

Pedagogical Approaches and Work Performance of Teachers in Public Elementary Schools

Analiza C. Dilidili, MAEd

Graduate Student, Tomas Claudio Colleges, Morong, Rizal, Philippines

Teacher II, Bagumbayan Elementary School, Teresa, Rizal Philippines

Publication history: Received: March 1, 2026; Revised: March 12, 2026; Accepted: March 25, 2026

Email of Corresponding Author: analiza.dilidili001@deped.gov.ph

Abstract

This study examined the pedagogical approaches and work performance of teachers in public elementary schools in Teresa District during the School Year 2024–2025. Specifically, it identified the extent to which constructivist, inquiry-based, reflective, collaborative, and integrative approaches were utilized and determined their relationship with teachers' work performance. A descriptive survey research design complemented by documentary analysis was employed. The respondents consisted of 268 teachers from seven public elementary schools, selected through total population sampling. Data on pedagogical approaches were gathered using a researcher-made questionnaire-checklist, while work performance was measured through the teachers' Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) results. Findings revealed that the majority of teacher-respondents were middle-aged, predominantly female, married, and holders of a baccalaureate degree, with 5–9 years of teaching experience and occupying Teacher I positions. They had participated in various in-service trainings. The results further showed that pedagogical approaches were "often utilized" across all five domains. Statistical analysis indicated no significant differences in the extent of pedagogical approaches when grouped according to demographic variables. Moreover, teachers demonstrated a "very satisfactory" level of work performance based on their IPCR ratings. Notably, no significant relationship was found between pedagogical approaches and work performance. The study concluded that teachers' demographic characteristics do not significantly influence their pedagogical practices, and the use of varied pedagogical approaches does not directly correlate with their work performance. It is recommended that school administrators promote the integration of technology, foster collaborative learning environments, and support differentiated instruction. Teachers are encouraged to continuously apply effective pedagogical strategies to enhance student engagement and learning outcomes. The proposed action plan may be implemented, and future studies may explore additional variables.

Keywords: pedagogical approaches, work performance, elementary teachers, constructivist approach, inquiry-based learning, descriptive survey, IPCR

1. Introduction

Education is widely recognized as a vital instrument for national development and a driving force toward sustainable progress and modernization. It equips individuals with the necessary knowledge, skills, values, and competencies to become productive and responsible citizens. As a fundamental human right, education must be accessible and of high quality, which places significant responsibility on teachers as key agents in the teaching-learning process. Teachers are expected to create learning environments that are conducive to active engagement, critical thinking, and holistic development of learners.

The 1987 Philippine Constitution underscores the State's commitment to education by promoting teachers' professional advancement and ensuring that the sector receives the highest budgetary priority. In line with this mandate, teachers are provided opportunities for continuous professional growth to enhance their competencies and effectiveness. The Department of Education (DepEd) further strengthens this commitment through policies such as Republic Act 10533 and DepEd Order No. 10, s. 2024, which highlight the importance of aligning pedagogies, content standards, and learning competencies under the MATATAG Curriculum. These reforms emphasize the need for teachers to utilize appropriate pedagogical approaches that cater to diverse learners and promote meaningful learning outcomes.

Anchored on the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), effective teaching requires mastery of both content knowledge and pedagogy. Teachers are encouraged to employ a range of instructional approaches, including constructivist, inquiry-based, collaborative, integrative, and reflective strategies, to foster higher-order thinking skills and learner engagement. These pedagogical approaches are integral to achieving quality teaching and improving student outcomes, as they support active participation, critical thinking, and contextualized learning experiences.

Numerous studies, both foreign and local, have examined the role of pedagogical approaches in education. Foreign studies revealed that effective teaching practices significantly influence student performance and learning outcomes. Heider (2023) found that teaching practices such as communication skills, subject knowledge, and instructional strategies significantly improved students' academic performance. Similarly, Janardhanan (2024) emphasized the strong relationship between pedagogical approaches, technology integration, and student success, while Purwanto (2020) confirmed the significant effect of pedagogical competence on learning outcomes. Studies by Nasibi (2022) and Adhikari (2021) further highlighted the importance of pedagogical skills in enhancing learners' abilities and classroom management. Local studies also affirm the importance of pedagogical approaches in improving educational outcomes. De Leon (2024) and Evangelio (2022) found that varied teaching approaches significantly influence students' academic performance and engagement. On the other hand, Agpasa (2022) reported no significant differences in pedagogical practices when grouped according to teachers' demographic profiles, suggesting consistency in instructional approaches. Other studies, such as those by Ampang (2023), Roallos (2022), and Malgapo (2020), explored the utilization, challenges, and effectiveness of pedagogical approaches in different educational contexts, emphasizing the need for continuous professional development and instructional support.

Despite the extensive body of literature, most studies primarily focus on the relationship between pedagogical approaches and student performance. There is limited research examining how these approaches relate to teachers' work performance, particularly in the context of public elementary schools in the Philippines. Moreover, few studies utilize standardized performance measures such as the Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) to assess teacher effectiveness. This indicates a significant gap in the literature regarding whether the application of pedagogical approaches directly contributes to teachers' professional performance. In addition, there is a growing need for evidence-based teaching practices and strengthened accountability within the education sector. While pedagogical approaches are widely promoted in policies and professional standards, their direct impact on teachers' work performance in actual school settings remains underexplored. Understanding this relationship is essential in guiding school administrators in designing targeted professional development programs, enhancing instructional supervision, and providing appropriate support systems for teachers.

In response to these gaps, the present study investigates the pedagogical approaches and work performance of teachers in public elementary schools in Teresa District. By focusing on teacher performance rather than solely on student outcomes, this study offers a distinct contribution to the existing body of knowledge. The findings are expected to inform educational leaders and policymakers in improving instructional practices, strengthening teacher development programs, and ensuring that pedagogical innovations lead to meaningful and measurable improvements in teaching quality and overall school effectiveness.

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Research Design

The study applied the descriptive method of research specifically, the survey design with documentary analysis.

2.2 Research Setting

The study was conducted in public elementary schools in Teresa District, Schools Division Office of Rizal. These schools include Abuyod Elementary School, Bagumbayan Elementary School, Pantay Elementary School, Prinza Elementary School, Quiterio San Jose Elementary School, Quiterio San Jose Elementary School- Annex and Teresa Elementary School. These schools offer complete elementary education from kindergarten level to grade six level.

2.3 Respondents

The respondents of the study included the total population of teachers in public elementary schools in Teresa District. This consists of 268 teachers. They were described in terms of age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, position title, length of service and in-service trainings attended.

2.4 Research Instruments

The study utilized a researcher-made questionnaire-checklist as the primary data-gathering instrument, consisting of two main parts. The first part gathered the respondents' personal and professional profile, including age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, length of service, position title, and in-service trainings attended. The second part measured the extent of teachers' pedagogical approaches across five domains: constructivist, inquiry-based, reflective, collaborative, and integrative, with each domain containing 10 items for a total of 50 items. A five-point Likert scale was used to interpret responses, ranging from "Never" to "Always." Meanwhile, teachers' work performance was determined based on their latest Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) ratings, categorized from "Poor" to "Outstanding." The instrument underwent content validation by experts in research and education, including the thesis adviser, statistician, faculty members, and school administrators, whose feedback was incorporated to ensure its validity and reliability.

2.5 Data Collection

The researcher followed the Gantt Chart of Activities in the conduct of the study. This includes the formulation of research problem up to the revision of the manuscript and submission of the final copy. After the validation of the instrument, permission to conduct the study was obtained from the Office of the Schools Division Superintendent. The questionnaire-checklist was administered to the respondents through the Google Survey form. Guidelines in the Data Privacy Act of 2012 were considered. .

After the retrieval, the data were encoded and processed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences(SPSS). Analysis and interpretation of data followed. Based on the interpreted data, summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations were formulated. After the oral defense, the manuscript was revised considering the comments and suggestions of the Oral Examination Committee. The study was also subjected to anti plagiarism test. After finalization, hard bound copies were submitted to the office of the Graduate Studies Program and other offices.

2.6 Data Analysis

The study employed various statistical tools for data analysis and interpretation. Frequency, percentage, and rank distribution were used to describe the respondents' profile based on selected variables. The weighted mean was applied to determine the extent of pedagogical approaches of teachers across different aspects. To test for significant differences in pedagogical approaches when grouped according to profile variables, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized. The level of teachers' work performance, based on their Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) results, was analyzed using frequency, mean, and standard deviation. Finally, correlation analysis was employed to examine the significant relationship between the extent of pedagogical approaches and the level of work performance of teachers.

2.7 Ethical Considerations

The study ensured the protection of the rights and welfare of all respondents. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed about the purpose of the study. Confidentiality and anonymity of all information provided were strictly maintained, and data were used solely for research purposes. The researcher ensured that the respondents were treated with respect and that no harm, whether physical, emotional, or psychological, would result from their participation in the study.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Selected Variables

It can be seen from the table that among the 268 teachers, there are 103 or 38.4 percent who belong to age bracket of 31-40 years old; followed by 80 or 29.9 percent who aged 41-50 years old; while 45 or 16.8 percent are 21-30 years old and only 40 or 14.9 percent are 51 years old and above. In terms of sex, majority of them are female with 222 or 82.8 percent and only 46 or 17.2 percent are males. As regard to their civil status, most of them are married with 170 or 63.4 percent; followed by 84 or 31.3 percent who are single and only 11 or 4.1 are widow/widower and 3 or 1.1 percent who are separated/annulled respectively. In terms of educational attainment, several of them are Bachelor's Degree holders with 108 or 40.3 percent; followed by Masters' Degree with 83 or 31.0 percent and Bachelors with MA units with 62 or 23.1 percent who are pursuing Masters' Degree; while only 12 or 4.5 percent are MA with Doctoral units and 3 or 1.1 who are Doctorate Degree holders. As regard to length of service, most of them are teaching for 5-9 years with 78 or 29.1 percent; followed by 10-14 years of teaching experience with 60 or 22.4 percent; hence there are only 16 or 6.0 percent who stayed in teaching for 25 years and above. The remaining percentages are teachers who have been in the service for 15-19 years, 4 years and below and 20-20 years respectively. In terms of position, mostly are holding a Teacher I position with 152 or 56.7 percent; followed by Teachers III with 70 or 26.1 percent and only 16 or 6.0 percent with Master Teacher I teaching position who have attended in-service trainings in the Division Level and School Level; while few have attended in-service trainings in the District Level and National Level.

Table 1: *Profile of the Respondents in Terms of the Selected Variables*

Profile	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
Age			
51 years old and above	40	14.9	4
41 – 50 years old	80	29.9	2
31 – 40 years old	103	38.4	1
21 – 30 years old	45	16.8	3
Total	268	100.0	
Sex			
Male	46	17.2	2
Female	222	82.8	1
Total	268	100.0	

Civil Status			
Single	84	31.3	2
Married	170	63.4	1
Separated/Annulled	3	1.1	4
Widow/Widower	11	4.1	3
Total	268	100.0	
Educational Attainment			
Bachelor's Degree	108	40.3	1
Bachelors With MA units	62	23.1	3
Masters' Degree	83	31.0	2
MA with Doctoral Units	12	4.5	4
Doctorate Degree	3	1.1	5
Total	268	100.0	
Length of Service			
25 years and above	16	6.0	6
20 – 24 years	28	10.4	5
15 – 19 years	44	16.4	3
10 – 14 years	60	22.4	2
5 – 9 years	78	29.1	1
4 years and below	42	15.7	4
Total	268	100.0	
Position Title			
Master Teacher I	16	6.0	4
Teacher III	70	26.1	2
Teacher II	30	11.2	3
Teacher I	152	56.7	1
Total	268	100.0	
In-Service Trainings Attended			
National Level	31	11.6	5
Regional Level	59	22.0	3
Division Level	72	26.9	1
District Level	40	14.9	4
School Level	66	24.6	2
Total	268	100.0	

3.2. Extent of Pedagogical Approaches of Teachers as Perceived by Themselves With Respect to the Different Aspects

It can be seen from the table that with respect to the pedagogical approaches, the composite mean obtained is 3.67 verbally interpreted as Often. Among the aspects, “Reflective Approach” got the highest weighted mean of 3.90; followed by “Integrative Approach” with an obtained weighted mean of 3.69 and “Inquiry-Based Approach with an obtained weighted mean of 3.68 all are interpreted Often; while “Constructivism Approach” got a weighted mean of 3.62 also interpreted Often and “Collaborative Approach” obtained the lowest weighted mean of 3.44 verbally interpreted Sometimes. It can be deduced from the findings that pedagogical approaches are often utilized by teachers with respect to constructivist approach, inquiry-based approach, reflective approach, collaborative approach and integrative approach. This means that teachers frequently apply a variety of learner-centered teaching strategies across multiple pedagogical frameworks. These approaches collectively emphasize active student engagement, critical thinking, collaboration, real-world connections, and continuous reflection—core principles of effective 21st-century teaching. The results imply that teachers themselves believed that they are increasingly embracing diverse and progressive teaching methods that promote holistic learning. Their frequent use suggests a shift away from traditional, teacher-centered instruction toward more dynamic, student-centered environments. This indicates a growing alignment with modern educational goals that aim to develop not only academic skills but also creativity, communication, and lifelong learning habits. This is in consonance with the ideas of Raquiza (2020), that the pedagogical approaches reflect an educator’s teaching preferences and how different students learn best. The practice is often based on pedagogical principles or even the personal beliefs of the educator but can be customized for targeted learning outcomes as well. Pedagogical approaches often depend on the instructor’s style of teaching and trainer skills, but they may also be tailored according to the learning material and types of learners.

Table 2:. *Extent of Pedagogical Approaches of Teachers as Perceived by Themselves With Respect to the Different Aspects*

Aspects	Overall Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
Constructivist Approach	3.62	Often	4
Inquiry-Based Approach	3.68	Often	3
Reflective Approach	3.90	Often	1
Collaborative Approach	3.44	Sometimes	5
Integrative Approach	3.69	Often	2
Composite Mean	3.67	Often	

3.3. Significant Difference on the Extent of Pedagogical Approaches of Teachers as Perceived by Themselves with Respect to the Different Aspects in Terms of Their Profile

It can be gleaned from the table that the null hypothesis is accepted as the computed F-values are accompanied by p-values higher than 0.05 for all pedagogical approaches when grouped by age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, position title, length of service and in-service trainings attended. This means that the null hypothesis is accepted. The finding that there is no significant difference in the extent to which pedagogical approaches specifically the constructivism, inquiry-based, reflective, collaborative, and integrative approaches are utilized by teachers as perceived by themselves, regardless of age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, position title, length of service, and in-service trainings attended, means that these demographic and professional variables do not appear to influence how frequently teachers apply these methods. This further means that teachers across different personal and professional backgrounds tend to report similar levels of usage of these pedagogical approaches. The results suggest a relatively uniform awareness and application of modern, learner-centered teaching strategies across the teaching workforce, possibly due to shared curricular standards, institutional expectations, or exposure to common teaching philosophies. Moreover, this uniformity may point to the effectiveness of existing teacher education programs or school-based training sessions in promoting consistent pedagogical practices. This is aligned with the findings of the study of Agpasa (2022), that the profile traits of the instructor responders do not affect the extent to which pedagogical strategies are used while instructing various learners. Age, the highest level of education, and the number of relevant training sessions attended by public elementary school teachers correlate strongly with their profile traits..

Table 3: *Significant Difference on the Extent of Pedagogical Approaches of Teachers as Perceived by Themselves with Respect to the Different Aspects in Terms of Their Profile*

Profile	f-value	p-value	Decision	Verbal Interpretation
Age				
Constructivist Approach	.380	.767	Accepted	Not Significant
Inquiry-Based Approach	.227	.877	Accepted	Not Significant
Reflective Approach	.244	.866	Accepted	Not Significant
Collaborative Approach	1.364	.254	Accepted	Not Significant
Integrative Approach	1.441	.231	Accepted	Not Significant
Sex				
Constructivist Approach	.020	.887	Accepted	Not Significant
Inquiry-Based Approach	1.523	.218	Accepted	Not Significant
Reflective Approach	1.958	.163	Accepted	Not Significant
Collaborative Approach	.134	.715	Accepted	Not Significant
Integrative Approach	1.349	.065	Accepted	Not Significant
Civil Status				
Constructivist Approach	1.165	.117	Accepted	Not Significant
Inquiry-Based Approach	.126	.945	Accepted	Not Significant
Reflective Approach	2.323	.075	Accepted	Not Significant
Collaborative Approach	1.931	.125	Accepted	Not Significant
Integrative Approach	.626	.599	Accepted	Not Significant
Educational Attainment				
Constructivist Approach	.316	.867	Accepted	Not Significant

Inquiry-Based Approach	1.980	.098	Accepted	Not Significant
Reflective Approach	.570	.685	Accepted	Not Significant
Collaborative Approach	.117	.976	Accepted	Not Significant
Integrative Approach	.256	.906	Accepted	Not Significant
Position Title				
Constructivist Approach	.656	.657	Accepted	Not Significant
Inquiry-Based Approach	.288	.919	Accepted	Not Significant
Reflective Approach	.219	.954	Accepted	Not Significant
Collaborative Approach	.854	.513	Accepted	Not Significant
Integrative Approach	2.149	.060	Accepted	Not Significant
Length of Service				
Constructivist Approach	.077	.972	Accepted	Not Significant
Inquiry-Based Approach	1.602	.189	Accepted	Not Significant
Reflective Approach	.484	.694	Accepted	Not Significant
Collaborative Approach	.932	.426	Accepted	Not Significant
Integrative Approach	1.343	.261	Accepted	Not Significant
In-service Trainings Attended				
Constructivist Approach	2.211	.068	Accepted	Not Significant
Inquiry-Based Approach	.809	.520	Accepted	Not Significant
Reflective Approach	.434	.784	Accepted	Not Significant
Collaborative Approach	1.267	.283	Accepted	Not Significant
Integrative Approach	1.156	.331	Accepted	Not Significant

3.4. Level of Work Performance of Teachers as Revealed in Their Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) Form

As depicted from the table, the level of work performance of teachers as revealed in their Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) form indicated that among the 268 teachers, there are 240 or 89.6 percent who obtained a numerical point between 3.51-4.50 with an adjective rating of Very Satisfactory, followed by 24 or 9.0 percent who obtained a numerical point of 4.51-5.00 with adjective rating of Outstanding and there are only 4 or 1.5 percent who obtained a numerical point of 2.51-3.50 with adjective rating of Satisfactory; however no one got Unsatisfactory and Poor work performance. The highest rating obtained is 4.90 and the lowest rating of 3.31 with a mean rating of 4.440 and standard deviation of 2.2218. It can be noted that the teachers are performing very satisfactory as revealed in their Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) form. This means that teachers are consistently meeting and in many cases exceeding the expected standards and objectives set by their roles and responsibilities. A "very satisfactory" rating typically reflects strong performance in areas such as instructional delivery, classroom management, learner outcomes, professional development, and contribution to school goals. This implies that teachers are effectively fulfilling their duties and demonstrating a high level of competence and professionalism. This suggests a positive impact on student learning, school performance, and overall educational quality. It also indicates that the support systems such as training programs, leadership, and evaluation tools are functioning well to guide and enhance teacher performance. This relates with the ideas of Hawton (2022) that teachers' performance is often assessed based on their knowledge of subject matter and their ability to implement effective pedagogical strategies. Teachers are encouraged to continuously develop their skills and knowledge through professional development programs to enhance their pedagogical practices.

Table 4: Level of Work Performance of Teachers as Revealed in Their Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) Form

Adjectival Rating	Numerical Point	Frequency	Percent	Rank
Outstanding	4.51 – 5.00	24	9.0	2
Very Satisfactory	3.51 – 4.50	240	89.6	1
Satisfactory	2.51 - 3.50	4	1.5	3
Unsatisfactory	1.51 - 2.50	-	-	-
Poor	1.50 and below	-	-	-
Total		268	100.0	
Highest Rating			4.90	
Lowest Rating			3.31	

Mean Rating	4.440 (VS)
Standard Deviation	2.2218

3.5. Significant Relationship Between the Extent of Pedagogical Approaches and Level of Work Performance of Teachers

The results show that the p-values associated with the computed r-values are greater than 0.05, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This indicates that there is no significant relationship between the pedagogical approaches employed by teachers and their level of work performance. In other words, teachers' work performance is not significantly influenced by the extent to which they utilize various pedagogical approaches, suggesting that these two variables operate independently. These findings imply that teachers are able to perform their duties effectively regardless of the specific pedagogical approaches they employ. While teachers demonstrate strong content knowledge and pedagogical competence, challenges remain in areas such as technology integration and adapting to evolving educational trends. The results are consistent with the findings of Roallos (2022), which revealed that teachers highly utilized constructivist, collaborative, inquiry-based, and integrative approaches, but showed limitations in areas such as triangulation assessment and action research. Moreover, while teachers were knowledgeable in applying learners' background, vocabulary development, and interactive classroom strategies, they expressed hesitation in using more complex strategies such as creative thinking tools and off-classroom activities.

Table 5: Significant Relationship Between the Extent of Pedagogical Approaches and Level of Work Performance of Teachers

Variables		r-value	p-value	Ho	Verbal Interpretation
Level of Work Performance	Constructivist Approach	.079	.198	Accepted	Not Significant
	Inquiry-Based Approach	.047	.447	Accepted	Not Significant
	Reflective Approach	.009	.879	Accepted	Not Significant
	Collaborative Approach	.084	.169	Accepted	Not Significant
	Integrative Approach	.055	.374	Accepted	Not Significant

4. Conclusion & Recommendations

The study concludes that teachers' demographic and professional characteristics—such as age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, position title, length of service, and in-service trainings attended—do not significantly influence the pedagogical approaches they employ in teaching. Furthermore, the findings reveal that the pedagogical approaches utilized by teachers are not significantly associated with their level of work performance. This suggests that regardless of the extent to which various teaching approaches are applied, teachers are still able to maintain a satisfactory level of performance in their professional responsibilities.

In light of these conclusions, it is recommended that school administrators promote the integration of technology as a supportive tool in enhancing the teaching-learning process while maintaining effective instructional practices. They should also foster a collaborative learning environment that encourages interaction, group activities, and meaningful discussions. Teachers are encouraged to adopt differentiated instruction to address diverse learner needs and continuously apply effective pedagogical approaches to improve student engagement and understanding. The implementation of the proposed action plan is likewise suggested, and future studies may be conducted to explore other variables that may influence teachers' pedagogical practices and work performance.

Compliance with ethical standards

The author declares no conflict of interest. This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. This study was self-funded. The authors thank the participating university and the nursing students for their contributions.

REFERENCES

- Adams, L., & Brown, S. (2022). Performance assessment tools and their influence on teacher effectiveness: A comprehensive study. *Journal of Educational Research*, 59(4), 421–438.
- Agpasa, L. M. (2022). Influence of teacher demographic profiles on the use of pedagogical approaches. *Philippine Journal of Education Research*, 14(2), 55–68.
- Ampang, A. (2023). Effectiveness of innovative teaching strategies in primary education. *International Journal of Educational Studies*, 9(1), 112–125.
- Brown, S. (2021). Continuous feedback and support: Essential elements of teacher performance evaluation. *Teaching and Learning Quarterly*, 33(1), 56–71.
- Cruz, C. E. (2024). The effectiveness of the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form as an evaluation tool to improve teachers' performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(2).
- De Leon, P. (2024). Impact of varied teaching approaches on student academic performance. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 18(1), 23–38.
- Department of Education (DepEd). (2017). DO 42, s. 2017: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) [Policy document]. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
- Department of Education (DepEd). (2024). DepEd Order No. 10, s. 2024: Policy guidelines on the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum [Policy document]. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
- Evangelio, M. T. (2022). Student-centered pedagogical practices in elementary classrooms. *Journal of Philippine Education*, 12(3), 44–58.
- Fernandez, S. (2020). Localized teacher performance evaluation methods and their adaptation to the Philippines' unique needs. *Philippine Educational Review*, 34(3), 211–228.
- Heider, S. (2023). Teaching practices and student academic performance: A global perspective. *International Journal of Education*, 15(4), 201–215.
- Janardhanan, R. (2024). Pedagogy, technology integration, and student success in primary education. *Educational Research Review*, 11(2), 45–63.
- Malgapo, R. (2020). Utilization of pedagogical approaches in Philippine elementary classrooms. *Philippine Educational Review*, 10(1), 77–90.
- Nasibi, A. (2022). Enhancing learners' abilities through effective pedagogical skills. *Asian Journal of Education Research*, 7(2), 89–104.
- Philippine Constitution of 1987. (1987). Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/constitutions/1987-constitution/>
- Purwanto, A. (2020). Pedagogical competence and learning outcomes: Evidence from Southeast Asia. *Journal of Educational Development*, 5(3), 31–45.
- Republic Act No. 10533. (2013). Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013. Official Gazette. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/>
- Republic Act No. 9155. (2001). Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. Official Gazette. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/>
- Roallos, J. (2022). Classroom practices and teacher performance in public schools. *Journal of Philippine Education Research*, 16(2), 88–102.