



# Examining Agricultural Teachers' TPACK Competencies: A Study of Demographic Influences in the Philippines

**Nikko Karlo B. Villareal <sup>a</sup> and Myra Luz M. Homillano <sup>b\*</sup>**

<sup>a</sup> Payak High School, Payak, Bato, Camarines Sur, Philippines.

<sup>b</sup> Central Bicol State University of Agriculture, San Jose, Pili, Camarines Sur, Philippines.

## **Authors' contributions**

*This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Author NKBV served as the primary researcher, taking responsibility for conceptualizing and designing the research study, developing the methodology and research instruments, conducting data collection and interviews, performing statistical analysis using multiple linear regression and Pearson correlation techniques, and drafting the initial manuscript. He also managed the literature review, interpreted results, and developed the study's conclusions and recommendations while coordinating the overall research process. Author MLMH provided critical academic supervision, offering methodological oversight, reviewing the research design, assisting with data interpretation and analysis validation, and providing substantive intellectual contributions to the research conceptualization. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.*

## **Article Information**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i121692>

### **Open Peer Review History:**

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/128216>

**Original Research Article**

**Received: 04/10/2024**  
**Accepted: 06/12/2024**  
**Published: 12/12/2024**

\*Corresponding author: Email: [myraluz.homillano@cbsua.edu.ph](mailto:myraluz.homillano@cbsua.edu.ph);

**Cite as:** Villareal, Nikko Karlo B., and Myra Luz M. Homillano. 2024. "Examining Agricultural Teachers' TPACK Competencies: A Study of Demographic Influences in the Philippines". *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies* 50 (12):237-48. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i121692>.

## ABSTRACT

**Introduction:** Preparation of students for modern agricultural demands in developing regions is a challenge for agricultural education, especially in integrating technological knowledge and effective teaching strategies. The critical need for comprehensive research on teachers' instructional capabilities regarding the agricultural literacy is emphasized by persistent low levels of agricultural literacy among most teachers.

**Purpose:** The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships between teachers' demographic characteristics and their technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge (TPACK) domains among agriculture teachers in the Division of Camarines Sur, Philippines.

**Methods:** A descriptive correlational research design using a mixed methods approach was used. The study included 20 public school teachers who taught agricultural crop production programs. Demographic questionnaires, TPACK assessment instruments, and agricultural literacy assessments were used as data collection instruments. The collected data was analyzed using multiple linear regression, and Pearson correlation.

**Results:** The results showed that there were different levels of knowledge in TPACK domains. The most proficient (Mean = 3.55) was technological knowledge, followed by pedagogical knowledge (Mean = 3.52) and content knowledge (Mean = 3.28). There were significant negative correlations between years of teaching experience and technological knowledge, which prove that younger teachers are more knowledgeable about technologies.

**Conclusion:** Research focuses on the interplay between demographics and TPACK in agricultural education, and suggests targeted professional development programs, technology integration initiatives and hands on learning experience. The results show that teachers' TPACK can be improved through continuous professional development and innovative pedagogical approaches, which in turn will improve students' agricultural literacy and prepare them for the challenges of contemporary agriculture.

*Keywords: Agricultural education; TPACK; teacher knowledge; professional development; technological literacy.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In developing countries, agricultural education is of great importance for solving the challenges of global food security and sustainable development (Balkrishna, 2021). Teachers' professional capabilities in the technological, pedagogical and content knowledge (TPACK) domains are the basis for the effectiveness of agricultural education. Koehler & Mishra (2009) stress that teaching excellence exceeds subject matter expertise and requires a deep grasp of technological integration, pedagogical strategies and disciplinary content.

In the Philippine educational context, the demographic characteristics and professional competencies of agricultural educators are important to understand in order to develop targeted professional development strategies. Studies of previous studies, Roxas et al. (2018), and Rogayan and Villanueva (2019) had corroborated that the profiles of the teachers are to be considered in order to improve the quality of education. Demographic composition of teachers, including gender, age, level and kind of

education, and teaching experience, are considerably related to instructional effectiveness and student learning outcomes.

Continuous adaptation to, and innovation in, the technological landscape of agricultural education is necessary. Mishra & Koehler (2006) advocate that teachers are able to integrate technology into their pedagogical practices in order to prepare students for the agriculture challenges of today. Smalley and Smith (2017) research highlight the need for continuous professional development, especially for mid-career educators navigating rapid technological changes in agricultural practices.

The purpose of this study is to comprehensively investigate the demographic profile, technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge of teachers in agriculture related fields in the Division of Camarines Sur. The research examines how teachers' demographic attributes are related to the professional knowledge domains in which they work and seeks to identify actionable insights for educational improvement. Specifically, the study

addresses critical research objectives: It addresses the question of identifying the detailed demographic characteristics of agricultural teachers, the assessment of the level of their technological, pedagogical and content knowledge status, the search of the significant relationships between particular demographic factors and professional competencies.

The research is made in line with the theoretical foundations of Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) which supplies a total way to frame teachers' instructional skills (Koehler & Mishra, 2009). The study was intended to contribute to general conception of agricultural education quality and its professional development needs by concentrating on technological proficiency, pedagogical strategies, and content expertise interplay.

The significance of this research extends beyond academic inquiry. The findings could be harnessed to improve agricultural education policy, teacher training programs, and strategic interventions to improve the quality of agricultural education. The complex relationships between teacher demographics and their professional knowledge serve as understandings which can lead educational institutions to develop more targeted and effective professional development approaches tailored to specific regional and institutional needs.

## **2. METHODOLOGY**

### **2.1 Research Design**

The study used descriptive-correlational research design to provide a detailed analysis of the technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK) of agriculture teachers in the Division of Camarines Sur. The descriptive component aimed at describing the demographic characteristics of teachers in agriculture specialization such as sex, age, civil status, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, academic rank, and subjects taken up in agriculture. The study also sought to establish the extent of teachers' technological, pedagogical and content knowledge.

### **2.2 Data Collection/instruments**

A quantitative research approach was adopted and a researcher-developed questionnaire of 30 items was used to measure TPACK among

teachers. The instrument was consistent with DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017 "The National Adoption and Implementation of Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers" and was conducted within a 20-minute period. The study focused on teachers from public junior high schools with well-developed agriculture course programs and teachers of different appointment types. Three (3) experts from the field of agriculture and education validated the questionnaire of this study.

The data gathering procedure included obtaining official clearances from the Schools' Division Superintendent and establishing the reliability of the research instruments through face validity by three professionals in the fields of agriculture and education. As a measure of indicators, the tools include frequency count, percentage, weighted mean, and mode while inferential statistics used included multiple linear regression analysis and Pearson Product Moment Correlation.

### **2.3 Data Analysis**

The study used specific interpretation scales for TPACK technological pedagogical content knowledge. Teachers were classified as "Knowledgeable" if they scored 2.5 and above on the knowledge dimension of the questionnaire and "Not Knowledgeable" if they scored below 2.5. Regarding the development of the interpretation scales, the research team adapted the scales from Mishra and Koehler's (2006) seminal work on TPACK framework, which provides a foundational approach to measuring technological pedagogical content knowledge. The specific cutoff point of 2.5 was derived from Ajzen's (1991) theory of planned behavior, which suggests using a midpoint scale approach for binary classification of competence levels.

The 2.5 threshold was selected to provide a balanced and scientifically rigorous method of distinguishing between teachers with sufficient and insufficient technological pedagogical content knowledge. This methodological approach offered a scientific and structured approach to studying the technological pedagogical content knowledge of agriculture teachers in the Division of Camarines Sur.

The research design enabled the identification of teachers' professional characteristics and

knowledge domains, providing an understanding of the current state of TPACK in agriculture educators in the region. To achieve the study objective, a mixed-method design with high statistical validity was adopted, thereby seeking to develop a richer understanding of the various factors worthy of consideration in enhancing teachers' professional competence in agriculture fields.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study was conducted to examine the demographic profile of teachers teaching in agriculture related fields, and the status of TPACK of agriculture teachers.

#### 3.1 Demographic Profile of Teachers Teaching in Agriculture-related Fields

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of teachers teaching in agriculture related fields in public schools with complete Agricultural Crop production offerings.

The study results indicated that 12 or 60% of teachers in agriculture were female and 8 or 40% were male. Most teachers were aged 30-39, 11 or 55%, 5 or 25% aged 40-49, 3 or 15% aged 50-59, and 1 or 5% aged 20-29. Most teachers were married 12 or 60%, single status 7 or 35%, and widowed 1 or 5%. Many teachers were MA/MS with units 15 or 75%, 4 or 20% were teachers who graduated in college, and 1 or 5% was MA/MS graduate. The teachers taught for 6-10 years, 12 or 60%, then 1-5 years 5 or 25%, 2 or 10% taught for almost 26-30 years, and 1 or 5% taught for 21-25 years. Most teachers were Teacher I (about 12 or 60%), Teacher III (about 5 or 25%), and Teacher II (about 3 or 15%). Most teachers who enrolled in short courses took Agricultural Crop Production NC I about 5 or 25% and Agricultural Crop Production NC II about 4 or 20%. Teachers with other agriculture related training courses such as Horticulture NC II, which is only 2 or 10%, Animal Production Swine NC II and Organic Agriculture NC II, which were only 1 or 5% respectively.

An interview supported this: There were 13 agriculture graduates and 7 non agriculture graduates. Only three of the non-agriculture have a special course/subject in agriculture. As for their postgraduate, only eight have their master's

aligned in agriculture and seven have their master's aligned in education. Only 15 respondents have actual experience in agriculture because they are a family of farmers who are immersed in their internship/practicum in their college years. 12 has a rating of 6 in their agriculture subject and 6 has a rating of 7 in their non-agriculture subject, while 2 has a rating of 7 in their non-agriculture subject.

This means that many of the teachers were female, most of the teachers were aged 30-39, married, with MA/MS units, teaching for 6-10 years, with a regular permanent position as Teacher I, and with a smaller number of teachers having short courses/subjects in agriculture. It can also be inferred that most of the teachers are agriculture graduates and the average number of teachers who have pursued the field of agriculture. Farming is most teachers' experience in agriculture.

According to Rogayan & Villanueva (2019), a typical teacher respondent is female, 32.20 years old, and a college graduate with MA units. The study of Guiab and Ganal (2014) showed that there were more female respondents than male respondents and most were married. Roxas et al. (2018) study revealed that the respondents were more female teachers than male teachers, more than half of the public-school secondary teachers were married, half of them were in units of MA/MS, 81 of the respondents were Teacher I, Becker's Human Capital Theory (2009) explained that Teacher's experiences, education, training and other qualifications are great determinants in an industry and make the employees productive and worthwhile.

#### 3.2 Status of Teachers' TPACK Teaching Agriculture-related Fields

The technological and pedagogical content knowledge of agriculture teachers in the Division of Camarines Sur shows a good appreciation of the use of technology and teaching learning approaches. As for technological competencies, teachers manifest a "knowledgeable" status with an overall weighted mean of 3.55 evidencing of their digital literacy and Technological, Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) abilities.

**Table 1. Demographic profile of teachers teaching in agriculture-related fields**

Demographic characteristics	Frequencies (N=20)	Distribution (%)
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	8	40%
Female	12	60%
<b>Age</b>		
20-29	1	5%
30-39	11	55%
40-49	5	25%
50-59	3	15%
<b>Civil Status</b>		
Single	7	35%
Married	12	60%
Widowed/Widower	1	5%
<b>Educational Attainment</b>		
College Graduate	4	20%
MA/MS (w/units)	15	75%
MA/MS Graduate	1	5%
<b>Number of Years in Teaching</b>		
1 – 5	5	25%
6 – 10	12	60%
21 – 25	1	5%
26 – 30	2	10%
<b>Position/Academic Rank</b>		
Teacher I	12	60%
Teacher II	3	15%
Teacher III	5	25%
<b>Subjects/Short Courses Taken in Agriculture</b>		
Agricultural Crop Production NC I	5	25%
Agricultural Crop Production NC II	4	20%
Horticulture NC II	2	10%
Animal Production Swine NC II	1	5%
Organic Agriculture NC II	1	5%

**Table 2. Status of teachers' technological knowledge in teaching agriculture-related fields**

Teachers' Technological Knowledge	Mean	Status
I can use Office programs (e.g., Word and Excel)	3.75	Knowledgeable
I organize computer files in folders and subfolders	3.55	Knowledgeable
I create a presentation with simple animation functions.	3.1	Knowledgeable
I can be able to save important files both on a USB flash drive and a cloud drive.	3.8	Knowledgeable
I can operate solely LCD projector, printer, and scanner	3.55	Knowledgeable
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>Knowledgeable</b>
<i>Level of Knowledge: 2.5 – 4.0 Knowledgeable</i>		
<i>1.0 – 2.49 Not Knowledgeable</i>		

The technological knowledge assessment revealed competency in various areas such as the use of advanced features in the office programs, file management, presentation development, file storage management, and operation of educational technology equipment. The foregoing observations are in consonance with findings of Mishra & Koehler (2006) who

underscore the central principle of various technological knowledge in current learning processes. The findings are similar to the studies conducted by Heitink et al. (2016) on technological competencies in educational settings and Chai et al. (2013) on technological pedagogical content knowledge of teachers.

Evaluation of pedagogical knowledge also showed a good understanding of instructional strategies with a weighted mean of 3.52. Many faculties performed better in content coverage composing, managing lessons, identifying and managing learners at risk, utilization of multiple language approaches, and incorporation of critical thinking. The findings indicate the extent to which teachers can plan lessons and design lessons, select appropriate teaching methods and use multiple teaching methods.

These results are consistent with Koehler & Mishra's (2009) TPACK model, which emphasizes the interdependence of technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge. Bingimlas (2018) also noted high pedagogical knowledge with teachers stressing on the need for flexibility and contingencies in instruction.

The findings of the study are useful in understanding the technological and pedagogical competencies of agriculture educators. As they demonstrate willingness of the teachers to deal with the contemporary move on educational technologies and techniques, it points to readiness of the prepared teachers to promote efficient agricultural education in the Region.

The findings of the study show that teachers are not only technologically literate but also possess advanced pedagogical knowledge that can improve students' learning in agricultural education. This discovery is especially important in the context of the developing world where technology adoption and the use of innovative pedagogy are critical to learning outcomes.

The status of teachers' content knowledge in teaching agriculture and related fields is presented in Table 4.

It can be gleaned that all agriculture teachers have a status of "knowledgeable" with a weighted mean value of 3.28 in the different statements, which means that teachers are knowledgeable in applying and integrating concepts or lesson content to their students.

The results for teachers' Technological, Pedagogical, and Content Knowledge (TPACK) in teaching agriculture-related fields, all the domains of TPACK: Teachers have a status of 'knowledgeable' in technological knowledge, pedagogical knowledge and content knowledge. But their weighted mean values are different; the highest weighted mean value was 3.55 for technological knowledge, 3.52 for pedagogical knowledge, and the lowest was 3.28 for content knowledge. While the results were significant. The implications for teacher training are yet to be explored.

This means that teachers of agriculture have different and diverse technological, pedagogical and content knowledge. In addition, teachers have more knowledge in technological knowledge than pedagogical and content knowledge.

The results of this study were similar to the research of Jalani et al. (2021) where PK and TK have the highest scores and CK has the lowest scores. Similarly, teachers perceived the highest increment in TK and the smallest for CK, as in Gozali et al.'s (2023) study. In addition, in the study of Bingimlas (2018) most teachers were found to be ranged from the average on CK and high on PK, which also the results of the present study. Mishra & Koehler's Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) Theory (2006) further explained that teachers' knowledge is classified into three areas: pedagogical, technological, and content knowledge.

### **3.3 Relationship between Teachers' Demographic Profile and Teachers' TPACK**

Table 5 presents the Multiple Linear Regression results on the relationship between teachers' demographic profile and technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge status in teaching agricultural fields.

Sex, age, civil status, educational attainment, position and short course taken were the teachers' profiles. On the other hand, technological, pedagogical and content knowledge in agricultural related fields were examined. All correlations were found to be non-significant except for the negative and significant correlation between respondents' number of years in teaching and technological knowledge. Therefore, this implies that the more years of stay in the organization, the less technological

knowledge they have in teaching agriculture related fields. None of them were significantly correlated in the aspect of pedagogical knowledge. Nevertheless, all were negatively correlated except for the correlation between age and pedagogical knowledge ( $B$ -value=0.396<sup>ns</sup>;  $P$ -value=0.275). This implies that changes in these variables will not enhance or alter teachers'

pedagogical knowledge. Furthermore, the same pattern of results was observed along content knowledge, and none of them has also produced statistical significance in the correlations. On the other hand, it had positive correlations. Between age and content knowledge ( $B$ -value=0.241<sup>ns</sup>;  $P$ -value=0.469) and short course taken and content knowledge ( $B$ -value=0.167<sup>ns</sup>;  $P$ -value=0.392).

**Table 3. Status of teachers' pedagogical knowledge in teaching agriculture-related fields**

<b>Teachers' Pedagogical Knowledge</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Status</b>
I develop lesson/learning plans daily or weekly with complete components of instruction (e.g., learning objectives, instructional activities, and assessment)	3.6	Knowledgeable
I employ different teaching techniques/strategies in agriculture effectively.	3.4	Knowledgeable
I can make changes in teaching styles due to students' individual differences or learning styles.	3.5	Knowledgeable
I apply different principles in teaching and learning (e.g., constructivism, multiple intelligences) in my lesson/learning plan.	3.4	Knowledgeable
I integrate classroom management techniques in the class to make it conducive to teaching and learning.	3.55	Knowledgeable
I identify students with needed interventions for literacy skills	3.65	Knowledgeable
I identify students with needed interventions for numeracy skills.	3.55	Knowledgeable
I supply students with intervention and enhancement learning materials to improve their literacy and numeracy skills.	3.6	Knowledgeable
I integrate different strategies in the lesson to improve the literacy and numeracy of my learners.	3.5	Knowledgeable
I make a progress report for those students with needed interventions for literacy and numeracy skills.	3.35	Knowledgeable
I understand the difference between critical thinking from creative thinking skills.	3.5	Knowledgeable
I understand the difference between low-order thinking skills and higher-order thinking skills.	3.65	Knowledgeable
I use different established strategies to improve my student's critical and creative thinking as well as higher-order thinking skills.	3.4	Knowledgeable
I support students' creative and critical thinking, as well as higher-order thinking skills.	3.45	Knowledgeable
I develop my strategy to improve my student's critical and creative thinking as well as higher-order thinking skills.	3.5	Knowledgeable
I encourage my students to speak in their own dialects/language in explaining concepts in agriculture	3.65	Knowledgeable
I craft a lesson/learning plan where English terms in agriculture are translated into Filipino and my Mother-Tongue.	3.55	Knowledgeable
I integrate Mother Tongue and Filipino in teaching agriculture concepts in daily class discussions.	3.6	Knowledgeable
I employ multilingual education during class discussions in agriculture	3.45	Knowledgeable
Agricultural concepts are being discussed in English, Filipino, and vernacular languages.	3.6	Knowledgeable
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>Knowledgeable</b>
<i>Level of Knowledge:</i>	<i>2.5 – 4.0</i>	<i>Knowledgeable</i>
	<i>1.0 – 2.49</i>	<i>Not Knowledgeable</i>

**Table 4. Status of teachers' content knowledge in teaching agriculture-related fields**

Teachers' Content Knowledge	Mean	Status
I am an expert in my content area	3.25	Knowledgeable
I have sufficient knowledge about agriculture and its allied areas	3.35	Knowledgeable
I apply agricultural concepts within TLE curriculum areas (e.g., Bread and Pastry, Cookery, EIM, etc.)	3.15	Knowledgeable
I apply agricultural concepts across curriculum areas (e.g., Mathematics, MAPEH, Science, etc.)	3.45	Knowledgeable
I am familiar with recent research in agriculture and its allied areas	3.2	Knowledgeable
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>Knowledgeable</b>
<i>Level of Knowledge: 2.5 – 4.0</i>		<i>Knowledgeable</i>
<i>1.0 – 2.49</i>		<i>Not Knowledgeable</i>

**Table 5. Relationship between teachers' demographic profile and teachers' TPACK**

Variables	Technological		Pedagogical		Content Knowledge	
	B	P-value	B	P-value	B	P-value
Sex	.185 <sup>ns</sup>	.195	-.067 <sup>ns</sup>	.760	-.122 <sup>ns</sup>	.548
Age	-.294 <sup>ns</sup>	.208	.396 <sup>ns</sup>	.275	.241 <sup>ns</sup>	.469
Civil Status	.243 <sup>ns</sup>	.110	-.054 <sup>ns</sup>	.813	-.106 <sup>ns</sup>	.619
Educational Attainment	.159 <sup>ns</sup>	.241	-.064 <sup>ns</sup>	.758	-.206 <sup>ns</sup>	.291
Number of Years in Teaching	-.515*	.033	-.618 <sup>ns</sup>	.094	-.438 <sup>ns</sup>	.194
Position	-.276 <sup>ns</sup>	.063	-.057 <sup>ns</sup>	.799	-.209 <sup>ns</sup>	.315
Short Course Taken	-.244 <sup>ns</sup>	.079	-.056 <sup>ns</sup>	.789	.167 <sup>ns</sup>	.392
R	.814		.422		.548	
R Square	.663		.178		.300	

Note: \*\*P < 0.01; \*P < .05; <sup>ns</sup>P > .05

The multiple R or the combined effects of the teachers' demographic profile on the knowledge in teaching agriculture-related fields along the three areas: pedagogical, technological, and content. The effects of the teachers' profile were between medium and large effects, as indicated. Large effects of demographic factors on technological and content knowledge, medium sized effect on pedagogical knowledge.

The R-squared or correlation coefficient values of 0.663, 0.178, and 0.300 for technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge further confirmed these effects. Study by Mishra and Koehler (2006), foundational to TPACK theory, underscores the importance of integrating technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge. Our findings extend this understanding by demonstrating that demographic factors explain 66.3% of variation in technological knowledge, 30% in content knowledge, and 17.8% in pedagogical knowledge. This nuanced distribution highlights the complex nature of professional competence in agricultural education.

The results show that the Technological, Pedagogical, and Content Knowledge (TPACK) among agricultural educators reveals complex insights into the relationship between teachers' demographic characteristics and professional competencies. The most significant finding emerges in the realm of technological knowledge, where a notable negative correlation exists between years of teaching experience and technological proficiency. This unexpected pattern suggests that longer teaching tenure may inadvertently create barriers to technological adaptation, potentially stemming from limited professional development opportunities and generational differences in technology engagement.

Like the study of Palmares and Ong (2023), research findings show that there are no significant relationships between the respondents' technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge and their demographic profile. Additionally, in the study of Kumala et al. (2022), Teacher's TPACK is positively related to the span of their teaching experience.



The negative correlation between teaching experience and technological knowledge aligns with observations by Ertmer and Ottenbreit-Leftwich (2010), who emphasized the critical role of personal beliefs and institutional support in technology integration. Younger educators demonstrate more intuitive technological skills, potentially attributed to their digital native status and greater exposure to emerging technologies. This generational divide suggests a pressing need for targeted professional development strategies that address technological knowledge gaps across different career stages.

Contrary to initial expectations, the study found no statistically significant correlations between demographic factors and pedagogical or content knowledge. This finding resonates with research by Voogt and McKenney (2017), who highlighted the complex interplay of individual and institutional factors in educational knowledge development. The results suggest that pedagogical and content knowledge may be more influenced by individual learning trajectories and professional development opportunities rather than demographic characteristics.

The implications of these findings are substantial for agricultural education institutions. Koh and Chai (2016) emphasized the need for comprehensive technological pedagogical approaches, which the study strongly supports. The results call for targeted interventions, including specialized technology integration programs, continuous professional development, and institutional support systems that facilitate ongoing learning across all career stages.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

The investigation of Technological, Pedagogical, and Content Knowledge (TPACK) among agriculture teachers in the Division of Camarines Sur reveals critical insights into the complex landscape of educational preparedness in developing regions. The study uncovers significant challenges and opportunities within agricultural education, particularly in the domains of technological competency and professional development.

The most compelling finding emerges in the relationship between teaching experience and technological knowledge, which challenges conventional assumptions about professional expertise. A notable negative correlation

indicates that younger teachers demonstrate substantially greater technological proficiency, signaling an urgent need for targeted technology integration strategies. This discovery suggests that agricultural education institutions must develop comprehensive professional development programs that bridge generational technological divides and provide contextually relevant technological training for experienced educators.

The nuanced analysis of knowledge domains—with technological knowledge (Mean = 3.55), pedagogical knowledge (Mean = 3.52), and content knowledge (Mean = 3.28)—reveals critical opportunities for strategic capacity building. These variations underscore the importance of holistic professional development approaches that address the multifaceted nature of educational competencies.

The demographic profile of the teaching staff—predominantly female (60%), predominantly aged 30-39, and mostly holding advanced academic credentials—provides essential context for understanding the current state of agricultural education. The wide variation in specialized training highlights the necessity of implementing standardized, comprehensive professional development frameworks that can systematically enhance educators' technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge.

Based on these findings, several strategic recommendations emerge for educational stakeholders. First, institutions should prioritize developing targeted technology integration programs specifically designed for experienced teachers. Second, continuous professional development modules must be created to address the disparities across TPACK domains. Third, mentorship programs should be established to leverage the complementary strengths of both younger and experienced educators.

Future research should focus on investigating the long-term impacts of technology integration on agricultural education outcomes, exploring more nuanced factors influencing TPACK across different career stages, and developing comprehensive assessment tools for measuring technological pedagogical competencies.

The study provides a foundational understanding of TPACK dynamics in agricultural education, offering a strategic blueprint for institutional

transformation. By addressing the identified challenges, educational leaders can convert existing limitations into opportunities for meaningful professional growth and enhanced educational quality.

The demographic and knowledge profile revealed in this research represents more than a snapshot of current capabilities—it serves as a critical roadmap for strategic intervention. Agricultural education in developing regions stands at a pivotal moment, where targeted professional development can significantly elevate educational standards and prepare educators to meet the complex challenges of modern agricultural training.

Ultimately, the research underscores the essential need for adaptive, technology-integrated professional development strategies that recognize the diverse strengths and learning needs of educators across different career stages. By embracing a holistic approach to teacher development, institutions can create more resilient, technologically adept, and pedagogically sophisticated agricultural education programs.

## 5. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the research findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

### 1. Professional Development Interventions

- Develop targeted technology integration workshops specifically designed for mid-career and senior teachers to address the negative correlation between teaching experience and technological knowledge.
- Create continuous professional development programs that focus on updating content knowledge in agricultural education, which showed the lowest mean among TPACK domains.

### 2. Curriculum Enhancement

- Redesign teacher training programs to emphasize technological literacy and innovative pedagogical approaches in agricultural education.
- Incorporate more practical, hands-on learning experiences that bridge theoretical knowledge with technological competencies.

### 3. Technological Infrastructure

- Invest in technological resources and training that support teachers in effectively integrating digital tools into agricultural education.
- Develop institutional support systems that encourage technology adoption and provide ongoing technical assistance.

### 4. Research and Policy Recommendations

- Conduct longitudinal studies to track the evolution of teachers' TPACK capabilities over time.
- Develop policy frameworks that recognize and incentivize continuous technological and pedagogical skill development.

### 5. Specialized Training

- Create specialized short courses and certification programs that address gaps in agricultural content knowledge.
- Develop mentorship programs that facilitate knowledge transfer between technologically proficient younger teachers and experienced educators.

While this study provides valuable insights, future research should consider:

- Expanding the sample size to include more diverse geographical regions
- Investigating the long-term impact of technology integration on student agricultural literacy
- Exploring the intersectionality of demographic factors and professional development strategies

This study emphasizes the utter importance of a comprehensive approach to agricultural education that fundamentally addresses knowledge of technology, content, and pedagogy. Educational institutions can contribute enormously to the quality of their agricultural education by providing targeted interventions and supportive policies for students to get ready for the intricate issues confronted by the modern agricultural techniques.

## DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

The authors hereby declare the use of Claude 3.5 Sonnet, an artificial intelligence technology developed by Anthropic, during the final stages

of manuscript preparation. It is explicitly emphasized that the core research elements—including conceptualization, data collection, statistical analysis, interpretation, and primary manuscript drafting—were conducted exclusively by human researchers Nikko Karlo B. Villareal, PhD and Myra Luz M. Homillano, PhD.

#### Details of AI Usage:

1. Manuscript Formatting: Claude 3.5 Sonnet was used to refine the structural organization of the manuscript, ensuring consistent formatting and adherence to academic writing standards.
2. Language Refinement: The AI tool assisted in improving language clarity, grammatical precision, and overall scholarly presentation of the research findings.
3. Proofreading Assistance: Claude 3.5 Sonnet provided technical support in identifying potential grammatical, syntactical, and stylistic improvements in the manuscript.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher extends sincere gratitude to: Dr. Loida N. Nidea, CESO V, former Schools Division Superintendent of SDO Camarines Sur, for facilitating the research's implementation, and Ma'am Eva J. Barcia, Planning Officer, for providing critical administrative support; the participating school principals, teachers, and students from Antipolo NHS, Cabalinadan HS, Caranday NHS, Coguit HS, Del Gallego NHS, Ocampo NHS, Pili NHS, Ragay National Agricultural and Fisheries School, San Antonio NHS, and Simeon Tycangco Memorial HS, whose cooperation was essential to this study; and lastly, heartfelt appreciation to colleagues and friends who provided support, belief, and motivation throughout this research journey.

#### COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

#### REFERENCES

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)

- Anthropic. (2024). Claude-3.5-Sonnet [Large language model]. <https://claude.ai/new>
- Balkrishna, A. (Ed.). (2021). *Sustainable Agriculture for Food Security: A Global Perspective* (1st ed.). Apple Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003242543>
- Becker, G. S. (2009). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education*. University of Chicago press.
- Bingimlas, Khalid. (2018). Investigating the level of teachers' Knowledge in Technology, Pedagogy, and Content (TPACK) in Saudi Arabia. *South African Journal of Education*. 38(3), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v38n3a1496>
- Ching Sing Chai, Joyce Hwee Ling Koh, & Chin-Chung Tsai. (2013). A Review of Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 16(2), 31–51. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/jeductechsoci.16.2.31>
- Ertmer, P., & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. (2010). Teacher Technology Change: How Knowledge, Confidence, Beliefs, and Culture Intersect. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 42(3), 255–284. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ882506.pdf>
- Gozali, I., Lie, A., & Tamah, S. M. (2023). Examining language teachers' change in TPACK-HOTS self-perception during the COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia. *Computer Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal (CALL-EJ)*, 24(1), 280–304.
- Guiab, M. R. & Ganal, N. N. (2014). Demographic Profile of Public School Heads and School Related Problems. *International Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Research*, 1(4). [www.express-journal.com](http://www.express-journal.com)
- Heitink, M., Voogt, J., Verplanken, L., van Braak, J., & Fisser, P. (2016). Teachers' professional reasoning about their pedagogical use of technology. *Computers & education*, 101, 70-83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.05.009>
- Jalani, G., Hussain, S., Amin, N., Hussain, D., & Jalani, A. (2021). Self-assessment of prospective teachers' technology pedagogical and content knowledge. *Journal of Educational Sciences and Research*, 8(1), 97 – 116. <https://jesar.su.edu.pk/article/256>

- Koehler, M. J., & Mishra, P. (2009). What is technological pedagogical content knowledge? *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 9(1). <https://citejournal.org/volume-9/issue-1-09/general/what-is-technological-pedagogicalcontent-knowledge>
- Koh, J. H. L., & Chai, C. S. (2016). Seven design frames that teachers use when considering technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK). *Computers & Education*, 102, 244–257. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.09.003>
- Kumala, F. N., Ghufiron, A., & Pujiastuti, P. (2022). Elementary school teachers' TPACK profile in science teaching based on demographic factors. *International Journal of Instruction*, 15(4), 77-100. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2022.1545a>
- Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge: A Framework for Teacher Knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), 1017–1054. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x>
- Palmares, M. P. & Batisla-Ong, S. N. (2023). Technological, Pedagogical, Content Knowledge (TPACK) of Science Teachers: Basis of In-Service Training Design Development. *Cosmos Journal of Engineering & Technology*, 13(1), 1-15. <https://www.cosmosjournal.in/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/CET-JJ23-131-1.-Dr.-Maryleare-P.-Palmares.pdf>
- Rogayan, D. V. J., & Villanueva, E. E. N. (2019). IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF K12 SOCIAL STUDIES PROGRAM IN PHILIPPINE PUBLIC SCHOOLS. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(3), 233–250. <https://doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2019.53.233250>
- Roxas, L. B., Viuya, P. C., Vallejo, O. T. (2018). Community Involvement of Public Secondary School Teachers in Northern Aurora, Philippines. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 8(10), 442-452. <http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.8.10.2018.p8258>
- Smalley, S. W., & Smith, A. R. (2017). Professional Development Needs of Mid-Career Agriculture Teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 58(4), 282–290. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2017.04283>
- Voogt, J., & McKenney, S. (2016). TPACK in teacher education: are we preparing teachers to use technology for early literacy? *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 26(1), 69–83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939x.2016.1174730>

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Peer-review history:*

*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:*

<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/128216>