

School Heads' Leadership Styles and Teachers' Teaching Practices: Basis for Enhancement Program

¹Jezrel R. Palumar, ²Yvonne P. Cruz

Foundation University

¹jezrel.palumar@deped.gov.ph, ²yvonnecruz83@gmail.com

Article Details:

Received: 18 April 2026

Revised: 22 April 2026

Accepted: 30 April 2026

Published: 15 May 2026

Corresponding Email:

jezrel.palumar@deped.gov.ph

Recommended Citation:

Palumar, J. R., Cruz, Y. P. (2026). School Heads' Leadership Styles and Teachers' Teaching Practices: Basis for Enhancement Program. *The International Review of Multidisciplinary Research*, 1 (5), 561-579.

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20215641>

Index Terms:

leadership styles, perception, teaching practices, transformational leadership, transactional leadership

Abstract. This study aimed to examine the leadership styles practiced by school heads and their influence on teachers' teaching practices. Specifically, it determined the extent to which school heads practice transactional and transformational leadership as perceived by themselves and teachers. An adapted, validated, and reliable questionnaire was utilized, and a descriptive-correlational research design was employed, involving 55 school heads, 218 teachers, and 436 students from selected public schools of Mabinay Districts I, II, III, and IV. The findings revealed that the extent to which the school heads practice both leadership styles is very high, with transformational leadership emerging as dominant. Teachers likewise employed teaching practices to a very high extent, particularly in creating a positive learning environment, promoting active learning, scaffolding learners, delivering explicit instruction, and providing assessment and feedback. A significant difference in perceptions was also observed between the school heads and the teachers regarding leadership styles. Furthermore, a significant positive relationship was established between the dominant leadership style and teachers' teaching practices. However, no significant differences were found in teaching practices or leadership styles based on demographic and professional profile variables. The study stresses the importance of leadership development initiatives that align school leadership with classroom implementation to promote instructional excellence and improve teaching practices. These findings further suggest that sustained capacity-building and reflective practice among school heads are critical in fostering coherent instructional systems, ensuring alignment between leadership actions and classroom practices, and enhancing teacher effectiveness and student learning outcomes across diverse educational contexts.

Introduction

Leadership style refers to how a leader guides, influences, and motivates individuals to achieve organizational goals through specific behaviors and interactions (Alegre-Quintana & Gutiérrez-Falcón, 2025). In educational settings, effective leadership plays a vital role in shaping student achievement and overall school outcomes (Ozdogru et al., 2025). However, many school heads face challenges in identifying and applying leadership approaches that effectively respond to the diverse and evolving needs of their schools. Research emphasizes that no single leadership style—whether transformational, transactional, distributed, or participative—can address all situations, highlighting the need for flexibility and adaptability (Katsikas, 2025). Supporting this, Alaro (2025) found that transformational and transactional leadership styles produce both positive and limited effects on school performance, suggesting that overreliance on a single approach may constrain effectiveness.

Similarly, Torres et al. (2024) reported that transformational, instructional, and distributed leadership practices are associated with improved teacher performance and student achievement. Despite these benefits, school heads continue to encounter difficulties in effectively implementing these approaches, as only certain leadership practices significantly influence school climate and learning outcomes (Simbre et al., 2023). Moreover, school leaders must balance instructional

support with collaborative practices to sustain school improvement, reflecting ongoing challenges amid limited resources and changing educational demands (Panga et al., 2025).

Although numerous studies have examined leadership styles in relation to student achievement, job satisfaction, and teacher performance, a clear gap remains in understanding how these leadership styles are perceived and how such perceptions influence actual teaching practices. For instance, studies by Punzalan and De Jesus (2024), Duran (2025), and Yalçın and Çoban (2023) focused on outcomes but did not explore how leadership experiences shape classroom practices.

This study addresses this gap by examining school heads' leadership styles as perceived by both teachers and school heads, and how these influence teaching practices. In doing so, it supports Sustainable Development Goal 4 by contributing insights that can guide leadership development and strengthen instructional quality in schools.

Statement of the Problem

The study aimed to determine the school heads' leadership styles and teachers' perceptions of these styles, as well as their impact on teaching practices.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent do school heads practice the leadership styles as perceived by themselves and teachers in terms of:
 - 1.1 transactional; and
 - 1.2 transformational leadership?
2. To what extent do teachers employ the following teaching practices as perceived by themselves and students:
 - 2.1 explicit instruction;
 - 2.2 assessment and feedback;
 - 2.3 promotion of active learning;
 - 2.4 scaffolding of learners; and
 - 2.5 creating a positive learning environment?
3. Is there a significant difference in perceptions between those of school heads and those of teachers as to the leadership styles of the former?
4. What is the dominant leadership style practiced by school heads?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the dominant leadership style practiced by school heads and teachers' teaching practices?
6. Is there a significant difference in teachers' teaching practices when grouped according to their profile in terms of:
 - 6.1 age;
 - 6.2 sex;
 - 6.3 years of teaching experience; and
 - 6.4 educational qualification?
7. Is there a significant difference in the leadership styles of school heads when grouped according to their profile in terms of:
 - 7.1 age;
 - 7.2 sex;
 - 7.3 years of supervisory experience; and
 - 7.4 educational qualification?

Statement of the Null Hypotheses

H₀₁: There is no significant difference in perceptions between those of school heads and those of teachers as to the leadership style of the former.

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between the dominant leadership style practiced by school heads and teachers' teaching practices.

H₀₃: There is no significant difference in teachers' teaching practices when grouped according to their profile in terms of age, sex, and years of teaching experience and educational qualification.

H₀₄: There is no significant difference in the leadership styles of school heads when grouped according to their profile in terms of age, sex, years of supervisory experience, and educational qualification.

Methodology

This study employed a quantitative research design, specifically utilizing descriptive, correlational, and comparative approaches to examine school heads' leadership styles and their influence on teachers' teaching practices. The descriptive component was used to determine the extent to which transformational and transactional leadership styles are practiced, as well as the level of teachers' teaching practices. The correlational design examined the relationship between leadership styles and teaching practices, while the comparative design identified differences in perceptions between school heads and teachers.

Research Environment

This study was conducted in randomly selected public schools across Mabinay Districts I, II, III, and IV, located in the municipality of Mabinay, Negros Oriental. As a first-class municipality, Mabinay places strong emphasis on education and serves learners from diverse socio-economic and cultural backgrounds. The schools are situated across both upland and lowland barangays, providing a varied and authentic educational context that reflects the realities of the communities they serve. Most schools have access to basic facilities such as electricity and clean water, ensuring a conducive environment for teaching and learning. Some schools are also equipped with internet connectivity, enabling access to digital resources, instructional planning, and professional development opportunities. However, several schools, particularly in more remote areas, experience limited or intermittent connectivity, which poses challenges in implementing technology-supported instruction.

Research Respondents

The respondents of this study consist of school heads, selected teachers, and students from public schools in Mabinay Districts I, II, III, and IV for the school year 2025–2026. A sampling formula was used to determine the appropriate number of school heads and teacher respondents to ensure adequate representation. A systematic sampling technique was employed to select teacher respondents from each school. Specifically, every second teacher listed on the official faculty list was chosen as a respondent, ensuring a fair and unbiased selection process. This approach provided a balanced representation of teachers across different grade levels and subject areas. To achieve data triangulation of teachers' perceptions of their teaching practices, students are likewise included as respondents. Two students are randomly selected for each teacher respondent to provide additional perspectives on classroom practices, thereby enhancing the reliability and credibility of the findings. Overall, the selection of respondents allowed the study to capture diverse and relevant perspectives from school heads, teachers, and students, providing a comprehensive understanding of how leadership styles influence teaching practices in the school setting.

Instrumentation

The study utilized an adapted and researcher-developed questionnaire to gather the required data. The instrument was developed based on relevant literature, existing validated tools, and aligned with established theoretical and conceptual frameworks to ensure its appropriateness and relevance. The questionnaire consists of three parts. Part I contains a disclosure statement that serves as the respondents' informed consent. Part II gathers demographic information. For teachers, this includes age, sex, years of teaching experience, and educational qualifications, while for school heads, it includes age, sex, years of supervisory experience, and educational qualifications. Part III assesses the school heads' leadership styles and teachers' teaching practices. Leadership styles were measured using a 16-item scale categorized into two dimensions: transactional leadership (odd-numbered items) and transformational leadership (even-numbered items), allowing clear analysis based on their theoretical constructs. Teaching practices were measured through indicators such as explicit instruction, assessment and feedback, promotion of active learning, scaffolding of learners, and creation of a positive learning environment. To achieve data triangulation, the same teaching practice items were also administered to students to validate teachers' self-reported responses. This approach enhanced the credibility and objectivity of the findings. The instrument underwent content validation by three experts in the field of education, and their suggestions were incorporated to improve clarity and alignment with the study objectives. A pilot test was conducted among selected teachers and students from schools outside the study sample. Reliability analysis using Cronbach's alpha yielded coefficients ranging from 0.700 to 0.825, indicating high internal consistency.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection was conducted following a systematic and ethical process. After the design hearing, all revisions and recommendations from the panel members were incorporated to improve the research instrument and methodology. An endorsement letter was then secured from the Graduate School of Foundation University to ensure compliance with academic requirements. Subsequently, formal request letters were distributed to the school heads of the participating

schools. These were endorsed through the respective district offices and forwarded to the Schools Division Office of Negros Oriental for final approval. Upon approval, the signed endorsements were transmitted to the concerned district supervisors, allowing the researcher to proceed with data collection. The researcher then personally coordinated with the school heads and teachers to facilitate the administration of the questionnaires. The purpose and significance of the study were clearly explained to ensure informed and voluntary participation. The questionnaires were administered in a manner that provided respondents with a comfortable and non-restrictive environment. Completed questionnaires were collected immediately after administration to ensure completeness of responses. All retrieved data were carefully organized, encoded, and analyzed using Jamovi statistical software. The results were interpreted in accordance with the objectives of the study, ensuring accuracy, consistency, and alignment with the research questions.

Statistical Treatment of the Data

To ensure accurate and meaningful analysis, both descriptive and inferential statistical tools were employed. Descriptive statistics, particularly the *mean*, was used to determine the extent of school heads' leadership styles as perceived by both school heads and teachers, as well as the level of teachers' teaching practices as perceived by teachers and students. The mean scores were interpreted using a five-point Likert scale, where higher values indicate a greater extent of practice.

To examine the relationship between variables, the *Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r)* was utilized. This test measured the strength and direction of the relationship between school heads' leadership styles and teachers' teaching practices. The interpretation of correlation coefficients followed standard guidelines: ± 0.50 to ± 1.00 (strong), ± 0.30 to ± 0.49 (moderate), ± 0.10 to ± 0.29 (weak), and ± 0.01 to ± 0.09 (very weak). All tests were conducted at a 0.05 level of significance.

To determine significant differences in leadership styles and teaching practices when grouped according to respondents' profiles, the *Chi-square test of independence* was employed. This test also examined differences in perceptions between school heads and teachers regarding leadership styles. It is appropriate for categorical data and identifies whether variations in responses are associated with specific demographic and professional characteristics.

Ethics Considerations

This study strictly adhered to ethical standards to protect the rights, dignity, and well-being of all respondents throughout the research process. Before data collection, respondents were provided with a disclosure statement embedded in the questionnaire, which served as informed consent and clearly explained the purpose, procedures, risks, and benefits of the study. Participation was entirely voluntary, and respondents were informed of their right to decline or withdraw at any time without any negative consequences. Approval to conduct the study was secured from the Graduate School of Foundation University and the appropriate ethics review body, ensuring compliance with institutional and professional guidelines.

During data collection, confidentiality and privacy were rigorously maintained. All responses were anonymized using coded identifiers, and no personal information or names appeared in any research document or report. Data were securely stored and accessed only by the researcher, ensuring protection from unauthorized use. A respectful and non-threatening environment was maintained to minimize any potential psychological discomfort, and all questions were designed to be non-intrusive and sensitive to respondents' experiences. The study also upheld inclusivity and fairness, ensuring that no participant was discriminated against based on age, sex, position, experience, or educational background.

After data collection, ethical responsibility was sustained through secure data handling, accurate reporting, and preservation of respondent anonymity. All findings and interpretations were carefully reviewed to ensure academic integrity and originality.

AI Usage and Assistance

This study was developed with the assistance of artificial intelligence (AI) tools, including ChatGPT and QuillBot, which supported literature organization, language refinement, and drafting of selected sections. The use of these tools was limited to enhancing clarity, coherence, and efficiency in writing. The role of AI did not replace the researcher's intellectual contribution, as all content generated or refined was carefully reviewed, critically evaluated, and substantially revised by the researcher. The interpretation of data, analysis of findings, and formulation of conclusions remained entirely under the responsibility of the researcher, ensuring originality, accuracy, and adherence to ethical standards.

Results and Discussion

To determine the verbal interpretation of responses and the extent of practice, the researcher applied the following descriptions:

Verbal Description (VD)	Extent of Practice (EoP)
4.21–5.00 – Strongly Agree (SA)	4.21–5.00 – Very High (VH)
3.41–4.20 – Agree (A)	3.41–4.20 – High (H)
2.61–3.40 – Moderately Agree (MA)	2.61–3.40 – Moderate (M)
1.81–2.60 – Disagree (D)	1.81–2.60 – Low (L)
1.00–1.80 – Strongly Disagree (SD)	1.00–1.80 – Very Low (VL)

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers	
	\bar{x}	VD	\bar{x}	VD
I focus my attention on irregularities, exceptions, and deviations from what is expected of me.	4.24	VH	4.25	VH
I monitor performance to ensure standards are met.	4.74	VH	4.56	VH
I emphasize the benefits and rewards that others will gain when they perform their duties.	4.65	VH	4.62	VH
I monitor performance to identify areas for growth and provide feedback.	4.56	VH	4.45	VH
I communicate the steps others should take so their hard work can be properly recognized and rewarded.	4.54	VH	4.51	VH
I ensure that when performance falls short, appropriate support is given to maintain quality.	4.54	VH	4.47	VH
I negotiate agreements with teachers and staff regarding responsibilities and the recognition they will receive.	4.53	VH	4.29	VH
I set clear expectations and standards for performance.	4.78	VH	4.54	VH
Composite	4.57	VH	4.46	VH

Note: School Heads n = 55, Teachers n = 218

Table 1. School Heads' Extent of Practice in Terms of Transactional Leadership Styles

Reflected in Table 1 is the school heads' extent of practice of transactional leadership style. The data show that the transactional leadership style is practiced to a very high extent, as perceived by the school heads and the teachers, with a \bar{x} of 4.57 and 4.46, respectively. This finding implies that the school heads consistently establish clear expectations, monitor performance, and reinforce desired behaviors through structured systems of accountability and rewards. It further suggests that such practices contribute to a stable and organized school environment where roles, responsibilities, and performance standards are well understood by teachers. Moreover, the alignment in perceptions between school heads and teachers indicates a shared experience of leadership practices, which may strengthen trust, promote consistency in implementation, and support sustained organizational effectiveness.

Examining the indicators further, variations in magnitude are observed while remaining within the "very high" descriptive level. Setting clear expectations and standards for performance obtained $\bar{x} = 4.78$ from school heads and $\bar{x} = 4.54$ from teachers, while monitoring performance to ensure standards yielded $\bar{x} = 4.74$ and $\bar{x} = 4.56$, respectively. Emphasizing the benefits and rewards garnered $\bar{x} = 4.65$ from school heads and $\bar{x} = 4.62$ from teachers. These results indicate that clarity of expectations, consistent monitoring, and reinforcement through rewards are strongly evident practices within the school context.

Further analysis shows that monitoring performance to identify areas for growth and provide feedback obtained $\bar{x} = 4.56$ from school heads and $\bar{x} = 4.45$ from teachers, while communicating the steps others should take obtained $\bar{x} = 4.54$ and $\bar{x} = 4.51$, respectively. Similarly, ensuring appropriate support when performance falls short yielded $\bar{x} = 4.54$ from school heads and $\bar{x} = 4.47$ from teachers. These findings highlight the presence of structured guidance accompanied by supportive mechanisms that sustain performance and accountability.

In addition, negotiating agreements with teachers and staff regarding responsibilities and recognition obtained $\bar{x} = 4.53$ from school heads and $\bar{x} = 4.29$ from teachers. Focusing attention on irregularities, exceptions, and deviations from what is expected also remained within the "very high" level, with $\bar{x} = 4.24$ from school heads and $\bar{x} = 4.25$ from teachers, indicating that attention to performance gaps is consistently practiced, though to a relatively lesser extent compared with other indicators.

These findings are consistent with the study of Ali et al. (2024), which emphasized that transactional leadership is characterized by clearly defined expectations, performance monitoring, and the use of contingent rewards to reinforce desired outcomes. Similarly, Ramirez and Capili (2024) noted that school heads commonly demonstrate transactional behaviors such as closely monitoring performance, addressing deviations, and reinforcing compliance through rewards. Furthermore, Hieng et al. (2024) found that teachers under transactional leadership exhibit confidence in managing instructional tasks due to the clarity of expectations and consistent guidance provided by school leaders, thereby reinforcing the present findings.

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers	
	\bar{x}	VD	\bar{x}	VD
I engage in words and deeds that enhance my image of competence.	4.51	VH	4.42	VH
I serve as a role model by inspiring others (i.e., teachers, students, and staff) through my actions and decisions.	4.74	VH	4.47	VH
I motivate others to take pride in their roles and responsibilities.	4.82	VH	4.54	VH
I support teachers and staff in overcoming challenges that hinder their work.	4.67	VH	4.49	VH
I make others aware of strongly held values, ideals, and aspirations that are shared in common.	4.62	VH	4.47	VH
I promote teamwork by aligning teachers' and staff efforts with the school's mission.	4.76	VH	4.54	VH
I share a vision of future opportunities that inspires and guides the school community.	4.69	VH	4.47	VH
I talk optimistically about the future.	4.62	VH	4.51	VH
Composite	4.68	VH	4.49	VH

Note: School Heads $n = 55$, Teachers $n = 218$

Table 2. School Heads' Extent of Practice in Terms of Transformational Leadership Style

Table 2 reflects the school heads' extent of practice of transformational leadership style. The data reveal that the school heads' practice of transformational leadership style is at very high extent as perceived by the school heads and the teachers, with a \bar{x} of 4.68 and 4.49, respectively. This suggests that transformational leadership behaviors are strongly manifested in the school setting.

Across indicators, variations in magnitude are observed while remaining within the "very high" descriptive level. Motivating others to take pride in their roles and responsibilities obtained a mean of $\bar{x} = 4.82$ from school heads and $\bar{x} = 4.54$ from teachers. Promoting teamwork by aligning teachers' and staff efforts with the school's mission yielded $\bar{x} = 4.76$ from school heads and $\bar{x} = 4.54$ from teachers. Serving as a role model by inspiring others through actions and decisions got $\bar{x} = 4.74$ from school heads and $\bar{x} = 4.47$ from teachers. These results suggest that fostering pride, strengthening collaboration, and modeling desired behaviors are consistently evident practices.

In the same vein, sharing a vision of future opportunities that inspires and guides the school community garnered $\bar{x} = 4.69$ from school heads and $\bar{x} = 4.47$ from teachers, while supporting teachers and staff in overcoming challenges obtained $\bar{x} = 4.67$ and $\bar{x} = 4.49$, respectively. Making others aware of strongly held values, ideals, and aspirations, obtained $\bar{x} = 4.62$ from school heads and $\bar{x} = 4.47$ from teachers, and talking optimistically about the future yielded $\bar{x} = 4.62$ and $\bar{x} = 4.51$, respectively. Engaging in words and deeds that enhance the image of competence, while still described as "very high," obtained $\bar{x} = 4.51$ from school heads and $\bar{x} = 4.42$ from teachers.

As a whole, the results show that motivating others, promoting teamwork, modeling desired behaviors, articulating shared values, and expressing optimism about the future are strongly practiced. This pattern reinforces the essential elements of transformational leadership within the school context. The findings are consistent with Deng et al. (2023), who found that transformational leadership significantly enhances employee engagement and organizational innovation by encouraging optimism, intellectual stimulation, and shared aspirations. Moreover, these findings are further supported by Alzoraiki et al. (2024), who reported that when school leaders consistently communicate a shared vision, reinforce common values, and provide concrete support to teachers, a positive and performance-oriented school culture is strengthened. Their study emphasized that optimism and visible competence from leaders build trust and collective confidence among teachers.

I am able to...	Teachers		Students	
	\bar{x}	VD	\bar{x}	VD
clearly communicate the learning objectives and expectations at the start of each lesson, ensuring my students understand the topic and why it is important.	4.26	SA	4.18	SA

<i>explain new concepts in a direct, step-by-step manner and demonstrate tasks or skills, making sure my instructions are easy to follow.</i>	4.30	SA	4.19	SA
<i>break down complex topics into simpler parts or smaller lessons so that students can grasp difficult content more easily and not feel overwhelmed.</i>	4.70	SA	4.28	SA
<i>guide students through practice activities by working through examples together, providing support and modeling before letting them attempt similar tasks on their own.</i>	4.71	SA	4.34	SA
<i>check for students' understanding throughout the lesson by asking questions and clarifying confusion.</i>	4.53	SA	4.36	SA
Composite	4.50	SA	4.27	SA

Note: Teachers n = 218, Students n = 436

Table 3. Extent to which Teachers Employ the Teaching Practices in Terms of Delivering Explicit Instruction as Perceived by Themselves and Their Students

Table 3 reflects the extent to which teachers employ teaching practices in terms of delivering explicit instruction. The data show that teachers' employment of teaching practices in terms of delivering explicit instruction is "very high" with a $\bar{x} = 4.50$ for teachers and $\bar{x} = 4.27$ for students. This implies that teachers are successfully providing clear, structured, and guided learning experiences that support student understanding. Sustaining these practices is essential, while continuous refinement, such as incorporating more student feedback and differentiated strategies, can further enhance engagement and ensure that high-quality instruction translates into deeper learning outcomes.

The table also exhibits that both teachers and students "strongly agree" that teachers are able to clearly communicate learning objectives and expectations at the start of each lesson (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.26$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.18$). This suggests that teachers intentionally set a clear direction for learning, helping students understand not only what they are expected to learn but also why the lesson is important. Establishing clear objectives at the outset provides structure and purpose, which are essential elements of effective instruction. This finding corroborates the study of Chinpakdee and Gu's (2024), which emphasized that articulating goals provides students with a clear direction for learning and helps them understand the purpose behind lessons.

Similarly, the respondents strongly agree that teachers explain new concepts in a direct, step-by-step manner and demonstrate tasks or skills clearly (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.30$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.19$). This finding signifies teachers' commitment to organized and systematic teaching. By presenting information sequentially and modeling procedures, teachers reduce ambiguity and make lessons easier to follow. It aligns with the results of Cadungog and Rollo (2024), which indicate that systematic explanation and modeling reduce confusion and support learners in mastering skills sequentially.

The indicator "ability to break down complex topics into simpler parts" received a strong level of agreement from teachers ($\bar{x} = 4.70$), with students likewise expressing strong agreement ($\bar{x} = 4.28$). This finding signifies that teachers are mindful of students' cognitive load and deliberately scaffold instruction to prevent learners from feeling overwhelmed. When complex concepts are segmented into manageable components, students are more likely to grasp difficult content and gain confidence in their learning. Similarly, Cadungog and Rollo (2024) stressed the importance of scaffolding instruction to manage students' cognitive load and foster confidence.

Teachers also reported a "very high" extent of guiding students through practice activities by working through examples together before allowing independent practice ($\bar{x} = 4.71$), and students similarly perceived this practice positively ($\bar{x} = 4.34$). This gradual release of responsibility from modeling to guided practice to independent work reflects a hallmark of explicit instruction. It ensures that students receive sufficient support before being expected to perform tasks on their own, thereby strengthening mastery and reducing misconceptions. The finding corresponds with the statement of Chinpakdee and Gu (2024) that clear strategy instruction, which included working through examples with students before assigning independent tasks, significantly improved learners' comprehension and confidence.

Moreover, both groups "strongly agree" that teachers check for students' understanding throughout the lesson by asking questions and clarifying confusion (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.53$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.36$). This indicates that formative assessment is actively embedded within instruction. By continuously monitoring comprehension and addressing misunderstandings in real time, teachers foster a responsive learning environment where students feel supported and guided. This result is consistent with the study of Bandahala (2024), which posited that continuous formative assessment allows teachers to monitor comprehension, provide immediate feedback, and adjust instruction to meet learners' needs.

I am able to...	Teachers		Students	
	\bar{x}	VD	\bar{x}	VD
<i>use regular assessments (such as quizzes, tests, or check-up activities) to monitor my students' learning progress and identify areas where they need more help.</i>	4.54	SA	4.21	SA
<i>provide timely and constructive feedback on my students' work, returning tests, assignments, or projects quickly with comments so that they know what/how to improve.</i>	4.62	SA	4.17	A
<i>adjust my teaching strategies based on assessment results, for example, by reviewing materials that many students find difficult or by giving extra practice where needed.</i>	4.69	SA	4.22	SA
<i>give specific feedback that highlights my students' strengths and point out areas for improvement, rather than simply giving a score or a general remark.</i>	4.40	SA	4.20	A
<i>involve students in the feedback process, for instance, by encouraging self-assessment or peer feedback, so they can reflect on their own learning and progress.</i>	4.35	SA	4.16	A
Composite	4.52	SA	4.19	A

Note: Teachers n = 218, Students n = 436

Table 4. Extent to Which Teachers Employ the Teaching Practices in Terms of Assessment and Feedback as Perceived by Themselves and Their Students

Table 4 depicts the extent to which teachers employ the teaching practices in terms of assessment and feedback. The data indicate that teachers believe their use of teaching practices in this area is "very high," with a mean score of 4.52. In contrast, students perceive these practices as being "high," reflected in their mean score of 4.19. Teachers' ratings are categorized as "strongly agree," while students' ratings fall under "agree." These results indicate that assessment and feedback are consistently embedded in classroom instruction, although slight variations can be observed across specific indicators. This further implies that teachers are actively using assessment and feedback strategies to support student learning and monitor progress in a structured manner. However, the difference in perceptions suggests the need to further strengthen the clarity, timeliness, and visibility of feedback so that students can more fully recognize and benefit from these practices.

Specifically, the table shows that both groups "strongly agree" that teachers use regular assessments (such as quizzes, tests, or check-up activities) to monitor students' learning progress and identify areas where they need more help (teachers: \bar{x} = 4.54; students: \bar{x} = 4.21). This finding corroborates Yao et al.'s (2024) assertion that ongoing checks for understanding enable teachers to identify learning gaps and respond appropriately. This suggests that teachers systematically gather evidence of learning to determine students' strengths and difficulties. Through regular assessments, teachers are able to track progress and make informed instructional decisions that respond to learners' needs.

Teachers "strongly agree" that they provide timely and constructive feedback, while students "agree." This feedback includes returning tests, assignments, or projects quickly with comments, allowing students to understand how to improve (teachers: \bar{x} = 4.62; students: \bar{x} = 4.17). This result stresses the importance teachers place on responsiveness. By returning outputs promptly and including meaningful comments, teachers help students recognize specific steps for improvement rather than leaving them uncertain about their performance. This also aligns with the systematic review of Sortwell et al. (2024), which specified that formative feedback enhances achievement and promotes self-regulated learning. Prompt and meaningful responses help students clearly recognize how to improve their performance.

Moreover, one of the highest-rated indicators from the teachers' perspective is their ability to adjust their teaching strategies based on assessment results (i.e., reviewing materials that many students find difficult or giving extra practice where needed) (teachers: \bar{x} = 4.69; students: \bar{x} = 4.22). Both groups are in strong agreement regarding this indicator. In other words, assessment results are not merely recorded but are actively utilized to refine instruction. When teachers revisit challenging content or provide additional practice, they demonstrate instructional flexibility and responsiveness to students' learning gaps.

In the same manner, teachers "strongly agree" while students "agree" that teachers give specific feedback that highlights students' strengths and points out areas for improvement, rather than simply giving a score or a general remark (teachers: \bar{x} = 4.40; students: \bar{x} = 4.20). This result shows that feedback in the classroom goes beyond numerical grades. By identifying strengths and clearly pointing out areas for improvement, teachers create a more supportive and growth-oriented learning environment that encourages students to develop their competencies further. In the same way, this result corresponds with Cagasan et al. (2020), who posited that formative assessment enables teachers to modify instruction to address students' immediate needs.

Furthermore, teachers “strongly agree” while students “agree” that teachers involve students in the feedback process, for instance, by encouraging self-assessment or peer feedback, so students can reflect on their own learning and progress (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.35$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.16$). This result indicates that feedback is not solely teacher-driven but also participatory. Encouraging self-assessment and peer feedback fosters reflection, accountability, and deeper engagement in the learning process. This notion coincides with Sortwell et al. (2024), who noted that targeted feedback fosters growth-oriented learning rather than mere grade-focused evaluation.

I am able to...	Teachers		Students	
	\bar{x}	VD	\bar{x}	VD
<i>engage my students in interactive activities (such as class discussions, problem-solving tasks, or educational games), rather than just having them listen to lectures.</i>	4.61	SA	4.24	SA
<i>practice a two-way dialogue in the classroom, where students ask questions, share ideas, and actively participate during lessons.</i>	4.46	SA	4.20	A
<i>organize group work or peer learning opportunities, where students collaborate on tasks or projects and learn from each other.</i>	4.58	SA	4.25	SA
<i>incorporate hands-on experiences and real-world projects into my teaching, allowing students to learn by doing (for example, through experiments, role-plays, or simulations).</i>	4.48	SA	4.19	A
<i>give students leadership roles or chances to present their work to the class, so they become active contributors to the learning process and take more ownership of their learning.</i>	4.59	SA	4.21	SA
Composite	4.54	SA	4.22	SA

Note: Teachers $n = 218$, Students $n = 436$

Table 5. Extent to Which Teachers Employ the Teaching Practices in Terms of Promotion of Active Learning as Perceived by Themselves and Their Students

Table 5 reflects the extent to which teachers employ the teaching practices in terms of promoting active learning. The data reveal that teachers' employment of teaching practices in this domain is “very high,” with a composite mean of $\bar{x} = 4.54$ from the teachers and $\bar{x} = 4.22$ from the students, both verbally described as “Strongly Agree” and interpreted as a “Very High” extent of practice. These findings suggest that active learning strategies are consistently embedded in classroom instruction, and both groups share a strong and aligned perception of their implementation.

Particularly, both teachers and students strongly agree that teachers are able to engage students in interactive activities (i.e., class discussions, problem-solving tasks, or educational games), rather than just having them listen to lectures (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.61$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.24$). This finding shows that classroom instruction moves beyond passive listening and instead promotes meaningful engagement. Incorporating class discussions, problem-solving tasks, and educational games allows teachers to create dynamic learning environments where students are encouraged to think critically and participate actively. The present result reflects the conclusions of Md Yusof et al. (2023) that practical and activity-based approaches significantly enhance students' motivation compared to traditional lecture-based instruction.

Similarly, teachers “strongly agree” while students “agree” that teachers practice a two-way dialogue in the classroom, where students ask questions, share ideas, and actively participate during lessons (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.46$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.20$). This finding underscores the importance of open communication in the learning process. A two-way dialogue allows students to clarify misconceptions, express their perspectives, and contribute to discussions, thereby fostering a more inclusive and collaborative classroom atmosphere. The findings align with those of De Bruijn-Smolanders and Prinsen (2024), who emphasized the importance of reciprocal communication in fostering behavioral and emotional engagement.

In addition, both groups strongly agree that teachers organize group work or peer learning opportunities, where students collaborate on tasks or projects and learn from each other (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.58$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.25$). This result suggests that collaborative learning is a prominent feature of instruction. Through group work and peer learning opportunities, students not only develop academic skills but also enhance their communication, teamwork, and problem-solving abilities. Learning from one another further deepens understanding and strengthens social interaction within the classroom. The present data mirror the outcomes reported by Almario et al. (2023), which showed that collaborative and gamified strategies enhance participation and reinforce shared responsibility in learning tasks.

Moreover, teachers “strongly agree” while students “agree” that teachers incorporate hands-on experiences and real-world projects into their teaching, allowing students to learn by doing (i.e., experiments, role-plays, and simulations) (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.48$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.19$). This result implies that experiential learning is meaningfully integrated into lessons. By allowing students to learn by doing, teachers help bridge theoretical knowledge and practical application, which makes learning

more authentic, relevant, and memorable. The result coincides with the finding of Md Yusof et al. (2023) that experiential and application-based activities increased relevance and sustained learner interest. Such strategies bridge theoretical understanding and practical application.

Furthermore, one of the highest-rated indicators from the teachers' perspective is their ability to assign leadership roles to students or provide opportunities for them to present their work to the class. This approach encourages students to become active contributors to the learning process and take greater ownership of their education (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.59$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.21$). Both groups interpreted these scores as "Strongly Agree." This goes to show that teachers intentionally empower students to assume responsibility in the classroom. Providing leadership roles and presentation opportunities nurtures confidence, accountability, and a sense of ownership, transforming students from passive recipients of information into active contributors to the learning process. The data corresponds with Almario et al. (2023), who postulated that empowering students to take visible roles in classroom activities nurtures ownership, confidence, and deeper engagement. This finding is further supported by Cagatan and Quirap (2024), who asserted that structured classroom engagement strategies, particularly those that assign active roles to students, are positively associated with improved academic performance and deeper participation.

I am able to...	Teachers		Students	
	\bar{x}	VD	\bar{x}	VD
<i>connect new lessons to my students' prior knowledge or past lessons, helping them link new information to what they already understand.</i>	4.60	SA	4.30	SA
<i>break down complex tasks and skills into smaller, manageable steps, so that my students can learn and master each part one at a time.</i>	4.69	SA	4.29	SA
<i>provide helpful support, like hints, guiding questions, visual aids, or examples, when introducing difficult material, to make it easier for students to grasp new concepts.</i>	4.58	SA	4.28	SA
<i>give extra guidance or one-on-one support to students who are struggling, adjusting the level of help based on each student's needs in the moment.</i>	4.39	SA	4.20	A
<i>gradually remove support and let my students work more independently until they become more confident to handle tasks on their own.</i>	4.36	SA	4.18	A
Composite	4.52	SA	4.22	SA

Note: Teachers n = 218, Students n = 436

Table 6. Extent to Which Teachers Employ the Teaching Practices in Terms of Scaffolding Learners as Perceived by Themselves and Their Students

Table 6 presents the data signifying the extent to which teachers employ the teaching practices in terms of scaffolding learners. The data show that teachers' employment of teaching practices in this domain is "very high," with a composite mean of $\bar{x} = 4.52$ from the teachers and $\bar{x} = 4.25$ from the students. Both groups verbally described their responses as "Strongly Agree" and interpreted the overall rating as a "Very High" extent of practice. These findings indicate that scaffolding strategies are consistently integrated into classroom instruction, and there is strong congruence between teachers' self-perceptions and students' observations.

More precisely, both teachers and students "strongly agree" that teachers are able to connect new lessons to students' prior knowledge or past lessons, helping them link new information to what they already know (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.60$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.30$). This finding suggests that teachers intentionally anchor new concepts to learners' existing knowledge base. Helping students link new information to their current understanding allows teachers to make learning more meaningful and coherent, reducing confusion and strengthening conceptual continuity. The result aligns with the findings of Fuentes (2025) that anchoring new concepts to students' existing knowledge improves comprehension and retention.

Likewise, the respondents "strongly agree" that teachers break down complex tasks and skills into smaller, manageable steps, so that students can learn and master each part one at a time (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.69$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.29$). Notably, this indicator obtained one of the highest ratings from the teachers' perspective. This means that teachers are highly attentive to cognitive load and pacing. The teachers structure the lessons into manageable steps and enable the students to progressively build competence and confidence. This ensures mastery before moving to more advanced components. This finding is supported by Surbakti et al. (2024), who found that segmenting instructional content into smaller, manageable parts reduces cognitive load and improves learning efficiency and student engagement.

It is also evident that both groups "strongly agree" that teachers provide helpful support to make it easier for students to grasp new concepts (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.58$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.28$). This result signifies that instructional support is deliberately embedded when challenges arise. Through hints, guiding questions, visual aids, and examples, teachers create multiple entry points to understanding, thereby accommodating diverse learning needs and styles. This result is in affirmation of Vo

et al. (2024), who claimed that strategically embedded instructional support facilitates comprehension and accommodates diverse learning styles.

Moreover, teachers “strongly agree” while students “agree” that teachers give extra guidance or one-on-one support to students who are struggling, adjusting the level of help based on each student’s needs in the moment (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.39$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.20$). This finding highlights the responsive nature of scaffolding. Rather than providing uniform assistance, teachers tailor their support depending on individual learners’ difficulties. Such personalized guidance ensures that struggling students receive timely intervention without feeling overwhelmed or left behind. Correspondingly, Esparcia et al. (2024) also found that personalized scaffolding improves learner confidence and performance.

Equally important, teachers “strongly agree” while students “agree” that teachers gradually remove support and let the students work more independently until they become more confident to handle tasks on their own (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.36$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.18$). This finding indicates that scaffolding is not intended to create dependency but to promote autonomy. By gradually removing support, teachers encourage students to internalize skills and strategies, which fosters independence and self-confidence in handling academic tasks. Similarly, the Gradual Release of Responsibility (GRR) model reported by Fuentes (2025) supposed that fading scaffolding at the right pace fosters autonomy and self-efficacy in learners.

I am able to...	Teachers		Students	
	\bar{x}	VD	\bar{x}	VD
<i>create a classroom atmosphere where my students feel safe asking questions and expressing their ideas, without fear of being embarrassed or ridiculed.</i>	4.71	SA	4.36	SA
<i>show care, respect, and fair treatment for all my students.</i>	4.67	SA	4.38	SA
<i>encourage students to be respectful and supportive of one another, fostering a sense of community and camaraderie.</i>	4.68	SA	4.30	SA
<i>recognize and praise my students for their efforts and achievements, using positive reinforcement.</i>	4.70	SA	4.34	SA
<i>maintain clear and consistent classroom rules and handle any misbehavior calmly and fairly.</i>	4.68	SA	4.27	SA
Composite	4.69	SA	4.33	SA

Note: Teachers $n = 218$, Students $n = 436$

Table 7. Extent to Which Teachers Employ the Teaching Practices in Terms of Creating a Positive Learning Environment as Perceived by Themselves and Their Students

The data in Table 7 reveal the extent to which teachers employ the teaching practices in terms of creating a positive learning environment. Based on the results, teachers’ employment of teaching practices in this domain is “Very High,” with a composite mean of $\bar{x} = 4.69$ from the teachers and $\bar{x} = 4.33$ from the students. Both groups verbally described their responses as “Strongly Agree” and interpreted the overall rating as a “Very High” extent of practice. This result suggests that teachers are consistently creating supportive and engaging classroom environments, highlighting the importance of sustaining these practices to further strengthen student participation, confidence, and overall learning experience.

Notably, both teachers and students “strongly agree” that teachers are able to create a classroom atmosphere where students feel safe asking questions and expressing their ideas, without fear of being embarrassed or ridiculed (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.71$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.36$). Notably, this indicator received one of the highest ratings from the teachers’ perspective. This suggests that psychological safety is firmly established in the classroom. When students feel safe asking questions and expressing their ideas, they are more likely to participate actively, take intellectual risks, and engage meaningfully in discussions without fear of negative judgment. This result affirms the findings of Zhang and Mauhay (2024) that psychological safety in classrooms promotes active participation and intellectual risk-taking.

In addition, the respondents “strongly agree” that teachers show care, respect, and fair treatment for all students (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.67$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.38$). This finding highlights the relational dimension of teaching, wherein teachers demonstrate care, respect, and fairness, thereby cultivating trust and mutual regard, which are essential foundations for effective learning. Such treatment reinforces students’ sense of belonging and value within the classroom community. This is consistent with Dumagy and Ponsades (2024), who noted that teacher-student relational quality enhances trust, sense of belonging, and academic engagement.

Likewise, both groups “strongly agree” that teachers encourage students to be respectful and supportive of one another, fostering a sense of community and camaraderie (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.68$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.30$). This underscores the importance of peer relationships in shaping the classroom climate. By promoting respect and support among students, teachers help build a collaborative environment where learners feel connected and motivated. A sense of community and camaraderie

not only enhances social interaction but also contributes to collective responsibility for learning. A similar finding by Rusticus et al. (2023) emphasized that peer support and collaborative interactions significantly contribute to a positive classroom climate and collective responsibility for learning.

Moreover, teachers and students “strongly agree” that teachers recognize and praise students for their efforts and achievements, using positive reinforcement (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.70$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.34$). This suggests that positive reinforcement is actively utilized by teachers to motivate learners. Recognizing and praising efforts and achievements affirms students’ progress, boosts confidence, and encourages continued engagement. Rather than focusing solely on shortcomings, teachers emphasize growth and accomplishment, thereby nurturing a constructive and encouraging atmosphere. As noted by Chow et al. (2024), positive reinforcement strengthens motivation, builds confidence, and encourages continued engagement, which aligns with the emphasis on growth-oriented classroom practices observed in the current study.

Finally, the respondents “strongly agree” that teachers maintain clear and consistent classroom rules and handle any misbehavior calmly and fairly (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.68$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.27$). This indicates that structure and discipline are managed with professionalism and balance. Maintaining clear and consistent classroom rules provides stability and predictability, while handling misbehavior calmly and fairly ensures that students perceive discipline as just and respectful rather than punitive. Such practices reinforce order without compromising the positive tone of the classroom. This corresponds with Zhang and Mauhay (2024), who argued that consistent rules and fair disciplinary practices create stability, reinforce order, and sustain a positive classroom atmosphere.

I am able to...	\bar{x}	VD	\bar{x}	VD
1. Delivering of Explicit Instruction	4.50	SA	4.27	SA
2. Assessment and Feedback	4.52	SA	4.19	A
3. Promotion of Active Learning	4.54	SA	4.22	SA
4. Scaffolding Learners	4.52	SA	4.25	SA
5. Creating a Positive Learning Environment	4.69	SA	4.33	SA
Composite	4.55	SA	4.25	SA

Note: Teachers n = 218, Students n = 436

Table 8. Summary Table as to the Extent Teachers Employ the Teaching Practices as Perceived by Themselves and Their Students

Table 8 bears the summary of the extent to which teachers employ core teaching practices. The findings reveal that the overall extent of practice is very high, with a composite mean of 4.55 as perceived by teachers and $\bar{x} = 4.25$ as perceived by students, both verbally described as “Strongly Agree” and interpreted as a very high extent of practice. This implies a strong alignment between teachers’ self-assessment and students’ perceptions, suggesting that effective instructional practices are consistently implemented and meaningfully experienced in the classroom.

Among the indicators, scaffolding learners obtained the highest rating from teachers ($\bar{x} = 4.69$), as well as a very high rating from students ($\bar{x} = 4.33$). In other words, the teachers actively provide structured support to help students gradually develop independence and mastery of skills. This finding aligns with Sun et al. (2023), who emphasized that teacher scaffolding significantly enhances student engagement and knowledge construction. Promotion of active learning (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.54$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.22$) also received very high ratings, indicating that interactive strategies such as discussions, collaboration, and problem-solving are embedded in instruction. This supports the findings of Bhuttah et al. (2024) that active learning approaches foster critical thinking and improve learning outcomes.

Similarly, assessment and feedback (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.52$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.19$) were strongly affirmed, highlighting the teachers’ consistent use of formative assessment and constructive feedback to guide student improvement, which is consistent with the conclusions of Alpuerto et al. (2025) that meaningful feedback strengthens student engagement and knowledge exchange. Delivering explicit instruction (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.50$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.27$) was likewise rated very high, suggesting that teachers provide clear explanations, modeling, and structured guidance, a practice supported by Baniqued (2024), who highlighted the effectiveness of explicit instructional approaches in improving conceptual understanding.

Lastly, creating a positive learning environment (teachers: $\bar{x} = 4.52$; students: $\bar{x} = 4.25$) further confirms that teachers foster supportive, respectful, and motivating classroom climates that enhance student confidence and participation, which coincides with contemporary research linking positive classroom environments to improved academic and socio-emotional outcomes. Overall, the consistently very high ratings across all domains reflect a shared recognition between teachers and students that high-impact, evidence-based teaching practices are systematically integrated into classroom instruction, reinforcing both academic achievement and meaningful student engagement. This is supported by Regidor et al. (2024),

who found that students reported a *high level of supportive classroom environment*, indicating that classrooms are generally perceived as conducive to learning and student engagement.

Variables	\bar{x}	Mean Difference	χ^2	Df	p-value	Decision Rule	Remarks
School Heads	4.62	.1506	3.54	271	.0013	Reject Ho ₁	Significant
Teachers	4.46						

Chi-square test at 0.05 level of significance

Table 9. Test on Significant Difference in the Perception of School Heads and Teachers as to the Leadership Style of the Former

Table 9 reflects the test of significant difference in perceptions between school heads and teachers. Results of the test reveal that the school heads and teachers' perceptions differ, as reflected in the *p*-value of .0013, which is less than the level of significance 0.05. Given that the *p*-value is less than the level of significance (0.05), the null hypothesis stating that no significant difference exists in the school heads and teachers' perception as to the leadership style of the former is rejected. Correspondingly, Da'as (2023) noted that principals often view their leadership as more transformational than teachers perceive, highlighting a perceptual gap between leaders and subordinates. Similarly, Hiba (2023) found in their study that while school heads believed they exercised transformational leadership, teachers often perceived a stronger influence of transactional leadership on their commitment, underscoring potential misalignment in perception. This finding clearly indicates that a statistically significant difference exists between the perceptions of school heads and those of teachers regarding the former's leadership styles. Although both groups may hold generally favorable views, the difference in their perceptions suggests that leadership practices may be interpreted or experienced differently by those who exercise leadership and those who are directly influenced by it. Such variation in perception may stem from differences in roles, responsibilities, expectations, and day-to-day experiences within the school setting.

\bar{x} Variables		Male	Percent (%)	Female	Percent (%)	Total	Percent (%)
Transactional	4.57	11	20	9	16.36	20	36.36
Transformational	4.68	16	29.1	19	34.54	35	63.64
Total		27	49.1	28	50.9	55	100

Note: n = 55

Table 10. Dominant Leadership Style Practiced by School Heads

Table 10 presents the dominant leadership styles practiced by school heads, categorized into transactional and transformational leadership. The results show that *transformational leadership* emerges as the dominant style, as indicated by its higher mean score ($\bar{x} = 4.68$) compared to transactional leadership ($\bar{x} = 4.57$). This finding suggests that school heads tend to lead through vision, motivation, and professional support, indicating the need to further strengthen transformational leadership practices while maintaining essential transactional structures to ensure balanced and effective school management.

Of the 55 school heads surveyed, 35, or 63.64%, are identified as predominantly practicing transformational leadership. In contrast, 20 school heads, accounting for 36.36%, were found to primarily employ transactional leadership as their dominant style. This distribution clearly shows that a greater proportion of school heads adopt transformational leadership behaviors compared to transactional approaches. The findings suggest that most school heads tend to emphasize inspiration, vision-sharing, motivation, and professional support rather than relying primarily on reward-based or corrective leadership mechanisms.

In the aspect of sex, the data further illustrate meaningful patterns. Among male school heads ($n = 27$), 11 or 20% practice transactional leadership, while 16 or 29.1% practice transformational leadership. This signifies that even among male school heads, transformational leadership is more prevalent than transactional leadership. Similarly, among female school heads ($n = 28$), 9 or 16.36% are classified under transactional leadership, whereas 19 or 34.54% are identified as practicing transformational leadership. Again, transformational leadership accounts for the larger share.

Notably, both male and female school heads demonstrate a stronger inclination toward transformational leadership. Although slight differences exist in percentages, the overall pattern remains consistent: regardless of sex, more school heads are characterized by transformational rather than transactional leadership. This consistency suggests that leadership orientation within the group is shaped more by professional philosophy and institutional expectations than by gender differences.

These results affirm the findings of Aldhaheri (2023), who discovered that school leaders in Abu Dhabi primarily exhibit transformational behaviors, which positively impact organizational performance and subordinate outcomes. Similarly, Soriano and Banayo (2024) conjectured that while school heads utilize both transformational and transactional practices, transformational behaviors are still the most prevalent and are crucial for motivating teachers and promoting positive educational results.

Variables Correlated to Dominant Leadership Style Practiced by School Heads	Pearson <i>r</i>	<i>p</i>-value	Decision Rule	Remarks
• Delivering of Explicit Instruction	.669	.001	Reject Ho ₃	Significant
• Assessment and Feedback	.787	.001	Reject Ho ₃	Significant
• Promotion of Active Learning	.718	.001	Reject Ho ₃	Significant
• Scaffolding Learners	.774	.001	Reject Ho ₃	Significant
• Creating a Positive Learning Environment	.705	.001	Reject Ho ₃	Significant

Note: Level of significance = 0.05

Table 11. Test on the Significant Relationship Between the Dominant Leadership Style Practiced by School Heads and Teachers' Teaching Practices

Table 11 presents the test on the significant relationship between the dominant leadership style practiced by school heads and teachers' teaching practices. Using Pearson *r*, the results reveal *p*-values of .001 for all variables, which are less than the level of significance of 0.05. This finding provides sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis Ho₃. Hence, there is a significant relationship between the dominant leadership style practiced by school heads and teachers' teaching practices across all five domains. This finding suggests that improving school heads' leadership practices can directly enhance teachers' teaching practices, highlighting the need for schools to invest in leadership development as a key strategy for strengthening classroom instruction and overall school performance.

It is important to note that the dominant leadership style that emerged is transformational leadership; however, both transactional and transformational leadership styles were included in the analysis. The leadership styles practiced by school heads were treated using data coding, wherein transactional leadership was coded as 1 and transformational leadership as 2. Both were utilized and treated equally in the statistical analysis. Thus, the significant relationship established reflects the combined influence of the leadership styles practiced by school heads, with transformational leadership emerging as dominant based on the results.

Specifically, the relationship between the dominant leadership style practiced by school heads and the delivery of explicit instruction is significant ($r = .669, p = .001$). The positive correlation indicates that as school heads demonstrate stronger leadership practices, teachers likewise show a greater extent in delivering explicit instruction. This connotes that leadership direction and guidance may influence how clearly and systematically teachers present lessons in the classroom. This result concurs with Dacpano (2024), who noted that transformational leadership fosters a shared vision that promotes clarity and effectiveness in teaching strategies.

A significant correlation was also observed between the dominant leadership style practiced by school heads and assessment and feedback ($r = .787, p = .001$). Notably, the assessment and feedback variable obtained the highest Pearson *r* value among all teaching practices. This implies that leadership style is most strongly associated with how teachers implement assessment and feedback strategies. When school heads emphasize clear expectations, monitoring, and professional growth, teachers may become more consistent and intentional in assessing student learning and providing constructive feedback. This is consistent with the notion of Academia (2025) that transformational leadership encourages structured monitoring and professional growth, thereby enhancing teachers' consistency in assessing student learning and providing constructive feedback.

In like manner, promotion of active learning is significantly related to the dominant leadership style practiced by school heads ($r = .718, p = .001$). This moderate to strong positive relationship indicates that leadership practices that inspire,

guide, and support teachers may encourage the use of strategies that actively engage students. As school heads foster vision and motivation, teachers may feel empowered to implement more interactive and participatory approaches in their instruction. A similar finding by Andriadi and Sulistiyo (2024) showed that transformational leadership boosts teacher motivation, encouraging the adoption of active learning strategies.

Moreover, the dominant leadership style practiced by school heads and the teachers' scaffolding of learners likewise have a significant correlation ($r = .774, p = .001$). This strong positive correlation suggests that when school heads provide direction, support, and developmental guidance, teachers are more likely to extend structured assistance to students. Leadership that values growth and improvement may translate into instructional practices that gradually build learners' independence and competence. Correspondingly, Da'as (2023) maintained that principals' perspective-taking fosters similar supportive behaviors among teachers, enhancing instructional scaffolding and collaboration.

Furthermore, creating a positive learning environment also shows a significant relationship with the dominant leadership style practiced by school heads ($r = .705, p = .001$). The positive association connotes that leadership behaviors characterized by inspiration, clarity, and support may influence teachers in fostering respectful, inclusive, and encouraging classroom climates. When school heads model professionalism and shared values, teachers may reflect these qualities in their interactions with students. This result echoes the finding of Balili and General (2023) that transformational leadership positively shapes school culture, teacher behavior, and overall school effectiveness.

Teaching Practices	χ^2	Df	p-value	Decision Rule	Remarks
Age	.863	4	.930	Do not Reject Ho _{3.1}	Not Significant
Sex	.957	1	.328	Do not Reject Ho _{3.2}	Not Significant
Years of teaching Exp.	6.75	5	.240	Do not Reject Ho _{3.3}	Not Significant
Educational Qualification	.719	4	.949	Do not Reject Ho _{3.4}	Not Significant

Note: Level of significance = 0.05; n = 218

Table 12. Test on Significant Difference in Teachers' Teaching Practices when Grouped According to Their Profile

Table 12 presents the test on the significant difference in teachers' teaching practices when grouped according to their profile. Using the chi-square (χ^2) test, the results reveal p-values that are greater than the level of significance of 0.05 across all profile variables. In short, there is no statistically significant difference in teachers' teaching practices when they are grouped according to age, sex, years of teaching experience, and educational qualification. Consequently, the results lead to the rejection of the null hypothesis. These results indicate that teachers' profile is not a determinant of their teaching practices. This signifies that teaching practices may be shaped more by shared institutional standards, professional development training, and established school policies rather than by individual profile characteristics.

This finding is corroborated by Nketsia et al. (2025), who found no significant differences in teaching practices based on teacher demographic factors such as gender, age, teaching experience, or prior training when examining inclusive teaching strategy use, suggesting that instructional practice patterns are shaped more by professional role expectations and contextual supports than by individual profiles. Similarly, Ingaran et al. (2025) reported that teacher professionalism levels do not significantly differ by age, educational qualification, academic rank, years of experience, or number of trainings attended, and are instead influenced by shared factors such as administrative support and collaborative work environments.

Leadership Style and	χ^2	Df	p-value	Decision Rule	Remarks
Age	.375	1	.762	Fail to Reject Ho ₄	Not Significant
Sex	.921	1	.846	Fail to Reject Ho ₄	Not Significant
Years of Supervisory Exp.	.1317	1	.717	Fail to Reject Ho ₄	Not Significant
Educational Qualification	1.5421	1	.214	Fail to Reject Ho ₄	Not Significant

Note: Level of significance = 0.05; n = 55

Table 13. Test on Significant Difference in the Leadership Styles of School Heads when Grouped According to Their Profile

Table 13 presents the test of the significant difference in the leadership style of school heads when grouped according to their profile. Using the chi-square (χ^2) test, the results reveal p-values that are greater than the level of significance (0.05) across all profile variables. Specifically, age ($\chi^2 = .375, p = .762$), sex ($\chi^2 = .921, p = .846$), years of supervisory experience ($\chi^2 = .1317, p = .717$), and educational qualification ($\chi^2 = 1.5421, p = .214$) all yielded non-significant results. This leads to the failure to reject the null hypothesis, indicating that there is no statistically significant difference in the leadership style of school heads based on these profile variables. This finding suggests that the leadership style practiced by school heads is consistent regardless of their age, sex, years of supervisory experience, or educational qualification. In other words,

individual demographic or professional characteristics do not appear to influence how school heads exercise their leadership.

This result is similar to the findings of Esogon and Gumban (2024), which showed no significant differences in transformational leadership practices among school heads when grouped by profile variables, suggesting that leadership behaviors are consistent across different profile characteristics. Likewise, a recent study by Joan et al. (2025) on instructional leadership among elementary school heads in Biliran District found no significant relationship between school heads' demographic profiles and their instructional leadership practices, which reinforces the idea that leadership effectiveness is not determined by personal attributes but rather by professional competencies and leadership development opportunities.

Conclusion and Implications

Leadership and instruction are not separate forces but mutually reinforcing elements that shape overall school effectiveness. This inquiry proved that schools are generally aligned with the expectations of the PPSSH and PPST, particularly in promoting learner-centered practices, instructional leadership, and professional growth. Indeed, existing systems and standards are not only understood but are being actively practiced in schools.

With the dominance of transformational leadership, alongside the sustained use of transactional practices, effective school leadership requires both inspiration and structure. School heads should not rely solely on one leadership style; instead, they must intentionally balance motivating teachers toward a shared vision while also maintaining clear expectations, accountability, and organizational stability. In practice, this means strengthening leadership development programs that cultivate both relational transformational and managerial transactional competencies. However, there exists a critical need for improved communication and alignment. Even when leadership practices are strong, their impact may be limited if they are not consistently understood or experienced in the same way by teachers. Therefore, there is a need for schools to prioritize reflective dialogue, feedback mechanisms, and collaborative planning to ensure that leadership intentions are clearly translated into classroom realities.

Furthermore, this study confirmed that leadership behavior directly shapes instructional quality. Improving leadership practices is a strategic pathway to enhancing teaching outcomes. Thus, school systems should invest in continuous leadership training, mentoring, and monitoring systems that explicitly connect leadership actions to classroom practices. Finally, the findings made it clear that effective leadership and teaching are less about individual characteristics and more about shared standards, school culture, and professional commitment.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions drawn, the following are hereby recommended to the school district supervisor, teachers, and students:

District Supervisors:

1. Sustain and strengthen a balanced leadership approach by integrating the positive elements of both transformational and transactional leadership dimensions.
2. Conduct regular Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, feedback conferences, and reflective leadership meetings with teachers to address perceptual gaps and foster a shared understanding of leadership practices that support effective classroom instruction.
3. Develop and implement a structured professional development program for school heads that emphasizes the balanced application of transformational and transactional leadership styles. The program should equip school leaders with practical strategies to inspire and motivate teachers while ensuring accountability, consistency, and high instructional standards.
4. Conduct training to enhance the leadership capacity of school heads and strengthen teachers' instructional practices through the implementation of the Strategic Leadership and Instructional Enhancement Program (SLIEP).

Teachers:

5. Conduct LAC sessions at least once a week, in accordance with DepEd Order No. 35 s. 2016, with clearly defined agendas focused on instructional improvement priorities (e.g., differentiated instruction, classroom management, or formative assessment strategies).
6. Utilize assessment results to guide informed instructional decisions and improve the overall quality of teaching and learning.

Students:

7. Participate in classroom activities that promote engagement, collaboration, and independent learning.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank the colleagues and institutions who provided guidance, feedback, and support throughout the conduct of this research and the preparation of this manuscript. Any remaining errors or omissions are the sole responsibility of the authors.

Funding

This research received no external funding from any public, commercial, or not-for-profit funding agency, and no organization provided financial support for the conduct of the study, authorship, or publication of this article.

Competing Interests Statement

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this article.

Data Availability Statement

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study; all data used were obtained from previously published sources as cited in the reference list.

References

- Academia, J. R. (2025). Transformational Leadership Skills of Head Teachers: Their Influence to School Effectiveness. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v8-i01-37>
- Alaro, A. G., Thuo, M. W., & Lodesso, S. L. (2025). Paradoxical effects of principals' leadership styles on school performance in government secondary schools in Wolaita Zone South Ethiopia. *Discover Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00996-4>
- Aldhaheri, A. (2023). Do school leaders in the Emirate of Abu Dhabi predominantly practice a transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire style of leadership? *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 31(5), 1826-1840. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijoa-06-2021-2824>
- Alegre-Quintana, J. A., & Gutiérrez-Falcón, P. C. (2025). Leadership styles and participation in the occupational health and safety management system. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23, 3016. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v23i0.3016>
- Ali, M., Niu, X., & Rubel, M. R. B. (2024). The influence of transformational and transactional leadership on employee retention: mediating role of employee engagement. *Management Matters*, 21(2), 164-190. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MANM-03-2024-0022>
- Almario, J. I. F., Castro, R. L. G., Pabustan, C. J. S., David, C. J. P., Macabali, A. J., Tolentino, J. C. G., & Valenzuela, L. R. (2023). fostering pre-service physical educators' retention of concepts in a professional education course using Moneyopoly game. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(9), 3366-3389. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.09.24>
- Alpuerto, M. G. B., Bentayao, G. J. L., Bustamante, G. B., Lubguban, N. S., Quibod, C. P. G., & Dupa, L. B. (2025). Exploring the Ripple Effect: How Teachers and Feedback Shape the Flow of Student Involvement, Discussion, and Knowledge Exchange to Enrich Learning Outcomes. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.905000376>
- Alzoraiki, M., Ahmad, A. R., Ateeq, A., & Milhem, M. (2024, July). The role of transformational leadership in enhancing school culture and teaching performance in Yemeni public schools. In *Frontiers in education* (Vol. 9, p. 1413607). Frontiers Media SA. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1413607>
- Andriadi, D., & Sulistiyo, U. (2024). The influence of transformational and instructional leadership styles of school principals on teacher performance, motivation, job satisfaction, and student achievement in primary and secondary schools. *PPSPD International Journal of Education*, 3(2), 536-548. <https://doi.org/10.59175/pijed.v3i2.335>
- Balili, D. M., & General, L. T. (2023). Transformational Leadership of School Heads and School Culture as Predictors of Professional Commitment. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 8(3) <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7787519>
- Bandahala, D. E. (2024). Explicit Instruction in Teaching General Mathematics and the Application of Concrete-Pictorial-Abstract Approach. *International Journal of Management Research and Analysis*, 7(10), 32-39. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i10-32>

- Baniqued, W. B., Cagatao, P. P. S., & Bautista, R. G. (2024). Modelling the Interplay of K-12 Science Teachers' Pedagogical Practices. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 12(11), 420-426. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-12-11-2>
- Bhuttah, T. M., Xusheng, Q., Abid, M. N., & Sharma, S. (2024). Enhancing student critical thinking and learning outcomes through innovative pedagogical approaches in higher education: the mediating role of inclusive leadership. *Scientific reports*, 14(1), 24362. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4864296/v1>
- Cadungog, J. L., & Rollo, C. R. (2024). UTILIZATION OF EXPLICIT INSTRUCTION IN KINDERGARTEN. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 11(3). <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v11i3.5241>
- Cagasan, L., Care, E., Robertson, P., & Luo, R. (2020). Developing a formative assessment protocol to examine formative assessment practices in the Philippines. *Educational Assessment*, 25(4), 259-275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2020.1766960>
- Cagatan, A. N. P., & Quirap, E. A. (2024). Collaborative learning and learners' academic performance. *International journal of multidisciplinary research and analysis*, 7(3), 1326-1335. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i03-57>
- Chinpakdee, M., & Gu, P. Y. (2024). The impact of explicit strategy instruction on EFL secondary school learners' reading. *Language Teaching Research*, 28(1), 296-319. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688219941>
- Chow, J. C., Sayers, R., Fu, Y., Granger, K. L., McCullough, S., Kingsbery, C., & Morse, A. (2024). A systematic meta-review of measures of classroom management in school settings. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 49(2), 60-74. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15345084231208671>
- Da'as, R. A. (2023). Between principals' and a teacher's perspective taking: the role of transformational and transactional leadership styles. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 26(4), 722-744. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2020.1850871>
- Dacpano, E. B. (2022). The Influence of School Heads' Transformational Leadership on Schools' Performance: The Case of City Schools Division of San Fernando, La Union. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 3(9), 1717-1736. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber03.09.12>
- De Bruijn-Smolers, M., & Prinsen, F. R. (2024). Effective Student Engagement with Blended Learning A systematic review. *Heliyon*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e39439>
- Deng, C., Gulseren, D., Isola, C., Grocutt, K., & Turner, N. (2023). Transformational leadership effectiveness: an evidence-based primer. *Human Resource Development International*, 26(5), 627-641. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2022.2135938>
- Dumagyo, C. J. E., & Ponsades, O. P. (2024). Supportive learning environment and assertive classroom management strategies as a contributing factor of the academic resiliency of T.L.E. students. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 9(6), 1028-1035. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/IJISRT24JUN1028>
- Duran, C. (2025). Leading with impact: The relationship between school heads' multifactor leadership styles and teachers' job satisfaction in public secondary schools. *British Journal of Teacher Education and Pedagogy*, 4(6), 01-14. <https://doi.org/10.32996/bjtep.2025.4.6.1>
- Esogon, S. G. T., & Gumban, J. L. (2024). Transformational Leadership of School Heads in Public Elementary Schools in Bacolod City, Philippines. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(3s), 3244-3255. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.803231s>
- Esparcia, R. D., Piñero, B. A., & Futralan, M. C. Z. Learners' Scaffolding Techniques: Their Advantages in Learning Mathematics. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0144>
- Fuentes, A. G. P. (2025). Assessing the effect of the gradual release of responsibility (GRR) model in teaching science. <https://doi.org/10.37134/ajatel.vol14.1.2.2024>
- Hiba, K. (2023). The Correlation between the Principal's Leadership Style and the Commitment of Teachers in Arab Schools in Israel. *Revista de Management Comparat International*, 24(5), 868-881. <https://doi.org/10.24818/rmci.2023.13.868>
- Hieng, S., Hum, C., Seoung, S., Sam, R., Phorn, P., & Vy, S. (2024). Transactional Leadership Style in Higher Educations: A Systematic Literature Review. *Scientia. Technology, Science and Society*, 1(3), 126-144. [https://doi.org/10.59324/stss.2024.1\(3\).08](https://doi.org/10.59324/stss.2024.1(3).08)
- Ingaran, A. V., Madriaga, E. B., Cagatao, P. P. S., & Bautista, R. G. (2025). Factors affecting teacher professionalism and ethical considerations in west cluster of schools, division of Santiago city, Philippines. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 13(2), 46-51. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-13-2-1>
- Joan, S., Jennifer, V., Medalla, P., & Iris, G. (2025). Instructional leadership among elementary school heads: Examining the relationships of demographic profiles, leadership practices and associated challenges. *CTU Journal of Innovation and Sustainable Development*, 17(3), 74-87. <https://doi.org/10.22144/ctujoisd.2025.065>
- Katsikas, A. (2025). Leadership style in education: Advantages and challenges. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 17(3), 397-403. <https://doi.org/10.26822/iejee.2025.387>
- Md Yusof, M. A., Wee, S. C., Md Akhir, N. A., & Mohamed, M. A. (2023, November). Transforming Petroleum Engineering Education: A Practical Industry-Oriented Capstone Project. In *International Conference on Advancing and Redesigning Education* (pp. 141-152). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-4507-4_16

- Nketsia, W., Opoku, M. P., & Amponteng, M. (2025). Inclusive teaching practices in secondary schools: Understanding teachers' competence in using differentiated instruction to support secondary school students with disabilities. *Education Sciences*, 15(12), 1613. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15121613>
- Ozdogru, M., Sarier, Y., & Korucuoglu, T. (2025). How Leadership and School Climate Influence Student Achievement: Evidence from a Comparative Meta-Analysis. *International Journal*, 15, e2025156. <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2025.15.156>
- Panga, K., Bohayo, C. P., Oquialda, E., Tabayag, M. K., & Bradecina, J. B. (2025). The Influence of Principal Leadership on School Improvement in a Philippine Public Secondary School: A Qualitative Study. *Journal of Mathematics Instruction, Social Research and Opinion*, 4(4), 1013-1024. <https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v4i4.526>
- Punzalan, A., & De Jesus, L. (2024). Influence of Effective School Leadership on Teachers' Performance: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 2(11), 405-410. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0324>
- Ramirez, H. J. C., & Capili, J. T. (2024). Leadership Style of School Heads And Its Influence to Teacher Retention: Basis for a Teacher Retention Plan. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 10, 25-57. <https://doi.org/10.56648/aide-irj.v10i1.151>
- Regidor, A. R., Vesmanos, A. T., & Deguito, P. O. (2024). The impact of supportive learning environment on student learning motivation of senior high school students. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 50(7), 558-571. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i71487>
- Rusticus, S. A., Pashootan, T., & Mah, A. (2023). What are the key elements of a positive learning environment? Perspectives from students and faculty. *Learning environments research*, 26(1), 161-175. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-022-09410-4>
- Simbre, A. P., Buenaventura, M. L. D., Aquino, J. M., de Vera, J. L., & de Vera, M. G. D. (2023). THE EFFECT OF SCHOOL HEADS'LEADERSHIP STYLE ON LEARNERS'PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL CLIMATE. *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen*, 21(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jam.2023.021.1.01>
- Soriano, Q. S., & Banayo, A. F. (2024). Harmony of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles towards Positive Change in Teachers' Motivation, Attitude, and Performance. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 9(8). <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/IJISRT24AUG987>
- Sortwell, A., Trimble, K., Ferraz, R., Geelan, D. R., Hine, G., Ramirez-Campillo, R., ... & Xuan, Q. (2024). A systematic review of meta-analyses on the impact of formative assessment on K-12 students' learning: Toward sustainable quality education. *Sustainability*, 16(17), 7826. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16177826>
- Sun, L., Kangas, M., Ruokamo, H., & Siklander, S. (2023). A systematic literature review of teacher scaffolding in game-based learning in primary education. *Educational Research Review*, 40, 100546. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2023.100546>
- Surbakti, R., Umboh, S. E., Pong, M., & Dara, S. (2024). Cognitive load theory: Implications for instructional design in digital classrooms. *International Journal of Educational Narratives*, 2(6), 483-493. <https://doi.org/10.70177/ijen.v2i6.1659>
- Torres, J. L., Abugan, M. D. Q., Ouano, A. A., Japinan, S. M. E., Peranco, R. E., & Ampil, F. D. (2024). Leadership styles and their impact on educational outcomes in the Philippines. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability and Excellence*, 1(11), 253-260. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14172311>
- Vo, K., Sarkar, M., White, P. J., & Yuriev, E. (2024). Development of problem-solving skills supported by metacognitive scaffolding: insights from students' written work. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 25(4), 1197-1209. <https://doi.org/10.1039/d3rp00284e>
- Yalçın, M. T., & Çoban, Ö. (2023). Effect of school leadership on student academic achievement: School level path variables. *Current Psychology*, 42(25), 21249-21262. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-04886-6>
- Yao, Y., Amos, M., Snider, K., & Brown, T. (2024). The impact of formative assessment on K-12 learning: a meta-analysis. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 29(7-8), 452-475. <https://doi.org/10.21449/ijate.870300>
- Zhang, X., & Mauhay, R. C. A. (2024). Classroom management, teaching strategies, and effectiveness among teachers in selected provinces in China. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 13(12), 131-144. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2024.24738>

Appendices

No appendices are attached to this study.