	Teacher NO.	w _x	Self-Efficacy Level
1	6.92	Some Degree	21	7.50	Quite a Bit
2	7.13	Quite a Bit	22	6.83	Some Degree
3	7.13	Quite a Bit	23	5.21	Some Degree
4	7.50	Quite a Bit	24	5.79	Some Degree
5	7.00	Quite a Bit	25	5.71	Some Degree
6	7.88	Quite a Bit	26	8.21	Quite a Bit
7	7.88	Quite a Bit	27	7.67	Quite a Bit
8	8.25	Quite a Bit	28	5.42	Some Degree
9	8.50	Quite a Bit	29	6.83	Some Degree
10	7.13	Quite a Bit	30	6.63	Some Degree
11	8.33	Quite a Bit	31	6.21	Some Degree
12	8.58	Quite a Bit	32	5.88	Some Degree
13	6.63	Some Degree	33	8.67	A Great Deal
14	8.92	Quite a Bit	34	4.92	Very Little
15	7.92	Quite a Bit	35	6.92	Some Degree
16	7.79	Quite a Bit	36	7.21	Quite a Bit
17	8.21	Quite a Bit	37	6.71	Some Degree
18	6.96	Some Degree	38	8.00	Quite a Bit
19	7.38	Quite a Bit	39	8.17	Quite a Bit
20	7.50	Quite a Bit	40	9.00	A Great Deal

The teacher respondents' self-efficacy bracket belongs to Quite - a -Bit. This is an indication that the teacher respondents have positive beliefs towards teaching pupils and their perception of the ways in which they approach classroom tasks including the accuracy of identifying the challenge, level of tasks, and the extent to which they try to break down complex, challenging tasks into something more manageable.

Table 7: The Correlation between Respondents' Profile and Self-Efficacy

Self-Efficacy VS.	Pearson Correlation R	P - Value	Remarks
Age	0.029	0.857	Not significant
Years in Service	0.160	0.324	Not significant
No. of Seminars Attended	-0.207	0.200	Not significant
Extent of Strategies Used	0.401	0.010	significant

Although some negative correlation is indicated between self-efficacy and the extent of strategies used, positive correlation exists between self-efficacy and age, years in service and number of seminars attended. This implies that teachers who are young and new in the service and attended fewer seminars have the same level of self-efficacy with the mature ones who are both work-oriented and motivated. This supports the idea of Erden (2010) ^[10], that teachers'

personal characteristics have an impact on curriculum implementation. The results of the study point out that teachers who are characterized as motivated, open to changes, and willing to try new learning opportunities have been found to be high curriculum implementers compared to teachers who are described as unmotivated and not open to changes.

Table 8 in the succeeding page shows the Pupils' Average in English Per Teacher during the School year 2012-2013.

The data found in Table 8 reflect that majority of the teachers have a pupil average of 76 - 79 % (Developing). Only 1 teacher has a pupil average of 92% (Advanced), whose learners are considered fast learners for belonging to section 1, while 7 teachers have an average of 80-84% (Approaching Proficiency). All these teachers from the Developing down to the Approaching Proficiency level have the average self-efficacy of Quite-a-Bit. None of the teachers have the pupil average of 74% and below. The findings could only suggest that most of the teacher respondents possess the beliefs regarding how children learn and develop which is a good sign of quality curriculum implementation.

Table 8: Pupils' Average in English Per Teacher (SY 2012-2013) VS. Teacher's Self-Efficacy

Teacher No.	Pupils' average	rank	Proficiency Level	Self-Efficacy
1	78.71	23	D	6.92
2	76.30	38	D	7.13
3	78.10	29	D	7.13
4	79.29	15	D	7.50
5	80.33	4	AP	7.00
6	80.11	6	AP	7.88
7	80.10	7	AP	7.88
8	78.83	21	D	8.25
9	78.89	20	D	8.50
10	92.58	1	A	7.13
11	76.53	36	D	8.33
12	78.34	25	D	8.58
13	77.68	32	D	6.63
14	84.50	2	AP	8.92
15	77.17	34	D	7.92
16	81.02	3	AP	7.79
17	79.78	10	D	8.21
18	79.41	13	D	6.96
19	78.36	24	D	7.38
20	76.48	37	D	7.50
21	75.70	40	D	7.50
22	78.90	19	D	6.83
23	76.70	35	D	5.21
24	78.90	18	D	5.79
25	78.30	26	D	5.71
26	78.11	28	D	8.21
27	79.18	17	D	7.67
28	79.80	9	D	5.42
29	79.21	16	D	6.83
30	77.86	31	D	6.63
31	79.58	12	D	6.21
32	77.48	33	D	5.88
33	77.91	30	D	8.67
34	78.80	22	D	4.92
35	75.84	39	D	6.92
36	79.36	14	D	7.21
37	79.75	11	D	6.71
38	80.20	5	AP	8.00
39	80.06	8	AP	8.17
40	78.25	27	D	9.00

Table 9: District Unified Test Program (DUTP) Result of Pupils in English SY 2012 – 2013

Teacher No.	Ps	Rank	Proficiency	Teacher No.	Ps	Rank	Proficiency
1	89.10	1	P	21	52.40	38	B
2	65.80	31	B	22	56.45	35	B
3	66.50	30	B	23	76.70	19	D
4	71.87	24	B	24	71.80	25	B
5	78.90	15	D	25	75.95	21	D
6	78.10	17	D	26	80.60	12	AP
7	76.50	20	D	27	78.15	16	D
8	84.50	6	AP	28	37.10	40	B
9	85.15	5	P	29	80.50	13	AP
10	88.70	2	P	30	80.90	10	AP
11	80.63	11	AP	31	53.15	37	B
12	84.10	7	AP	32	55.78	36	B
13	83.75	8	AP	33	70.26	28	B
14	86.85	3	P	34	74.00	23	B
15	77.30	18	D	35	49.93	39	B
16	86.10	4	P	36	61.96	32	B
17	81.26	9	AP	37	59.40	33	B
18	74.30	22	B	38	70.40	26	B
19	69.00	29	B	39	70.30	27	B
20	58.00	34	B	40	79.10	14	D

The table shows that most of the pupils have not yet acquired the proficiency level because out of the 40 schools tested 19 of them belong to the Beginning level; 8 are Developing; while the other 8 are Approaching Proficiency. Only 5 schools belong to the Proficient level. This is an indication that there is a need for teachers to evaluate their performance and exert more effort in elevating the English language skills of their pupils. This supports Magno and Sembrano's study (The Role of Teacher Efficacy and Characteristics on Teaching Effectiveness, Performance and Use of Learner-Centered Practices) on the need to focus not only on teacher-related behaviors to teaching but also to translate them into student outcome.

The Pupils' Mean Performance to Formal and Informal English Expressions

Table 10: Pupils' Mean Performance in the Researcher-Made Test

School	Mean	School	Mean
1	11.20	12	7.84
2	10.67	13	9.34
3	8.14	14	7.63
4	7.98	15	9.86
5	7.07	16	7.80
6	10.25	17	10.00
7	6.60	18	7.50
8	9.44	19	9.44
9	8.91	20	10.22
10	10.43	21	6.80
11	9.67	22	8.14

Out of the 20 items in the researcher-made test as shown in Table 9, the highest score obtained by the school is 11.20, a little more than half of the total number of items. The lowest mean is 6.60. From the scores obtained by the students although nobody got zero 0. It can be inferred that the pupils have low performance which must be taken into consideration.

Table 11 on page 57 shows the results of the levels of formality of the answers of the pupils in the researcher-made test conducted together with the profile of the respondents and the standardized test. As seen from the results it could be said that of the 20 questions distributed equally from Formal, Informal, Intimate and Casual, most of them have Informal answers in almost all items. This only shows that there is a need for pupils to learn more about formal Mother-Tongue expressions aside from the informal expressions for them to be able to use it during formal conversations and being able to answer formal questions during the tests.

Table 11: Levels of Formality of Pupils' Answers Per Teacher in the Researcher-Made Test

Teacher No.	Wx	Description	Teacher No.	Wx	Description
1	3.21	Informal	21	3.40	Formal
2	3.13	Informal	22	3.10	Informal
3	3.35	Formal	23	3.20	Informal
4	3.14	Informal	24	3.23	Informal
5	3.16	Informal	25	2.73	Informal
6	3.63	Formal	26	3.04	Informal
7	3.12	Informal	27	3.15	Informal
8	3.22	Informal	28	3.12	Informal
9	2.64	Informal	29	3.05	Informal
10	3.58	Formal	30	3.06	Informal
11	3.22	Informal	31	3.05	Informal
12	2.91	Informal	32	2.91	Informal
13	3.29	Formal	33	3.06	Informal
14	3.32	Formal	34	2.99	Informal
15	3.39	Formal	35	3.14	Informal
16	2.96	Informal	36	2.91	Informal
17	3.24	Informal	37	3.17	Informal
18	2.85	Informal	38	3.00	Informal
19	3.37	Formal	39	3.17	Informal
20	3.02	Informal	40	2.91	Informal

Table 12 found in the succeeding page displays the self-efficacy of the teacher respondents in relation to the grades of pupils in the English subject, District Unified Test Program (DUTP) result, and the performance of the pupils in the researcher-made test.

The P-value of 0.535 between the grades of pupils in English and the respondents' self-efficacy and the P-value of 0.655 between the performance of the pupils in the learning of formal and informal English expressions show no significant relationship. This means that all the teachers were able to accomplish what is expected of them especially in school responsibilities.

Some negative correlation exists between respondents' self-efficacy and the pupils' result in the District Unified Test (DUTP) since the Pearson Correlation r at 0.404 is greater than the P-value at 0.010. This finding implies that for a curriculum to be successfully implemented and for pupils to achieve the proficiency level, there is a need for teachers to change their strategies in teaching and align them to the thrusts set by the Department of Education.

The Correlation between Respondents' Self-efficacy and Pupils' Performance

Table 12: The Correlation between Respondents' Self-efficacy and Pupils' Performance

Self-Efficacy VS	Pearson Correlation R	P - Value	Remarks
Grades of Pupils in English	0.101	0.535	Not Significant
Grades of Pupils in the DUTP	0.404	0.010	Significant
Learning of Formal and Informal English Expressions	0.073	0.655	Not Significant

Summary of Findings

From the study conducted, the following findings are advanced:

1. Profile of the Respondents Fifty per cent of the respondents age from 36-45 years old. Majority of the respondents have work experience from 5-19 years. They are not fresh graduates and neither are they new to the service. Majority of the respondents have only attended 2-3 seminars and only a few were given the opportunity to attend more seminars. Among the 11 strategies presented asking questions is the most used strategy (Always), by the respondents.
2. Respondents' Self-Efficacy Seventy-three per cent of the teacher respondents believe that their self-efficacy belongs to 6.50 – 8.49 bracket (Quite-a- Bit).
3. Relationship between Respondents' Profile and Self-Efficacy the P-value of 0.857 for age, 0.324 for years in service, 0.200 for number of seminars attended indicate no significant relationship to teachers' self-efficacy.
4. Performance of the Grade-One Pupils Majority of the teachers have a pupil average of 76-79% (Developing) as far their grades in English are concerned. While on the other hand their DUTP result shows that most of the teachers' pupil per cent (PS) scores are from seventy-four per cent and below and are in the Beginning level (B). From this DUTP results, it could be inferred that most of the pupils have not yet acquired proficiency level which needs to be addressed
5. Pupils' Responses to Formal and Informal Mother-Tongue Expressions From the scores obtained by the pupils, although nobody got zero (0) they have low performance in the researcher-made test. This is indicative of how they were taught by their teachers or whether teachers also have enough knowledge on teaching formal and informal Mother-tongue expressions such as greetings and leave-takings, making introductions, identifying oneself, and expressing and acknowledging gratitude.
6. Correlation of the Respondents' Self-Efficacy and the Performance of Pupils the pupils' response showed little knowledge on the appropriate responses appropriate for the different situations. The P-value of 0.5353 between the grades of pupils in English and the respondents' self-efficacy and the P-value of 0.655 between the performance of the pupils in the learning of formal and informal Mother-tongue expressions show no significant relationship. This means that all the teachers were able to accomplish what is expected of them especially in school responsibilities some negative correlation exists between respondents' self- efficacy and the pupils' result in the District Unified Test Program (DUTP) since the Pearson Correlation r at 0.404 is greater than the P-value at 0.010.

Conclusions

In view of the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. Most of the respondents of the study are in the prime of their teaching profession, and only very few have attended seminars about the new curriculum, and asking questions is utilized as the main strategy in determining comprehension of the lesson.
2. The self-efficacy bracket of the teachers is Quite - a - Bit.
3. There is no significant relationship between respondents' profile (as to age, years in service, and number of seminars attended) and self-efficacy.
4. The performance of the pupils in the English subject as shown in their report cards is in the Developing level. The result of the District Unified Test Program (DUTP) shows that the performance of the pupils is in the Beginning level.
5. Pupils have low performance in the use of formal and informal Mother-tongue expressions.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Teachers who still have the capacity to deal well with children who are very active be assigned to teach grade one pupils; that those who will handle grade one classes have the experience and adept with the new curriculum; that grade one teachers be given more opportunities related to the thrust of the new curriculum; and that effective strategy be used order to improve the performance of the pupils.
2. English teachers teaching grade-one classes may know how to break down complex, challenging tasks into something more manageable.
3. English teachers must develop their beliefs in their power to achieve certain proficiency level regardless of their age and number of years in service. They must also be given equal opportunities to upgrade themselves to cope with the new curriculum or better yet, whoever is sent to a seminar should be given time to echo to the rest of the teachers in the school or division.
4. English teachers may keep abreast with what is new and check whether what they are teaching is aligned with the learning competencies set by the Department of Education. Teachers may manifest more effort in elevating the English language skills of their pupils.
5. Teachers need to include more drills and reinforcement activities in using formal and informal Mother tongue expressions.
6. It is strongly recommended that English teachers may have a better background in teaching the pupils formal and informal Mother-tongue expressions, expose their pupils to the different situations that call for the use of formal or informal Mother- tongue expressions and provide related activities that would elicit more pupil practice for them to be more adept in using appropriate Mother-tongue expressions.

References

1. Bandura A. Self-Efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of psychological behaviour change. *Psychological Review*. 1977; 84:191-215
2. Magno C, Sembrano J. The role of teacher efficacy and characteristics on teaching effectiveness, performance, and use of learner centered practices. *De La Salle College of Saint Benilde, Philippines: The Asia Pacific Education Researcher* 2007; 16(1)
3. Atkinson D. "The mother tongue in the classroom: a neglected resource?" *ELT Journal*. 1987; 41:241-247 Oxford University Press
4. Cruz I. Reengineering Filipino, English and the lingua franca in basic education. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*. 2004; 34(2) 35(1):61-69.
5. Gacheche, Kagure. "Challenges in implementing a mother tongue-based language- in education: Policy and Practice in Kenya." *POLIS Journal*. 2010, 4
6. Quisumbing LR. The 1987 Policy on Bilingual Education, Department of Education, Culture and Sports Order No. 52 Manila; DECS, 1987.
7. Tschannen-Moran M, Woolfolk Hoy A, Hoy WK. Teacher efficacy: Its meaning. *Review of Educational Research*, 1998; 68:202-248
8. Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy A. "Teacher- efficacy: Capturing an Elusive construct." *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 2001; 17:783-805.
9. Weinert, Franz E. "Concepts of competence. Definition and selection of competencies." Max Planck Institute for Psychological Research, Munich Germany, 1999.
10. Erden, Emine. "Problems That Preschool Teachers Face in th Curriculum Implementation, A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University, 2010.
11. Gahungu, Olive N. "The realtionships among strategy use, self-efficacy, and language ability in foreign language learners." Northern Arizona University, 2007
12. Stone, Rebecca Paulson. A professional development program for the mother-tongue based teacher: addressing teaching knowledge and attitudes about MTB-MLE A Dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst, 2012.
13. Ball, Jessica. "Enhancing Learning of Children from Diverse Language Backgrounds: Mother Tongue Based Bilingual or Multilingual Education in Early Childhood and Primary School Years." University of Victoria [www.ecdp.org/docs/pdf/UNESCOMother-tongue based EY 2010.pdf](http://www.ecdp.org/docs/pdf/UNESCOMother-tongue%20based%20EY%202010.pdf), 2010
14. Celce-Murcia M, Dörnyei Z, Thurrell S. Communicative competence: a pedagogically motivated model with Content specifications. *Issues in applied linguistics*. 1995; 6(2):5-35 Retrieved April, 7th2012 from <http://escholarship.ucop.edu/uc/item/2928w4zj#page-1, on>
15. DECS (Department of Education, Culture and Sports). s. 1999. Lingua franca education project. 1999, 144 Retrieved October 10, 2011 from [http://www.deped.gov.ph/cpanel/uploads/issuancelmg/DM%20No.20144 %20s%201999.pdf](http://www.deped.gov.ph/cpanel/uploads/issuancelmg/DM%20No.20144%20s%201999.pdf)
16. DECS (Department of Education, Culture and Sports). (2000). Memo No. 243 s. 2000. Training workshop batch 2 on the lingua franca education project. Retrieved October 10, 2011 <http://www.deped.gov.ph/cpanel/uploads/issuancelmg/DM%20No%20243%20s%202000.pdf>.
17. DepEd (Department of Education). (2009). Order No. 74 2009. Institutionalizing mother tongue-based multilingual education (MLE). Retrieved October 10, 2011 from [http://www.deped.gov.ph/cpanel/uploads/issuancelmg/DO%20No.2074, 20s%202009.pd.190300001.pdf](http://www.deped.gov.ph/cpanel/uploads/issuancelmg/DO%20No.2074,20s%202009.pd.190300001.pdf).
18. Duguiang, Norma and Dekker. Diane "Mother Tongue Based Multilingual Education–The Lubuagan Experience." *Multilingual Education-Philippines: Advocacy for Mother Tongue-Based Education*. February18-20, 2010. <http://mlephil.wordpress.com/2010/03/06/mother-tongue-based-multilingual-education-the-lubuagan-experience/> (accessed September 20, 2014).
19. MTB-MLE Network, RTI International. Improving learning outcomes through mother tongue based education, 2011 http://www.rti.org/brochures/eddata_ii_mother_tongue_instruction.pdf
20. The Forum. The language learning: Mother tongue-based multi-lingual education in the Philippines, 2010; 11(2). Retrieved, Oct.1, 2014 from <http://mlephil.wordpress.com/2010/05/06/the-language-of-learning-mother-tongue-based-multilingual-education-in-the-philippines/>