

Classroom Management, Teaching Strategies, and Engagement in Relation to Performance: Implications for Educational Plan

Divina D. Damalerio

La Carlota City College Graduate School Negros Occidental, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100800224>

Received: 14 August 2026; Accepted: 19 August 2026; Published: 31 August 2026

ABSTRACT

This study entitled “Classroom Management, Teaching Strategies, And Engagement In Relation To Performance: Implications For Educational Plan” examined the levels of classroom management, teaching strategies, student engagement, and academic performance among public secondary school teachers in selected schools in Murcia and E.B. Magalona, Negros Occidental. Effective classroom management, appropriate instructional strategies, and meaningful learner engagement are recognized as essential factors that contribute to educational quality and academic success. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, the study involved 152 public secondary school teachers. Data were gathered through a validated survey questionnaire, while academic performance data were obtained from school-approved academic records. Frequency counts, percentages, means, standard deviations, Mann-Whitney U Test, Kruskal-Wallis H Test, and Spearman Rank-Order Correlation were used in the analysis of data. Findings revealed that teachers demonstrated an Outstanding level of classroom management ($M = 4.82$, $SD = 0.26$), a Very High level of teaching strategies ($M = 4.76$, $SD = 0.31$), and a Very High level of student engagement ($M = 4.63$, $SD = 0.44$). Learners obtained a Very Satisfactory level of academic performance ($M = 86.24$, $SD = 6.68$). No significant differences were found in classroom management, teaching strategies, and student engagement when grouped according to age, sex, educational attainment, and length of service. Likewise, classroom management and teaching strategies were not significantly related to academic performance. However, student engagement demonstrated a significant positive relationship with academic performance ($r_s = 0.191$, $p = 0.018$). The findings served as the basis for a proposed Educational Plan aimed at strengthening learner engagement, enhancing instructional effectiveness, and sustaining academic achievement.

Keywords: Classroom Management, Teaching Strategies, Student Engagement, Academic Performance, Educational Plan

Background

The quality of education in the 21st century increasingly depends on teachers' ability to effectively manage classrooms, implement innovative instructional strategies, and foster meaningful student engagement. These factors collectively influence learners' academic performance and overall educational outcomes. Effective classroom management establishes a conducive learning environment, while innovative teaching strategies promote active participation and critical thinking among students. Student engagement, in turn, serves as a key determinant of academic success, influencing motivation, attendance, retention, and achievement.

Globally, concerns regarding classroom management and student engagement continue to challenge educational systems. According to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), findings from the Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) indicate that more than 77% of teachers identify classroom management and student engagement as among their most pressing professional concerns (OECD, 2023). Furthermore, evidence from educational meta-analyses suggests that effective classroom management can improve student achievement by as much as 20% across various learning contexts. Similarly, UNESCO (2022) highlights student disengagement as a persistent global issue, estimating that one in every five learners is at risk of dropping out due to unfavorable classroom environments and inadequate learning support. These

findings underscore the importance of strengthening classroom practices that promote both engagement and academic success.

Within the Philippine educational landscape, several studies have explored factors influencing teacher effectiveness and learner outcomes. Galache (2023) reported that teachers in Guimaras State University demonstrated high levels of professional development and effective classroom management practices; however, demographic variables such as age, educational attainment, and teaching experience significantly influenced teacher engagement and performance. Likewise, Cambay and Paglinawan (2024) found that innovative teaching strategies significantly affected learner outcomes in the Schools Division of Iloilo, although inconsistencies in implementation across schools remained evident. In a study conducted in Iligan City, Amer-Gumpal and Basmayor (2024) revealed that teachers exhibited strong classroom management competencies, yet their performance ratings remained only at a “very satisfactory” level, suggesting opportunities for further improvement. Moreover, the Department of Education (DepEd, 2022) reported variations in learning outcomes across divisions during School Year 2021–2022, emphasizing the need for targeted interventions to address persistent achievement gaps.

At the local level, public school teachers continue to face the challenge of balancing classroom discipline, innovative instructional delivery, and learner engagement amidst large class sizes, diverse learner needs, and limited educational resources. These realities often hinder the consistent application of effective classroom management and teaching strategies, thereby affecting students' academic performance. Such challenges are particularly significant within the context of public basic education, where teachers are expected to meet increasing demands while maintaining quality instruction and positive learning environments.

Despite the recognized importance of classroom management and teaching strategies, disparities in student engagement and academic performance persist. While many teachers employ various approaches to maintain order and facilitate learning, levels of student engagement often remain inconsistent. This inconsistency may contribute to differences in learner performance and educational achievement. Consequently, there is a need to examine how classroom management practices and teaching strategies relate to student engagement and performance outcomes within specific educational settings.

Hence, this study seeks to investigate the relationship among classroom management, teaching strategies, student engagement, and performance. By providing empirical evidence on these variables, the study aims to contribute valuable insights for educational leaders, policymakers, and practitioners. The findings may serve as a basis for developing programs and interventions that enhance teaching effectiveness, strengthen student engagement, and improve academic performance. Furthermore, the study supports the Department of Education's commitment to promoting quality, equitable, and inclusive education for all learners.

METHODS

This study utilized a quantitative descriptive-correlational design involving 152 public secondary school teachers from selected public secondary schools in Murcia and E.B. Magalona, Negros Occidental. Data were collected through a validated researcher-developed questionnaire measuring classroom management, teaching strategies, and student engagement, while academic performance data were obtained from school-approved records. Descriptive statistics and nonparametric tests, including the Mann-Whitney U test, Kruskal-Wallis H test, and Spearman rank-order correlation, were used to analyze the data at the 0.05 level of significance.

Results and Discussion

Table 1 below shows the frequency and percent distribution of the demographic profile of respondents.

Table 1. Frequency and Percent Distribution of the Demographic Profile of Respondents.

Profile	Category	f	%
Age			
	20-29 years old	35	23.03

	30-39 years old	63	41.45
	40-49 years old	33	21.71
	50-59 years old	20	13.16
	60 years old and above	1	0.66
	Total	152	100.00
Sex			
	Male	49	32.24
	Female	103	67.76
	Total	152	100.00
Educational Attainment			
	Bachelor's Degree	96	63.16
	Master's Degree	50	32.89
	Doctorate Degree	3	1.97
	Other	3	1.97
	Total	152	100.00
Length of Service			
	1-5 years	56	36.84
	6-10 years	44	28.95
	11-15 years	27	17.76
	16 years and above	25	16.45
	Total	152	100.00

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the teacher-respondents. The majority were female ($n = 103$, 67.76%), while males comprised 32.24% ($n = 49$). Most respondents were between 30 and 39 years old ($n = 63$, 41.45%), followed by those aged 20-29 years ($n = 35$, 23.03%) and 40-49 years ($n = 33$, 21.71%). Only one respondent (0.66%) was 60 years old and above. The results indicate that the teaching workforce was predominantly female and composed largely of individuals in their early to middle career stages.

In terms of educational attainment, the majority held a bachelor's degree ($n = 96$, 63.16%), while 32.89% ($n = 50$) possessed a master's degree. Respondents with doctoral degrees and other educational qualifications each accounted for 1.97% ($n = 3$). Regarding length of service, most respondents had 1-5 years of teaching experience ($n = 56$, 36.84%), followed by those with 6-10 years ($n = 44$, 28.95%), 11-15 years ($n = 27$, 17.76%), and 16 years or more ($n = 25$, 16.45%). These findings suggest that the respondents were relatively young professionals with varying levels of academic preparation and teaching experience.

The demographic profile of the respondents provides important context for interpreting the relationships among classroom management, teaching strategies, student engagement, and academic performance examined in this study.

Table 2 below shows the level of classroom management of teachers when taken as a whole and in terms of classroom structure and routines, behavior management and positive discipline, instructional management, learning environment and student support.

Table 2. Level of Classroom Management of Teachers when taken as a whole and in terms of Classroom Structure and Routines, Behavior Management and Positive Discipline, Instructional Management, Learning Environment and Student Support.

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Classroom Structure and Routines	4.84	0.28	Outstanding
1. I establish clear classroom rules and expectations before beginning instructional activities.	4.88	0.33	Outstanding
2. I consistently implement classroom procedures for attendance, transitions, group work, and submission of outputs.	4.83	0.38	Outstanding

3. I organize classroom time so that learning activities are completed within the allotted period.	4.79	0.42	Outstanding
4. I give clear directions that help students understand what they are expected to do.	4.88	0.35	Outstanding
5. I maintain routines that help students focus on learning tasks.	4.86	0.35	Outstanding
Behavior Management and Positive Discipline	4.84	0.27	Outstanding
1. I use positive reinforcement to encourage desirable student behavior.	4.83	0.38	Outstanding
2. I address misbehavior promptly and fairly without embarrassing students.	4.76	0.43	Outstanding
3. I apply classroom rules consistently to all learners.	4.82	0.40	Outstanding
4. I guide students to understand the consequences of their actions.	4.88	0.32	Outstanding
5. I promote respectful interaction between and among learners.	4.89	0.34	Outstanding
Learning Environment and Student Support	4.84	0.30	Outstanding
1. I prepare learning materials and activities before the class begins.	4.74	0.46	Outstanding
2. I monitor students' work while activities are ongoing.	4.78	0.43	Outstanding
3. I adjust instructional pacing when students need clarification or additional support.	4.74	0.45	Outstanding
4. I use questioning and feedback to check students' understanding during the lesson.	4.83	0.38	Outstanding
5. I manage individual, pair, and group activities effectively.	4.75	0.48	Outstanding
Instructional Management	4.77	0.34	Outstanding
1. I create a classroom atmosphere where students feel safe to participate.	4.86	0.35	Outstanding
2. I encourage students to ask questions and express ideas respectfully.	4.90	0.30	Outstanding
3. I recognize students' different learning needs during classroom activities.	4.76	0.45	Outstanding
4. I provide assistance to students who encounter difficulty in learning tasks.	4.82	0.41	Outstanding
5. I maintain a classroom environment that motivates students to learn.	4.85	0.36	Outstanding
Classroom Management (Overall Mean)	4.82	0.26	Outstanding

Legend: (4.21 – 5.00)-Outstanding; (3.41 – 4.20)-Very Good; (2.61 – 3.40)-Good; (1.81 – 2.60)-Fair; (1.00 – 1.80)-Poor

The findings revealed that teachers demonstrated an outstanding level of classroom management ($M = 4.82$, $SD = 0.26$), with all dimensions receiving outstanding ratings. Classroom structure and routines, behavior management and positive discipline, and learning environment and student support obtained the highest mean scores ($M = 4.84$), while instructional management received the lowest rating ($M = 4.77$), although it remained within the outstanding category. These results indicate that teachers consistently maintained organized classroom procedures, promoted positive learner behavior, provided supportive learning environments, and facilitated effective instructional practices.

The high ratings for classroom structure and routines suggest that teachers effectively establish clear expectations and procedures that enhance classroom order and instructional efficiency. Likewise, strong ratings in behavior management and positive discipline indicate the consistent promotion of respectful interactions and supportive disciplinary practices. The findings further show that teachers regularly monitor student understanding, provide

instructional support, and encourage learner participation, creating classroom environments conducive to engagement and learning.

Although instructional management obtained the lowest mean among the dimensions, the rating remained outstanding, indicating effective classroom interaction and instructional delivery. However, the relatively lower scores related to addressing diverse learner needs highlight opportunities to strengthen differentiated instruction and individualized support.

Overall, the results demonstrate that classroom management is a significant strength of the teacher-respondents. The findings support the works of Praetorius et al. (2020), Niemi (2021), Darling-Hammond et al. (2024), Hattie (2023), and Sims et al. (2025), which emphasize that effective classroom management, positive discipline, supportive learning environments, and responsive instruction contribute to increased student engagement, positive behavior, and improved educational outcomes.

Table 3 below shows the level of teaching strategies of teachers when taken as a whole and in terms of teacher-focused, learner-focused, problem-solving, discussion/brainstorming, modeling/simulation/role playing, thinking/interrogation/interpretation, presentation, question-answer, note taking/summarizing, and research/project strategies.

Table 3. Level of Teaching Strategies of teachers when taken as a whole and in terms of teacher-focused, learner-focused, problem-solving, discussion/brainstorming, modeling/simulation/role playing, thinking/interrogation/interpretation, presentation, question-answer, note-taking/summarizing, and research/project strategies.

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Teacher-Focused Strategies	4.78	0.34	Very High
1. I clearly explain lesson objectives and expected outputs before beginning the lesson.	4.81	0.41	Very High
2. I provide direct instruction when introducing new concepts, skills, or procedures.	4.81	0.41	Very High
3. I model the correct process or performance before asking students to do the task independently.	4.73	0.46	Very High
4. I use structured explanations to help students understand difficult lesson content.	4.76	0.46	Very High
5. I summarize key points at the end of the lesson to reinforce student learning.	4.77	0.42	Very High
Learner-Focused Strategies	4.80	0.33	Very High
1. I design activities that require students to participate actively in the learning process.	4.81	0.39	Very High
2. I consider students' interests, needs, and abilities when selecting learning activities.	4.77	0.44	Very High
3. I provide opportunities for students to make choices in completing learning tasks.	4.78	0.43	Very High
4. I encourage students to take responsibility for their own learning.	4.84	0.39	Very High
5. I use student-centered activities that promote independence and confidence.	4.81	0.39	Very High
Problem-Solving Strategies	4.80	0.33	Very High
1. I present real-life problems that allow students to apply lesson concepts.	4.82	0.39	Very High
2. I guide students in identifying possible solutions to learning tasks or classroom problems.	4.78	0.44	Very High
3. I encourage students to analyze situations before giving answers.	4.82	0.38	Very High

4. I provide activities that develop higher-order thinking skills.	4.78	0.41	Very High
5. I allow students to explain the process they used in solving problems.	4.80	0.40	Very High
Discussion and Brainstorming Strategies	4.79	0.32	Very High
1. I ask open-ended questions that encourage students to share ideas.	4.80	0.40	Very High
2. I facilitate class discussions that allow students to express different viewpoints.	4.81	0.39	Very High
3. I use brainstorming activities to generate possible answers or solutions.	4.72	0.47	Very High
4. I encourage respectful listening during group or class discussions.	4.83	0.39	Very High
5. I synthesize students' ideas to connect discussion outputs with the lesson objectives.	4.82	0.39	Very High
Modeling, Simulation, and Role-Playing Strategies	4.73	0.37	Very High
1. I demonstrate skills, behaviors, or processes before students perform them.	4.77	0.42	Very High
2. I use simulations to help students understand real-life situations related to the lesson.	4.72	0.46	Very High
3. I provide role-playing activities that allow students to apply concepts in practical contexts.	4.70	0.53	Very High
4. I guide students in reflecting on what they learned from simulations or role-playing activities.	4.76	0.43	Very High
5. I connect modeled or simulated activities to the expected learning competencies.	4.71	0.48	Very High
Thinking, Interrogation, and Interpretation Strategies	4.75	0.38	Very High
1. I use probing questions that require students to explain or justify their answers.	4.74	0.45	Very High
2. I encourage students to interpret information, texts, events, or situations during class activities.	4.73	0.46	Very High
3. I ask students to compare, contrast, classify, or analyze lesson concepts.	4.75	0.48	Very High
4. I provide activities that require students to draw conclusions based on evidence.	4.72	0.49	Very High
5. I help students refine their answers through follow-up questions and guided thinking.	4.79	0.41	Very High
Presentation Strategies	4.76	0.36	Very High
1. I use clear visual materials or examples when presenting lesson content.	4.74	0.48	Very High
2. I organize lesson presentations in a logical and understandable sequence.	4.74	0.45	Very High
3. I use appropriate multimedia or instructional aids to support learning.	4.72	0.50	Very High
4. I provide opportunities for students to present their outputs or ideas to the class.	4.80	0.40	Very High
5. I give constructive feedback on students' presentations or oral reports.	4.81	0.41	Very High
Question-and-Answer Strategies	4.81	0.32	Very High
1. I ask questions to assess students' prior knowledge and lesson understanding.	4.84	0.37	Very High
2. I provide enough wait time for students to think before answering.	4.78	0.43	Very High

3. I encourage students to ask questions when they need clarification.	4.84	0.37	Very High
4. I use students' answers to determine whether reteaching or enrichment is needed.	4.77	0.44	Very High
5. I provide immediate and respectful feedback to students' responses.	4.84	0.37	Very High
Note-Taking and Summarizing Strategies	4.74	0.38	Very High
1. I guide students in identifying important details during discussions.	4.76	0.43	Very High
2. I teach students how to organize notes using outlines, charts, or graphic organizers.	4.64	0.55	Very High
3. I ask students to summarize key ideas after a lesson or activity.	4.74	0.46	Very High
4. I provide opportunities for students to review and improve their notes.	4.77	0.45	Very High
5. I use summary activities to check students' understanding of the lesson.	4.77	0.42	Very High
Research and Project Strategies	4.62	0.52	Very High
1. I assign research or projectbased tasks that are aligned with the lesson objectives.	4.51	0.68	Very High
2. I guide students in identifying reliable sources of information.	4.61	0.59	Very High
3. I monitor students' progress while they are completing research or project tasks.	4.63	0.61	Very High
4. I encourage students to present research or project outputs clearly and responsibly.	4.67	0.57	Very High
5. I assess research or project outputs using clear criteria or rubrics.	4.70	0.53	Very High
Teaching Strategies (Overall Mean)	4.76	0.31	Very High

Legend: (4.21 – 5.00)-Very High; (3.41 – 4.20)-High; (2.61 – 3.40)-Moderate; (1.81 – 2.60)-Low; (1.00 – 1.80)-Very Low

The findings revealed that teachers demonstrated a very high level of teaching strategies overall ($M = 4.76$, $SD = 0.31$), indicating the consistent use of diverse instructional approaches to support learning and student engagement. Among the dimensions, Question-and-Answer Strategies obtained the highest rating ($M = 4.81$, $SD = 0.32$), followed by Learner-Focused Strategies and Problem-Solving Strategies ($M = 4.80$, $SD = 0.33$). In contrast, Research and Project Strategies ($M = 4.62$, $SD = 0.52$) and Modeling, Simulation, and Role-Playing Strategies ($M = 4.73$, $SD = 0.37$) received comparatively lower ratings, although both remained within the very high category.

The results suggest that teachers effectively integrate both teacher-centered and learner-centered approaches by providing clear instructional guidance, promoting learner autonomy, encouraging critical thinking, and facilitating meaningful classroom discussions. Teachers also frequently utilized questioning techniques, feedback, and problem-solving activities to assess understanding and promote active participation. These findings support the view of Darling-Hammond et al. (2024) that well-planned instructional practices enhance student learning outcomes, while Tomlinson (2021) emphasized the importance of learner-centered approaches in improving student motivation and engagement. Furthermore, the strong emphasis on problem-solving, discussion, and questioning strategies aligns with the findings of OECD (2021), Mercer (2020), and Black and Wiliam (2021), who highlighted their contributions to higher-order thinking, collaboration, and formative assessment.

Although all dimensions received very high ratings, the relatively lower scores for research and project-based learning, modeling and simulation activities, multimedia integration, and note-taking instruction suggest areas for further enhancement. These findings indicate the need for additional instructional resources, technology integration, and professional development opportunities to strengthen experiential and project-based learning.

Similar observations were reported by Condcliffe (2021), Joyce and Calhoun (2021), Koehler et al. (2022), and Marzano (2021), who emphasized the value of project-based learning, experiential activities, educational technology, and effective summarizing strategies in improving student learning outcomes.

Overall, the results demonstrate that teachers possess strong instructional competence and consistently employ varied, evidence-based teaching strategies that promote active learning, critical thinking, and meaningful classroom interaction. The findings support Darling-Hammond et al. (2024), who concluded that teachers who utilize diverse instructional approaches are more effective in enhancing student engagement, academic achievement, and higher-order thinking skills.

Table 4 below shows the level of student engagement when taken as a whole and in terms of behavioral engagement, emotional engagement and cognitive engagement

Table 4. Level of Student Engagement when taken as a whole and in terms of Behavioral Engagement, Emotional Engagement and Cognitive Engagement.

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Behavioral Engagement	4.64	0.45	Very High
1. Students actively participate in classroom activities and discussions.	4.71	0.50	Very High
2. Students complete assigned learning tasks within the given time.	4.58	0.59	Very High
3. Students follow classroom rules and procedures during learning activities.	4.63	0.55	Very High
4. Students cooperate with classmates during pair or group tasks.	4.69	0.50	Very High
5. Students stay focused on learning activities with minimal off-task behavior.	4.59	0.58	Very High
Emotional Engagement	4.65	0.48	Very High
1. Students show interest and enthusiasm during class discussions and activities.	4.66	0.54	Very High
2. Students show confidence in	4.55	0.61	Very High
3. sharing their ideas or answers.	4.67	0.51	Very High
4. Students appear encouraged to participate in classroom learning tasks.	4.66	0.55	Very High
5. Students show a positive attitude toward the subject and learning activities.	4.69	0.52	Very High
Cognitive Engagement	4.61	0.49	Very High
1. Students show interest and enthusiasm during class discussions and activities.	4.60	0.54	Very High
2. Students show confidence in sharing their ideas or answers.	4.53	0.60	Very High
3. Students appear encouraged to participate in classroom learning tasks.	4.65	0.54	Very High
4. Students show a positive attitude toward the subject and learning activities.	4.62	0.57	Very High
5. Students demonstrate a sense of belonging and respect in the classroom.	4.67	0.52	Very High
Student Engagement (Overall Mean)	4.63	0.44	Very High

Legend: (4.21 – 5.00)-Very High; (3.41 – 4.20)-High; (2.61 – 3.40)-Moderate; (1.81 – 2.60)-Low; (1.00 – 1.80)-Very Low

The findings revealed that students demonstrated a very high level of engagement overall ($M = 4.63$, $SD = 0.44$), indicating strong behavioral, emotional, and cognitive involvement in classroom learning. Among the three dimensions, Emotional Engagement obtained the highest mean score ($M = 4.65$, $SD = 0.48$), followed by

Behavioral Engagement ($M = 4.64$, $SD = 0.45$), while Cognitive Engagement recorded the lowest mean ($M = 4.61$, $SD = 0.49$), although all dimensions remained within the very high category.

The results suggest that students actively participate in classroom activities, maintain positive attitudes toward learning, and demonstrate meaningful intellectual involvement during instruction. High ratings in behavioral engagement indicate that learners consistently participate, cooperate, and adhere to classroom expectations. Likewise, the strong emotional engagement scores reflect students' enthusiasm, motivation, and positive disposition toward learning activities. The high level of cognitive engagement further suggests that learners are actively processing information, connecting new knowledge with prior experiences, and engaging in thoughtful learning activities.

Despite the overall positive results, relatively lower ratings on students' confidence in sharing their ideas and completing tasks within the allotted time suggest opportunities for teachers to further strengthen classroom strategies that promote self-confidence, communication skills, and independent learning.

Overall, the findings indicate that teachers have successfully created learning environments that foster active participation, positive learning attitudes, and meaningful cognitive involvement. These results support the works of Fredricks et al. (2023), Skinner et al. (2022), Greene (2021), and Bond et al. (2020), which emphasize that high levels of behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement are associated with improved motivation, persistence, academic achievement, and overall educational success.

Table 5 below shows the level of academic performance of the learners.

Table 5. Level of Academic Performance of the Learners.

Level of Academic Performance	f	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Outstanding	48	86.24	6.68	Very Satisfactory
Very Satisfactory	76			
Satisfactory	26			
Fairly Satisfactory	0			
Did Not Meet Expectations	2			
Total	152			

Legend: (90-100)-Outstanding; (85-89)-Very Satisfactory; (80-84)-Satisfactory; (75-79)-Fairly Satisfactory; (Below 75)-Did Not Meet Expectations

The findings revealed that learners attained a Very Satisfactory level of academic performance ($M = 86.24$, $SD = 6.68$). Most learners achieved a Very Satisfactory rating ($n = 76$), followed by those with Outstanding performance ($n = 48$) and Satisfactory performance ($n = 26$). Only two learners were classified as Did Not Meet Expectations, while none fell under the Fairly Satisfactory category. These results indicate that the majority of learners successfully attained the expected learning competencies and demonstrated satisfactory to outstanding academic achievement.

The predominance of learners in the Very Satisfactory and Outstanding categories suggests that effective instructional practices and supportive learning environments may have contributed positively to student achievement. The findings further imply that learners have generally acquired the knowledge, skills, and competencies expected at their grade level. However, the presence of a small number of learners who did not meet expectations highlights the importance of sustained academic interventions, remediation programs, and individualized learning support.

Overall, the results indicate a favorable level of academic performance among learners, supporting the findings of Hattie (2023) and Darling-Hammond et al. (2024) that effective instruction, continuous feedback, responsive teaching practices, and supportive classroom environments contribute significantly to improved student achievement and academic success.

Table 6a on the next page shows the difference in the level of classroom management when grouped according to age.

Table 6a. Difference in the Level of Classroom Management when grouped according to Age.

Age	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
20-29 years old	0.937	0.919	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant
30-39 years old				
40-49 years old				
50-59 years old				
60 years old and above				

As shown in Table 6a, the difference in the level of classroom management when respondents were grouped according to age yielded a Kruskal–Wallis test statistic of $H = 0.937$ with a p -value = 0.919. Since the p -value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the level of classroom management among teachers across the different age groups.

The findings suggest that teachers, regardless of whether they are younger or older, demonstrate comparable classroom management practices. This implies that age does not appear to influence teachers' ability to establish classroom routines, manage student behavior, provide instructional support, or create a positive learning environment. The consistently high level of classroom management across all age groups may reflect the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs, professional development opportunities, and the implementation of standardized teaching practices within schools. These initiatives likely enable teachers of different ages to demonstrate similar levels of competence in managing their classrooms effectively.

This finding is consistent with the study of Klassen and Kim (2021), which found that demographic characteristics such as age do not necessarily predict differences in teachers' instructional effectiveness or classroom management practices. Instead, professional competence is more strongly associated with continuous professional learning, teaching experience, and school support systems. Likewise, OECD (2020) reported that teachers across different age groups can demonstrate comparable teaching effectiveness when provided with sustained professional development and supportive school environments.

Table 6b below shows the difference in the level of classroom management when grouped according to sex.

Table 6b. Difference in the Level of Classroom Management when grouped according to Sex.

Sex	Test Statistics (U)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Male	2458.500	0.788	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Female				

As shown in Table 6b, the difference in the level of classroom management when respondents were grouped according to sex yielded a Mann–Whitney U test statistic of $U = 2458.500$ with a p -value = 0.788. Since the p -value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the level of classroom management between male and female teachers.

The findings suggest that both male and female teachers demonstrate comparable classroom management practices regardless of their sex. This implies that the ability to establish classroom routines, manage student behavior, maintain a positive learning environment, and implement effective instructional management is not influenced by gender. Instead, classroom management competencies appear to be shaped by teachers' professional preparation, teaching experience, and continuous professional development rather than by biological sex. The result further indicates that both male and female teachers possess similar capabilities in creating organized, supportive, and learner-centered classroom environments that facilitate effective teaching and learning.

This finding is consistent with the study of Klassen and Kim (2021), which found that teacher effectiveness, including classroom management, is more closely associated with professional competence and instructional expertise than with demographic characteristics such as sex. Likewise, OECD (2020) reported that effective teaching practices are generally consistent across male and female teachers when both groups have access to quality teacher preparation, professional learning opportunities, and supportive school environments.

Table 6c below shows the difference in the level of classroom management when grouped according to educational attainment.

Table 6c. Difference in the Level of Classroom Management when grouped according to Educational Attainment.

Educational Attainment	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Bachelor's Degree	4.796	0.187	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Master's Degree				
Doctorate Degree				
Other				

As shown in Table 6c, the difference in the level of classroom management when respondents were grouped according to educational attainment yielded a Kruskal–Wallis test statistic of $H = 4.796$ with a p-value = 0.187. Since the p-value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the level of classroom management among teachers with different educational attainment.

The findings suggest that teachers demonstrate comparable classroom management practices regardless of whether they hold a bachelor's degree, master's degree, doctorate degree, or other educational qualifications. This implies that academic attainment alone does not determine a teacher's effectiveness in managing the classroom. Instead, effective classroom management appears to develop through professional experience, continuous training, reflective teaching practices, and regular engagement in professional learning activities. The result further indicates that teachers are able to maintain organized classrooms, implement effective instructional routines, and foster positive learning environments irrespective of their highest educational qualification.

This finding is supported by the study of Admiraal et al. (2021), which emphasized that teachers' professional competence is strengthened through participation in professional learning communities and continuous collaboration rather than solely through formal academic qualifications. Similarly, Ainsworth and Oldfield (2022) reported that teachers' effectiveness in classroom practice is greatly influenced by ongoing professional support, reflective practice, and collaborative learning experiences, regardless of educational attainment.

Table 6d below shows the difference in the level of classroom management when grouped according to length of service.

Table 6d. Difference in the Level of Classroom Management when grouped according to Length of Service.

Length of Service	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
1-5 years	3.594	0.309	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant
6-10 years				
11-15 years				
16 years and above				

As shown in Table 6d, the difference in the level of classroom management when respondents were grouped according to length of service yielded a Kruskal–Wallis test statistic of $H = 3.594$ with a p-value = 0.309. Since the p-value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the level of classroom management among teachers with varying lengths of service.

The findings suggest that teachers demonstrate comparable classroom management practices regardless of whether they are beginning teachers or have many years of teaching experience. This implies that length of service alone does not significantly influence teachers' ability to establish classroom routines, manage student behavior, maintain a positive learning environment, or implement effective instructional management. The result may indicate that teachers acquire and continuously strengthen classroom management competencies through regular professional development, mentoring, and school-based learning opportunities throughout their careers. Consequently, both novice and experienced teachers are capable of demonstrating effective classroom management practices that support student learning.

This finding is consistent with the study of Flores and Swennen (2020), which emphasized that teachers continue to develop their professional competencies throughout their careers through continuous learning, reflective practice, and professional collaboration, regardless of their years of teaching experience. Likewise, Admiraal et al. (2021) found that participation in professional learning communities and collaborative professional development enables teachers at different career stages to maintain and improve effective classroom practices.

Table 7a below shows the difference in the level of teaching strategies when grouped according to age.

Table 7a. Difference in the Level of Teaching Strategies when grouped according to Age.

Age	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
20-29 years old	3.809	0.433	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant
30-39 years old				
40-49 years old				
50-59 years old				
60 years old and above				

As shown in Table 7a, the difference in the level of teaching strategies when respondents were grouped according to age yielded a Kruskal–Wallis test statistic of $H = 3.809$ with a p -value = 0.433. Since the p -value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the level of teaching strategies among teachers across the different age groups.

The findings suggest that teachers employ comparable teaching strategies regardless of their age. This implies that younger and older teachers are equally capable of utilizing a variety of instructional approaches, including teacher-focused, learner-focused, problem-solving, discussion, questioning, and research-based strategies, to facilitate effective learning. The absence of a significant difference also indicates that age is not a determining factor in teachers' selection and implementation of instructional strategies. Instead, the consistent use of diverse teaching approaches across age groups may be attributed to ongoing professional development, curriculum implementation, and continuous adaptation to learners' educational needs.

This finding is supported by the study of Tondeur et al. (2021), which found that teachers' instructional practices are shaped more by professional learning opportunities and pedagogical competence than by demographic characteristics such as age. Similarly, Schleicher (2020) emphasized that teachers across different age groups are capable of adopting effective instructional strategies when they are provided with continuous professional development and institutional support.

Table 7b below shows the difference in the level of teaching strategies when grouped according to sex.

Table 7b. Difference in the Level of Teaching Strategies when grouped according to Sex.

Sex	Test Statistics (U)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Male	2192.500	0.186	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Female				

As shown in Table 7b, the difference in the level of teaching strategies when respondents were grouped according to sex yielded a Mann–Whitney U test statistic of $U = 2192.500$ with a p -value = 0.186. Since the p -value is

greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the level of teaching strategies between male and female teachers.

The findings suggest that both male and female teachers employ similar teaching strategies in facilitating classroom instruction. This implies that sex does not significantly influence the selection and implementation of instructional approaches such as teacher-focused, learner-focused, problem-solving, discussion, questioning, and research-based strategies. Regardless of gender, teachers appear equally capable of applying varied instructional methods that address learners' needs, promote active participation, and enhance the teaching-learning process. The result further indicates that effective teaching strategies are more likely developed through professional preparation, instructional experience, and continuous capacity-building rather than differences in sex.

This finding is supported by the study of Fauth et al. (2020), which reported that the quality of instructional practices is influenced primarily by teachers' pedagogical competence and professional expertise rather than demographic characteristics such as gender. Similarly, Kunter et al. (2021) found that effective teaching depends largely on teachers' professional knowledge, instructional skills, and classroom practices, with no substantial differences attributable to sex.

Table 7c below shows the difference in the level of teaching strategies when grouped according to educational attainment.

Table 7c. Difference in the Level of Teaching Strategies when grouped according to Educational Attainment.

Educational Attainment	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H ₀	Interpretation
Bachelor's Degree	0.927	0.819	Fail to Reject H ₀	Not Significant
Master's Degree				
Doctorate Degree				
Other				

As shown in Table 7c, the difference in the level of teaching strategies when respondents were grouped according to educational attainment yielded a Kruskal–Wallis test statistic of $H = 0.927$ with a p -value = 0.819. Since the p -value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the level of teaching strategies among teachers with different educational attainment.

The findings suggest that teachers employ comparable teaching strategies regardless of whether they hold a bachelor's degree, master's degree, doctorate degree, or other educational qualifications. This implies that educational attainment alone does not significantly influence the way teachers plan, organize, and deliver instruction. Rather, the consistent use of varied teaching strategies may be attributed to teachers' professional experience, curriculum implementation, participation in professional development programs, and commitment to addressing learners' diverse needs. The result further indicates that teachers, irrespective of their highest educational qualification, are capable of applying effective instructional approaches that promote active learning, critical thinking, and meaningful classroom engagement.

This finding is consistent with the study of Guerriero (2021), which emphasized that teacher effectiveness depends more on professional competence, instructional knowledge, and continuous learning than on formal educational qualifications alone. Likewise, König et al. (2022) reported that teachers' classroom practices are shaped primarily by pedagogical competence, professional development, and practical teaching experience rather than differences in academic attainment.

Table 7d below shows the difference in the level of teaching strategies when grouped according to length of service.

Table 7d. Difference in the Level of Teaching Strategies when grouped according to Length of Service.

Length of Service	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H ₀	Interpretation
1-5 years	1.192	0.755	Fail to Reject H ₀	Not Significant
6-10 years				
11-15 years				
16 years and above				

As shown in Table 7d, the difference in the level of teaching strategies when respondents were grouped according to length of service yielded a Kruskal–Wallis test statistic of $H = 1.192$ with a $p\text{-value} = 0.755$. Since the $p\text{-value}$ is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the level of teaching strategies among teachers with varying lengths of service.

The findings suggest that teachers utilize similar teaching strategies regardless of whether they are beginning teachers or have many years of teaching experience. This implies that length of service does not significantly influence the selection and implementation of instructional approaches in the classroom. Teachers across different career stages appear equally capable of employing teacher-focused, learner-focused, problem-solving, discussion, questioning, presentation, and research-based strategies to facilitate effective learning. The result may also indicate that continuous professional development, mentoring programs, curriculum implementation, and school-based learning opportunities enable teachers to maintain consistent instructional practices throughout their careers.

This finding is supported by the study of Lachner et al. (2021), which found that teachers' instructional quality is strengthened through continuous professional learning and reflective teaching practices rather than years of teaching experience alone. Similarly, Kraft and Hill (2020) emphasized that sustained professional development enables teachers at different career stages to improve and maintain effective instructional practices, resulting in comparable teaching performance regardless of length of service.

Table 8a shows the difference in the level of student engagement when grouped according to age.

Table 8a. Difference in the Level of Student Engagement when grouped according to Age.

Age	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H ₀	Interpretation
13 – 16 years old	5.183	0.269	Fail to Reject H ₀	Not Significant
17 – 20 years old				
21 – 24 years old				
25 years old and above				

As shown in Table 8a, the difference in the level of student engagement when respondents were grouped according to age yielded a Kruskal–Wallis test statistic of $H = 5.183$ with a $p\text{-value} = 0.269$. Since the $p\text{-value}$ is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the level of student engagement among respondents across the different age groups.

The findings suggest that students demonstrate comparable levels of behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement regardless of their age. This implies that age does not significantly influence students' participation in classroom activities, interest in learning, or intellectual involvement in instructional tasks. The result further indicates that students across all age groups respond similarly to classroom experiences, likely because they are exposed to the same curriculum, learning environment, and instructional practices. Consequently, teachers appear to provide learning opportunities that effectively engage students regardless of their age, promoting active participation and meaningful learning experiences for all learners.

This finding is consistent with the study of Wong and Liem (2022), which reported that student engagement is influenced more by classroom climate, instructional quality, and teacher support than by demographic characteristics such as age. Likewise, Reschly and Christenson (2022) emphasized that supportive learning environments and effective teaching practices play a more significant role in fostering behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement than students' personal characteristics.

Table 8b below shows the Difference in the Level of Student Engagement when grouped according to Sex.

Table 8b. Difference in the Level of Student Engagement when grouped according to Sex.

Sex	Test Statistics (U)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Male	2073.000	0.064	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Female				

As shown in Table 8b, the difference in the level of student engagement when respondents were grouped according to sex yielded a Mann–Whitney U test statistic of $U = 2073.000$ with a p -value = 0.064. Since the p -value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the level of student engagement between male and female students.

The findings suggest that both male and female students demonstrate comparable levels of behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement in classroom learning. This implies that sex does not significantly influence students' participation in classroom activities, enthusiasm toward learning, or intellectual involvement during instruction. Although the obtained p -value is relatively close to the level of significance, the result indicates that both groups remain similarly engaged in classroom experiences. This may reflect teachers' ability to create inclusive and supportive learning environments that encourage equal participation and engagement among all learners regardless of sex.

This finding is supported by the study of Wang and Eccles (2021), which found that classroom support, instructional practices, and positive teacher-student relationships exert a greater influence on student engagement than demographic characteristics such as sex. Similarly, Fredricks et al. (2023) emphasized that behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement are primarily shaped by students' learning experiences and the quality of classroom instruction rather than by gender differences.

Table 8c below shows the difference in the level of student engagement when grouped according to educational attainment.

Table 8c. Difference in the Level of Student Engagement when grouped according to Educational Attainment.

Educational Attainment	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Bachelor's Degree	1.321	0.724	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Master's Degree				
Doctorate Degree				
Other				

As shown in Table 8c, the difference in the level of student engagement when respondents were grouped according to teachers' educational attainment yielded a Kruskal–Wallis test statistic of $H = 1.321$ with a p -value = 0.724. Since the p -value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the level of student engagement among learners taught by teachers with different educational attainment.

The findings suggest that students exhibit comparable levels of behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement regardless of whether their teachers hold a bachelor's degree, master's degree, doctorate degree, or other educational qualifications. This implies that teachers' educational attainment alone does not significantly influence learners' engagement in classroom activities. Instead, student engagement may be more strongly

shaped by the quality of classroom instruction, teacher-student interactions, classroom climate, and the effective use of engaging instructional strategies. The result further indicates that teachers, regardless of their highest academic qualification, are capable of creating learning environments that encourage students to participate actively, remain motivated, and become meaningfully involved in the learning process.

This finding is consistent with the study of Korpershoek et al. (2021), which found that students' engagement is more strongly influenced by classroom management, instructional quality, and supportive learning environments than by teachers' demographic or educational characteristics. Likewise, Salmela-Aro et al. (2021) reported that positive classroom experiences and effective teacher practices play a more important role in promoting student engagement than teachers' formal educational qualifications.

Table 8d shows the difference in the level of student engagement when grouped according to length of service.

Table 8d. Difference in the Level of Student Engagement when grouped according to Length of Service.

Length of Service	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
1-5 years	2.917	0.405	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant
6-10 years				
11-15 years				
16 years and above				

As shown in Table 8d, the difference in the level of student engagement when respondents were grouped according to teachers' length of service yielded a Kruskal–Wallis test statistic of $H = 2.917$ with a p-value = 0.405. Since the p-value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the level of student engagement among learners taught by teachers with varying lengths of service.

The findings suggest that students demonstrate comparable levels of behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement regardless of whether their teachers are in the early, middle, or later stages of their teaching careers. This implies that teachers' years of service do not significantly influence learners' participation, motivation, or cognitive involvement in classroom activities. The result indicates that both novice and experienced teachers are capable of fostering engaging learning environments that encourage active participation and meaningful learning experiences. This may be attributed to continuous professional development, mentoring, collaborative learning among teachers, and the consistent implementation of learner-centered instructional practices across different career stages.

This finding is supported by the study of Thoonen et al. (2022), which found that students' engagement is more strongly associated with teachers' instructional quality and classroom practices than with teachers' years of teaching experience. Similarly, Zepeda et al. (2021) emphasized that ongoing professional learning and reflective teaching enable teachers at different career stages to effectively engage students and promote positive learning outcomes.

Table 9 below shows the relationship between level of classroom management and academic performance.

Table 9. Relationship between Level of Classroom Management and Academic Performance.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Level of Classroom Management vs. Level of Academic Performance	0.083	0.312	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant

As shown in Table 9, the relationship between the level of classroom management and academic performance yielded a Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient of $r_s = 0.083$ with a p-value = 0.312. Since the p-value is

greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. This indicates that there is no significant relationship between teachers' level of classroom management and the academic performance of the learners.

The findings suggest that variations in teachers' classroom management practices are not significantly associated with differences in learners' academic performance. Although teachers demonstrated an outstanding level of classroom management, this alone does not appear to directly influence students' academic achievement. This implies that learners' academic performance may be affected by other factors beyond classroom management, such as students' learning motivation, prior knowledge, study habits, family support, socioeconomic background, attendance, and the quality of instructional strategies implemented during classroom instruction. The result further indicates that while effective classroom management remains essential for maintaining an orderly and supportive learning environment, it may not independently determine learners' academic success.

This finding is consistent with the study of Wang and Degol (2021), which emphasized that students' academic achievement is influenced by multiple interacting factors, including individual learner characteristics, family environment, school climate, and instructional quality, rather than by a single classroom variable. Similarly, Korpershoek et al. (2021) reported that although effective classroom management contributes to positive behavioral and motivational outcomes, its direct relationship with academic achievement is often influenced by other contextual and instructional factors.

Table 10 below shows the relationship between level of teaching strategies and academic performance.

Table 10. Relationship between Level of Teaching Strategies and Academic Performance.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Level of Teaching Strategies vs. Level of Academic Performance	0.125	0.126	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant

As shown in Table 10, the relationship between the level of teaching strategies and academic performance yielded a Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient of $r_s = 0.125$ with a p-value = 0.126. Since the p-value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. This indicates that there is no significant relationship between teachers' level of teaching strategies and the academic performance of the learners.

The findings suggest that although teachers consistently employ a very high level of teaching strategies, these instructional approaches do not have a statistically significant relationship with learners' academic performance. This implies that the use of varied teaching strategies alone may not be sufficient to directly influence students' academic achievement. Learners' performance may also depend on other factors such as individual learning abilities, motivation, study habits, attendance, parental involvement, availability of learning resources, and the overall learning environment. The result further indicates that while effective teaching strategies remain essential in facilitating meaningful learning experiences and promoting classroom engagement, academic performance is a multifaceted outcome that is shaped by a combination of learner-related, teacher-related, and environmental factors.

This finding is supported by the study of Kyriakides et al. (2022), which emphasized that although effective teaching practices contribute to positive learning experiences, student achievement is influenced by multiple interconnected factors beyond instructional strategies alone. Likewise, Muijs et al. (2020) reported that instructional strategies positively support classroom learning, but their effect on academic achievement is often mediated by learner characteristics, school context, and other educational variables.

Table 11 below shows the relationship between level of student engagement and academic performance.

Table 11. Relationship between Level of Student Engagement and Academic Performance.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Level of Student Engagement vs. Level of Academic Performance	0.191	0.018	Reject H_0	Significant

As shown in Table 11, the relationship between the level of student engagement and academic performance yielded a Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient of $r_s = 0.191$ with a p-value = 0.018. Since the p-value is less than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected. This indicates that there is a significant relationship between the level of student engagement and the academic performance of the learners.

The findings suggest that higher levels of student engagement are associated with better academic performance. Although the correlation is weak and positive, the statistically significant result indicates that as students become more behaviorally, emotionally, and cognitively engaged in classroom learning, their academic performance also tends to improve. This implies that students who actively participate in classroom discussions, demonstrate enthusiasm toward learning, and invest cognitive effort in understanding lesson content are more likely to achieve better academic outcomes. The result highlights the importance of fostering student engagement through interactive instruction, supportive classroom environments, and meaningful learning experiences. Schools and teachers may therefore strengthen strategies that encourage active participation, collaboration, critical thinking, and learner motivation to further enhance students' academic achievement.

This finding is consistent with the study of Bond et al. (2020), which concluded that student engagement is a significant predictor of academic achievement and that students who are actively engaged in learning demonstrate better academic performance than those with lower levels of engagement. Similarly, Salmela-Aro et al. (2021) reported that behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement are positively associated with learners' academic success, persistence, and overall educational outcomes.

Recommendations and Future Research

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are proposed for appropriate actions by the concerned stakeholders:

1. Policymakers and Curriculum Planners may continue developing policies and support programs that address the professional needs of teachers, particularly those who are in the early stages of their teaching careers, to further strengthen instructional quality.
2. School Administrators can sustain effective classroom management practices by providing regular classroom observations, mentoring, and professional development activities that reinforce positive discipline, classroom organization, and supportive learning environments.
3. Teachers can continue using varied and learner-centered teaching strategies while exploring innovative instructional approaches that further enhance students' participation, critical thinking, and meaningful learning experiences.
4. Teachers may implement more engaging classroom activities that strengthen students' behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement to maintain their active participation in the learning process.
5. School Administrators and Teachers may sustain intervention programs and academic support services that help learners maintain and further improve their very satisfactory level of academic performance.
6. School Administrators can continue providing equal access to professional development opportunities for all teachers regardless of age, sex, educational attainment, or length of service, since effective classroom management can be achieved across different demographic groups.

7. School Administrators can ensure that instructional training and capacity-building programs remain accessible to all teachers, recognizing that effective teaching strategies are not dependent on demographic characteristics.
8. Teachers may continue creating inclusive and supportive classroom environments that promote student engagement for all learners, regardless of differences in teachers' demographic profiles.
9. Teachers and School Administrators may recognize that although effective classroom management is essential for maintaining an orderly learning environment, additional efforts should also focus on other factors that influence academic performance, such as learner motivation, study habits, parental support, and academic interventions.
10. Teachers can continue improving their instructional practices while integrating approaches that address learners' individual needs, recognizing that teaching strategies alone may not be sufficient to improve academic performance.
11. Teachers and School Administrators may prioritize programs and instructional practices that strengthen student engagement through collaborative learning, meaningful classroom participation, and interactive learning experiences, as increased student engagement contributes to better academic performance.
12. Future Researchers are encouraged to replicate this study using larger samples, different educational settings, or other research methods. They may also examine additional variables such as learning motivation, parental involvement, study habits, school climate, teacher-student relationships, and socioeconomic factors to gain a broader understanding of the factors affecting learners' academic performance.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that public secondary school teachers demonstrated outstanding classroom management and very high utilization of teaching strategies, while learners exhibited very high levels of behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement and achieved very satisfactory academic performance. These findings suggest that teachers consistently implement effective classroom practices and instructional approaches that foster positive learning environments and active learner participation.

The results further revealed that classroom management, teaching strategies, and student engagement did not significantly differ according to teachers' age, sex, educational attainment, and length of service. This indicates that effective teaching practices and learner engagement are evident across demographic groups and are more likely influenced by professional competence and instructional practice than by personal characteristics.

Moreover, no significant relationship was found between classroom management and academic performance, nor between teaching strategies and academic performance. These findings suggest that learner achievement cannot be explained solely by classroom management practices or instructional approaches and may be influenced by other learner-related, family-related, and contextual factors.

However, student engagement was found to have a significant positive relationship with academic performance. Although the correlation was weak, the result highlights the critical role of behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement in enhancing learner achievement. This implies that students who actively participate in learning activities, maintain positive attitudes toward learning, and invest intellectual effort in classroom tasks are more likely to perform better academically.

Overall, the study affirms that while effective classroom management and diverse teaching strategies create supportive conditions for learning, student engagement emerges as the most important factor associated with academic performance. Therefore, educational interventions and school improvement initiatives should prioritize strategies that strengthen learner engagement to further improve academic outcomes and educational success.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researcher sincerely acknowledges the invaluable support and cooperation of the school administrators, teacher-respondents, and participating schools whose contributions made this study possible. Special appreciation is extended to the research adviser, panel members, professors, colleagues, family, and friends for their guidance, encouragement, and unwavering support throughout the conduct of this research. Above all, the researcher expresses profound gratitude to Almighty God for His wisdom, strength, guidance, and abundant blessings throughout the completion of this academic endeavor.

REFERENCES

1. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2021). Classroom assessment and pedagogy. Routledge.
2. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2021). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (6th ed.). Sage.
3. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., Gardner, M., & Espinoza, D. (2024). Effective teacher professional development: Research, policy, and practice. Learning Policy Institute.
4. Fredricks, J. A., Reschly, A. L., & Christenson, S. L. (2023). Handbook of student engagement interventions: Working with disengaged students (2nd ed.). Academic Press.
5. Hattie, J. (2023). Visible learning: The sequel. Routledge.
6. Joyce, B., Calhoun, E., & Hopkins, D. (2021). Models of learning: Tools for teaching (4th ed.). Open University Press.
7. Kyriakides, L., Creemers, B. P. M., & Charalambous, E. C. (2022). Quality and equity in education: Revisiting theory and research on educational effectiveness. Routledge.
8. Marzano, R. J. (2021). The new art and science of teaching. Solution Tree Press.
9. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2020). Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners: TALIS 2018 results (Volume II). OECD Publishing.
10. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2021). 21st-century readers: Developing literacy skills in a digital world. OECD Publishing.
11. Reschly, A. L., & Christenson, S. L. (2022). Handbook of student engagement interventions: Working with disengaged students (2nd ed.). Academic Press.
12. Schleicher, A. (2020). World class: How to build a 21st-century school system. OECD Publishing.
13. Skinner, B. F. (1938). The behavior of organisms: An experimental analysis. Appleton-Century.
14. Skinner, E. A., Pitzer, J. R., & Brule, H. (2022). In R. M. Ryan (Ed.), Handbook of motivation at school (2nd ed.). Routledge. (Book chapter)
15. Tomlinson, C. A. (2021). How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms (3rd ed.). ASCD.
16. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.
17. Zepeda, S. J., Parylo, O., & Bengtson, E. (2021). The principal as professional development leader (2nd ed.). Routledge.
18. Articles/Journals/Publications/Magazines
19. Admiraal, W., Schenke, W., De Jong, L., Emmelot, Y., & Sligte, H. (2021). Schools as professional learning communities: What can schools do to support professional development of teachers? Professional Development in Education, 47(4), 684–698. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2019.1665573>
20. Ainsworth, S., & Oldfield, J. (2022). Social support and early career teacher resilience: A qualitative study. Teaching and Teacher Education, 115, 103724. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103724>
21. Alqarni, S. (2022). Teacher engagement and professional development in Saudi Arabia. Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 12(3), 45–62.
22. Alshammari, A. (2022). Teacher performance and professional development in Saudi Arabia. Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 12(3), 45–62.
23. Amer-Gumpal, R., & Basmayor, E. (2024). Classroom management skills of teachers and their teaching performance. Philippine E-Journals.

24. Bacus, R. C., Picardal, M. T., Perez, N. B., & Balo, V. T. M. (2024). Predictors of beginning teachers' teaching performance. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, Article 1375726. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1375726>
25. Bautista, M., & Cruz, J. (2025). Curriculum modernization in Philippine schools: Challenges and opportunities. *Philippine Journal of Education Policy*, 14(2), 55–72.
26. Bond, M., Bedenlier, S., Marín, V. I., & Händel, M. (2020). Emergency remote teaching in higher education: Mapping the first global online semester. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 17(1), Article 50. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-00282-x>
27. Cambay, D. J., & Paglinawan, J. L. (2024). Classroom management strategies and school environment on student engagement. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(5).
28. Catayas, C. H., & Hussien, O. Q. (2024). Classroom management strategies, practices, and learners' academic performance. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 23(8), 973–989.
29. Cesário, F., & Anunciato, R. O. M. M. (2024). Teacher induction and mentoring as professional development strategies for beginning teachers. *Professional Development in Education*, 50(2), 281–297.
30. Chow, J. C., Sayers, R., Fu, Y., Granger, K. L., McCullough, S., Kingsbery, C., & Morse, A. (2023). A systematic meta-review of measures of classroom management in school settings. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 49(2), 60–74.
31. Fauth, B., Decristan, J., Decker, A.-T., Büttner, G., Hardy, I., Klieme, E., & Kunter, M. (2020). The effects of teacher competence on student outcomes in elementary science education: The mediating role of teaching quality. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 86, 102882. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102882>
32. Flores, M. A., & Swennen, A. (2020). The COVID-19 pandemic and its effects on teacher education. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(4), 453–456. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1824253>
33. Galache, D. M. (2023). Teachers' professional development, classroom management strategies, and performance. *IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 5(2).
34. Garcia, J., & Ramos, L. (2025). Family concessions among Filipino educators abroad: A demographic analysis. *Philippine Journal of Migration Studies*, 9(2), 77–95.
35. Gebre, Z. A., Demissie, M. M., & Yimer, B. M. (2025). The impact of teacher socio-emotional competence on student engagement: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, Article 1526371. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1526371>
36. Gonzales, R. (2022). Digital literacy and teacher preparedness in Philippine classrooms. *Asian Journal of Education and Technology*, 11(3), 112–128.
37. Greene, B. A. (2021). Measuring cognitive engagement with self-report scales: Reflections from over 20 years of research. *Educational Psychologist*, 56(1), 1–24.
38. Hernandez, L. (2023). Community involvement in sustaining Philippine educational reforms. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 45(1), 89–104.
39. Johnson, R., & Lee, S. (2022). Student-centered approaches and teacher performance in U.S. classrooms. *American Journal of Education*, 128(4), 567–584.
40. Kassab, S. E., Rathan, R., Taylor, D. C. M., Abu-Hijleh, M. F., & Hamdy, H. (2024). The impact of the educational environment on student engagement and academic performance in health professions education. *BMC Medical Education*, 24, Article 1278. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-06270-9>
41. Kim, J., & Park, H. (2023). Digital transformation and teacher engagement in South Korea. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 43(2), 211–229.
42. Klassen, R. M., & Kim, L. E. (2021). Teacher selection and recruitment: Understanding teacher effectiveness across career stages. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33(2), 765–791.
43. Koehler, M. J., Mishra, P., & Cain, W. (2022). What is technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK)? *Journal of Education*, 202(1), 7–15.
44. König, J., Blömeke, S., & Kaiser, G. (2022). Teacher competence and instructional quality: Empirical evidence on the relationship between professional knowledge and classroom practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 115, 103732. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103732>
45. Korpershoek, H., Harms, T., de Boer, H., van Kuijk, M., & Doolaard, S. (2021). A meta-analysis of the effects of classroom management strategies and classroom management programs on students' academic,

- behavioral, emotional, and motivational outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 91(5), 775–813. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543211022393>
46. Kraft, M. A., & Hill, H. C. (2020). Developing ambitious mathematics instruction through web-based coaching: A randomized field trial. *American Educational Research Journal*, 57(6), 2378–2414. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831220904080>
47. Kunter, M., Klusmann, U., Baumert, J., Richter, D., Voss, T., & Hachfeld, A. (2021). Professional competence of teachers: Effects on instructional quality and student development. *Journal for Educational Research Online*, 13(1), 7–26.
48. Kwiek, M., & Roszka, W. (2022). The young and the old, the fast and the slow: Age, productivity, and research performance in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 47(8), 1570–1588.
49. Lachner, A., Backfisch, I., Stürmer, K., & Scheiter, K. (2021). Learning by teaching without errors? The role of professional knowledge in explaining instructional quality. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 98, 103243. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103243>
50. Li, Y., & Chen, H. (2023). Digital transformation and teacher performance in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 43(2), 211–229.
51. Martinez, A. (2024). Teacher performance and systemic inequities in Latin America. *Latin American Journal of Education Studies*, 19(1), 33–52.
52. Mercer, N. (2020). The educational value of classroom talk. *Language and Education*, 34(6), 497–512.
53. Muijs, D., Kyriakides, L., van der Werf, G., Creemers, B. P. M., Timperley, H., & Earl, L. (2020). State of the art – Teacher effectiveness and professional learning. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 31(2), 189–212. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2019.1657502>
54. Paigalan, D. M., & Bauyt, M. (2025). A systematic review on the factors affecting teacher's job performance. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(3), 702–718.
55. Pamon, E. Q., & Oco, R. M. (2024). Teachers' competence and learners' academic performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 7(3), 1375–1383. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i03-63>
56. Prananto, K., Cahyadi, S., Lubis, F. Y., & Hinduan, Z. R. (2025). Perceived teacher support and student engagement among higher education students: A systematic literature review. *BMC Psychology*, 13, Article 112. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-02412-w>
57. Reyes, A., & Santos, M. (2023). Governance reforms in Philippine education: Accountability and implementation. *Journal of Southeast Asian Education Policy*, 9(1), 34–52.
58. Salama, M. S., Utaminingsih, E. S., Ramadhani, M. H., & Intania, B. Y. (2025). Classroom management and student behavior in primary schools: A systematic review. *Universitas Negeri Semarang*.
59. Salavacion, R. L. (2025). Teachers' innovative strategies and engagement: Their influence on learners' performance (Doctoral dissertation). Guimaras State University, Philippines.
60. Salmela-Aro, K., Tang, X., Symonds, J., & Upadyaya, K. (2021). Student engagement in adolescence: A scoping review of longitudinal studies. *Learning and Instruction*, 71, 101430. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2020.101430>
61. Sapalo-Agno, D. (2025). Teachers' strategies in teaching 21st-century literature. *Guild of Educators in TESOL International Research Journal*, 3(1), 472–603.
62. Singh, R., & Sharma, P. (2021). Teacher engagement and workload in Indian schools. *International Journal of Pedagogy and Learning*, 16(2), 101–118.
63. Sørensen, T. B., Jørgensen, C. R., & Philipp, M. (2024). Supporting early career teachers through mentoring and professional learning communities. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 139, 104456.
64. Tao, Y., Meng, Y., Gao, Z., & Yang, X. (2022). Perceived teacher support, student engagement, and academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology*, 42(4), 401–420. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2022.2033168>
65. Tekir, S. (2025). Strategies for effective classroom management in online teaching: A post-pandemic review. *SAGE Open*, 15(3), 1–17.
66. Thoonen, E. E. J., Slegers, P. J. C., Oort, F. J., Peetsma, T. T. D., & Geijsel, F. P. (2022). Building teacher capacity to enhance student engagement and learning: The role of professional learning and instructional practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 114, 103700. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103700>

67. Tondeur, J., Howard, S. K., Siddiq, F., & Scherer, R. (2021). Enhancing future teachers' competencies for technology integration in education: A systematic review of intervention studies. *Educational Research Review*, 32, 100373. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100373>
68. Topchyan, R., & Woehler, C. (2021). Do teacher gender and gender matching matter? Exploring teacher gender effects on students and educational outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 106, 101718.
69. Toquero, S. C., & Capistrano, F. M. (2024). Pedagogy in the 21st-century literature classroom: Teachers' teaching mechanisms, challenges, and coping mechanisms. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2024.24046>
70. Torres, E. (2024). Teacher engagement and cultural adaptation in Southeast Asia. *Asian Journal of Comparative Education*, 12(1), 55–72.
71. Villanueva, P. (2024). Teacher migration and its impact on Philippine classrooms. *Philippine Journal of Labor and Education Studies*, 18(2), 77–95.
72. Wang, M.-T., & Degol, J. L. (2021). School climate: A review of the construct, measurement, and impact on student outcomes. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33(2), 481–512. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-021-09609-6>
73. Wong, Z. Y., & Liem, G. A. D. (2022). Student engagement: Current state of the construct, conceptual refinement, and future research directions. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34(1), 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-021-09628-3>