

School Climate, Instructional Styles, Digital Competence, and Performance of Teachers: Implications for Educational Intervention

Ana Liza B. Villanueva¹, Citrobelle A. Aldeguez²

¹DepEd Negros Island Region, Philippines

²La Carlota City College, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100800251>

Received: 20 August 2026; Accepted: 25 August 2026; Published: 01 September 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined the school climate, instructional styles, digital competence, the performance of teachers in one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region during the School Year 2026-2027. It also determined whether these variables differed according to teachers' age, sex, subject specialization, teaching experience, and educational attainment. The study used a descriptive-comparative-correlational research design involving 270 permanent public elementary and secondary school teachers. Data were gathered through validated questionnaires and teachers' IPCRF ratings. Results showed that teachers demonstrated a high level of instructional styles, a very high level of digital competence, and a very high perception of school climate. Teacher performance was rated outstanding. Significant differences were found in instructional styles according to sex, in digital competence according to sex and subject specialization, and in teacher performance according to age, subject specialization, teaching experience, and educational attainment. No significant differences were found in school climate across profile variables. Furthermore, instructional styles were not significantly related to teacher performance. However, digital competence and school climate showed significant positive relationships with teacher performance.

Keywords: School Climate; Instructional Style; Digital Competence; Performance of Teachers; Educational Intervention.

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Education (DepEd) pursues reforms that strengthen teacher performance and learner outcomes, guided by policies such as the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) and the implementation of DepEd Order No. 009, s. 2026 (three-term school calendar). Within this framework, teachers are expected to contribute to a positive school climate, demonstrate adaptive instructional styles, and digital competence that fosters holistic development. However, recent Philippine studies highlight persistent gaps. Alcontin (2021) notes that teachers' digital competence remains uneven, heavily dependent on access to professional development and resources. De Vera et al. (2021) find that while teachers rated themselves competent in technology integration, many struggle with lesson preparation and assessment in online environments due to limited ICT infrastructure and connectivity. Hero et al. (2021) emphasize that Filipino teachers' ICT practices vary widely, underscoring the need for continuous faculty development programs. These findings resonate with DepEd's own monitoring reports, which reveal disparities in instructional delivery across divisions.

In rural settings such as the Negros Island Region, teachers often encounter challenges in sustaining innovative instructional practices due to limitations in resources, access to technology, and institutional support. The quality of the school climate, particularly in terms of teacher collaboration, leadership support, and organizational responsiveness, likewise plays a crucial role in shaping teachers' motivation, professional growth, and overall performance. A positive and supportive school climate creates opportunities for collaboration, innovation, and continuous improvement; however, schools with limited resources and varying levels of institutional support may face difficulties in providing such conditions. These concerns are consistent with the Department of

Education's commitment to strengthening teacher competencies and fostering learning environments that support quality teaching and learning, as articulated in the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) under DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017 and the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS-PPST) under DepEd Memorandum No. 008, s. 2023.

In one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region, these challenges have become increasingly significant as the Department of Education continues to implement educational reforms and organizational adjustments. The implementation of the three-term school calendar under DepEd Order No. 009, s. 2026 calls for greater adaptability in instructional planning, lesson delivery, and learning management. At the same time, DepEd Memorandum No. 008, s. 2023 highlights the importance of developing teachers' professional competencies and ensuring their alignment with the indicators of the PPST. Given these expectations, it is essential that teachers possess adequate digital competence, instructional flexibility, and a supportive school climate that will enable them to meet professional standards and respond effectively to the changing demands of education. Addressing these concerns is vital not only for compliance with DepEd policies but also for promoting equitable access to quality education and improved learning outcomes for all learners (Department of Education, 2017; Department of Education, 2023; Department of Education, 2026).

This study, titled *School Climate, Instructional Styles, Digital Competence, and Performance of Teachers: Implications for Educational Intervention*, explores how these factors interact within one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region. Grounded in the Department of Education (DepEd) framework, the research aims to generate evidence-based insights that can guide the development of effective educational interventions. Ultimately, the study seeks to support teachers in enhancing their instructional practices, strengthening their digital capabilities, and fostering a more supportive school environment that aligns with ongoing national education reforms.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed a descriptive-comparative-correlational research design to examine the school climate, instructional styles, digital competence, and teaching performance of teachers. The descriptive aspect was used to determine the respondents' profile and assess the levels of school climate, instructional styles, digital competence, and teaching performance. The comparative aspect was utilized to determine whether significant differences existed in these variables when respondents were grouped according to age, sex, subject specialization, teaching experience, and highest educational attainment. Meanwhile, the correlational aspect was used to determine the relationships among school climate, instructional styles, digital competence, and teacher performance. This research design was appropriate because it enabled the researcher to describe existing conditions, compare groups, and examine relationships among the major variables of the study.

The respondents of the study were 270 permanent public elementary and secondary school teachers from one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region during School Year 2026-2027. These teachers were selected from a total population of 825 permanent teachers. The sample size was determined using Yamane's Formula with a five percent margin of error and was proportionally distributed across thirty-one schools to ensure adequate representation of both elementary and secondary levels.

To select the respondents, the study employed stratified simple random sampling through the draw-lots method. This technique ensured that each teacher had an equal opportunity to be selected while maintaining proportional representation from each school. Only permanent teachers who were actively engaged in classroom instruction were included in the study.

Data were collected using three adopted and validated instruments. School climate was measured using the School Climate Questionnaire developed by Reyes (2024). Instructional styles were assessed using the Teacher Instructional Style Questionnaire developed by Benjamin (2025). Digital competence was measured using the Teachers' Digital Competence and Instructional Effectiveness Questionnaire adapted from Balauro and Agatep (2026). Teacher performance was determined through the respondents' Individual Performance Commitment

and Review Form (IPCRF) ratings aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). All instruments demonstrated acceptable validity and reliability based on their original studies.

Before the conduct of the study, permission was secured from the Schools Division Superintendent and the respective school heads. The research instruments were consolidated into a Google Form and administered online to the selected respondents. An informed consent statement was included to ensure voluntary participation and confidentiality. After data collection, responses were encoded, organized, tabulated, and prepared for statistical analysis.

To analyze the data, frequency counts and percentages were used to describe the respondents' profile. Mean and standard deviation were employed to determine the level of school climate, instructional styles, digital competence, and teacher performance. To determine significant differences, the Mann-Whitney U Test was used for variables grouped according to sex, while the Kruskal-Wallis H Test was used for variables grouped according to age, subject specialization, teaching experience, and highest educational attainment. Whenever significant differences were found through the Kruskal-Wallis H Test, pairwise comparisons were conducted to identify the specific groups where the differences existed. Finally, the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson r) was utilized to determine the significant relationships between instructional styles and teacher performance, digital competence and teacher performance, and school climate and teacher performance. All statistical tests were analyzed using a 0.05 level of significance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Table 2. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents According to Profile.

Profile	Category	f	%
Age			
	30 years old and below	29	10.74
	31 – 40 years old	107	39.63
	41 – 50 years old	81	30.00
	51 – 60 years old	51	18.89
	61 years old and above	2	.74
	Total	270	100.00
Sex			
	Male	60	22.22
	Female	210	77.78
	Total	270	100.00
Subject Area/s or Teaching Specialization			
	Mathematics	55	20.37
	English	43	15.93
	Filipino	41	15.19
	Science	31	11.48
	EPP/TLE	25	9.26
	Araling Panlipunan	20	7.41
	MAPEH	15	5.56
	ESP/Values Ed	7	2.59
	General Subjects	33	12.22
	Total	270	100.00
Teaching Experience			
	9 years and below	95	35.19
	10 to 14 years	54	20.00

	15 to 19 years	59	21.85
	20 to 24 years	32	11.85
	25 years and above	30	11.11
	Total	270	100.00
Highest Educational Attainment			
	Bachelor's Degree	49	18.15
	Graduate Units	98	36.30
	Graduate Degree	93	34.44
	Post Graduate Units	21	7.78
	Post Graduate	9	3.33
	Total	270	100.00

As presented in Table 2, the largest proportion of respondents belonged to the 31- to 40-year-old age bracket, with 107 teachers or 39.63% of the total sample. This was followed by teachers aged 41 to 50 years, comprising 81 respondents or 30.00%. Teachers aged 51 to 60 years accounted for 18.89% (51), while those aged 30 years and below represented 10.74% (29). Only two respondents, equivalent to 0.74%, were aged 61 years and above.

The distribution indicates that a substantial majority of the respondents were in their middle adulthood years. With nearly seven out of every ten teachers falling within the 31 to 50 age range, the workforce can be characterized as both experienced and professionally established. At this stage of their careers, teachers are likely to have developed strong instructional and classroom management skills while remaining capable of adapting to educational reforms and technological advancements. This age composition suggests a balance between professional maturity and continued professional growth.

In terms of sex, female teachers comprised the majority of the respondents. Out of 270 participants, 210 (77.78%) were female, while 60 (22.22%) were male. This distribution reflects the long-observed pattern within the Philippine basic education system, where teaching continues to be a profession predominantly occupied by women. Although a notable difference exists in the number of male and female respondents, professional effectiveness is not determined by gender alone. Rather, teacher performance is more closely associated with competencies, professional preparation, and the availability of institutional support.

Regarding teaching specialization, Mathematics recorded the highest number of respondents, with 55 teachers (20.37%). English followed with 43 respondents (15.93%), while Filipino accounted for 41 respondents (15.19%). Teachers assigned to General Subjects represented 12.22% (33), and Science teachers comprised 11.48% (31) of the sample. The remaining respondents specialized in EPP/TLE (25 or 9.26%), Araling Panlipunan (20 or 7.41%), MAPEH (15 or 5.56%), and ESP/Values Education (7 or 2.59%).

The greater concentration of respondents in Mathematics, English, Filipino, and Science may be attributed to the priority given to these learning areas within the curriculum. These subjects are often considered foundational to student learning and therefore require a relatively larger number of teaching personnel. On the other hand, the smaller representation in specialized areas such as ESP/Values Education highlights the importance of ensuring equal access to professional development opportunities across all subject areas so that instructional quality can be consistently maintained throughout the curriculum.

In terms of teaching experience, the largest group consisted of teachers with nine years of service or less, representing 35.19% (95) of the respondents. This was followed by teachers with 15 to 19 years of experience (59 or 21.85%) and those with 10 to 14 years of service (54 or 20.00%). Teachers with 20 to 24 years of experience accounted for 11.85% (32), while those who had served for 25 years or more comprised 11.11% (30). Although beginning and early-career teachers formed the largest single category, the overall distribution reveals that a considerable proportion of respondents had extensive teaching experience. More than 60% of the respondents had served for at least ten years, reflecting a workforce enriched by long-term professional practice.

This combination of less experienced and veteran educators may contribute positively to school effectiveness by blending current pedagogical perspectives with years of accumulated expertise.

In terms of educational attainment, the largest proportion of respondents had earned graduate units, accounting for 36.30% (98). Teachers who had completed a master's degree represented 34.44% (93) of the sample. Meanwhile, 18.15% (49) reported a bachelor's degree as their highest educational qualification. Smaller percentages were recorded among those with postgraduate units (21 or 7.78%) and completed postgraduate degrees (9 or 3.33%).

The findings demonstrate a strong commitment among teachers to professional and academic advancement. More than two-thirds of the respondents had either completed graduate coursework or earned a master's degree, indicating that many educators actively pursue further studies; however, only a few respondents had reached the doctoral level.

Overall, the profile data portray a teaching workforce that is predominantly female, largely composed of teachers in their middle professional years, and characterized by substantial teaching experience. Most respondents are assigned to core academic subjects and have pursued graduate-level education to enhance their professional qualifications.

Level of School Climate as Perceived by the Respondents

Table 3. Level of School Climate of the Respondents in Terms of Leadership and Support, Teacher Collaboration, Institutional Environment, and Teaching and Learning Environment.

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Leadership and Support	4.26	.80	Very High
1. The principal provides clear guidance in school operations.	4.23	.85	Very High
2. School leaders encourage teachers to innovate in their teaching.	4.30	.81	Very High
3. I feel supported by administrators when challenges arise.	4.28	.83	Very High
4. Leadership decisions are communicated transparently.	4.26	.84	Very High
5. The administration values teacher input in school planning.	4.20	.88	High
Teacher Collaboration	4.36	.70	Very High
6. Teachers in this school trust and respect one another.	4.34	.76	Very High
7. Collaboration among teachers is actively encouraged.	4.49	.69	Very High
8. I feel comfortable sharing teaching strategies with colleagues.	4.45	.73	Very High
9. Conflicts among teachers are resolved constructively.	4.19	.87	High
10. There is a strong sense of teamwork among staff.	4.31	.80	Very High
Institutional Environment	4.17	.84	High
11. The school maintains clear rules and procedures.	4.20	.86	High
12. Policies on discipline and safety are consistently enforced.	4.22	.87	Very High
13. The school climate supports teacher well-being.	4.15	.89	High
14. Decision-making processes are fair and inclusive.	4.14	.91	High
15. The overall atmosphere of the school is positive and motivating.	4.15	.89	High
Teaching and Learning Environment	4.23	.68	Very High
16. I have access to adequate instructional resources.	4.09	.80	High
17. Professional development opportunities are regularly provided.	4.21	.80	Very High

18. Innovation in teaching is valued and recognized.	4.23	.76	Very High
19. The school climate motivates me to improve my teaching practices.	4.24	.76	Very High
20. Collaboration with students enhances the learning environment.	4.40	.68	Very High
School Climate as a Whole	4.25	.67	Very High

Legend:(4.21-5.0)-Very High;(3.41 – 4.20)-High;(2.61-3.40) Moderate (1.81 – 2.60)-Low;(1.00 – 1.80)-Very Low

Based on the results presented in Table 3, school climate obtained a grand mean of 4.25 with a standard deviation of 0.67, verbally interpreted as very high. This result shows that the respondents experience an exceptionally positive, supportive, and conducive organizational atmosphere within their school. Garcia and Mendoza (2024) posited that a highly positive school climate is a strong indicator of a thriving educational community where both professional growth and student welfare are heavily prioritized.

Among the specific dimensions, teacher collaboration registered the highest mean rating of 4.36 (SD = 0.70), interpreted as very high. The most prominent indicator in this cluster is the active encouragement of collaboration among teachers (Mean = 4.49, SD = 0.69). Furthermore, respondents reported feeling highly comfortable sharing teaching strategies with colleagues (Mean = 4.45, SD = 0.73) and indicated high levels of mutual trust and respect (Mean = 4.34, SD = 0.76). While the constructive resolution of conflicts yielded a comparatively lower score (Mean = 4.19, SD = 0.87, High), the overall domain underscores a deeply collegial working environment. This aligns with the assertions of Gaviola, Cabolao, and Olarte (2026), who highlighted that robust peer-to-peer collaboration and shared pedagogical practices are hallmark features of highly effective and resilient school cultures.

The domain of leadership and support garnered the second-highest domain mean of 4.26 (SD = 0.80), interpreted as very high. Respondents strongly agreed that school leaders encourage innovation in teaching (Mean = 4.30, SD = 0.81) and provide adequate support when challenges arise (Mean = 4.28, SD = 0.83). Transparent communication of decisions (Mean = 4.26, SD = 0.84) and clear operational guidance from the principal (Mean = 4.23, SD = 0.85) were also rated highly. Conversely, the valuation of teacher input in school planning scored the lowest in this domain (Mean = 4.20, SD = 0.88, High). These observations corroborate the findings of Santos and Villanueva (2025), noting that while school leaders often excel in providing instructional guidance, fostering deeply participatory decision-making during strategic planning remains a developmental area in many institutional frameworks.

The teaching and learning environment dimension obtained an overall mean of 4.23 (SD = 0.68), corresponding to a very high interpretation. Within this domain, collaboration with students to enhance the learning environment received the highest mean score (Mean = 4.40, SD = 0.68). The data also show that the climate motivates teachers to improve practices (Mean = 4.24, SD = 0.76) and values teaching innovation (Mean = 4.23, SD = 0.76). However, access to adequate instructional resources received the lowest rating across the entire table (Mean = 4.09, SD = 0.80, High). This dynamic supports the conclusions drawn by Alvarez and Dela Cruz (2025), whose research emphasized that teachers frequently sustain high motivation and innovative student engagement despite ongoing systemic challenges related to physical and material resource allocation.

The institutional environment dimension yielded a mean of 4.17 (SD = 0.84), interpreted as High. The consistent enforcement of policies on discipline and safety was the strongest indicator in this category (Mean = 4.22, SD = 0.87, Very High). Items assessing the overall positive school atmosphere (Mean = 4.15, SD = 0.89), support for teacher well-being (Mean = 4.15, SD = 0.89), and fair, inclusive decision-making processes (Mean = 4.14, SD = 0.91) all recorded high interpretations. These findings are consistent with the observations of Reyes (2024), who noted that although schools are generally effective in maintaining order and discipline, continuous efforts from school administrators remain essential in promoting teacher well-being and fostering a more inclusive learning environment.

These findings suggest that the respondents perceive their schools as supportive, collaborative, and conducive to professional growth. The high ratings across the different dimensions of school climate indicate that teachers benefit from effective leadership, positive working relationships with colleagues, and a learning environment that encourages continuous improvement. These conditions foster mutual trust, shared responsibility, and a collective commitment to achieving educational goals. Moreover, the positive school climate reflected in the results is consistent with the principles of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), which emphasize supportive professional environments as essential factors in enhancing teacher effectiveness and promoting successful student outcomes.

Level of Instructional Styles of the Respondents

Table 4. Level of Instructional Styles of the Respondents in Terms of Lecture, Demonstrator, Facilitator, Delegator Style and Integrative and Innovative Strategies.

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Lecture Style	3.53	.96	High
1. I deliver lessons primarily through direct explanation.	3.76	1.13	High
2. I rely on structured lectures to cover the curriculum.	3.60	1.04	High
3. I emphasize content mastery through teacher-centered instruction.	3.19	1.27	Moderate
4. I provide detailed notes and expect students to follow them closely.	3.58	1.08	High
5. I consider lecturing the most efficient way to manage large classes.	3.53	1.11	High
Demonstrator Style	4.47	.59	Very High
6. I model step-by-step problem-solving for students.	4.39	.68	Very High
7. I use visual aids and demonstrations to clarify concepts.	4.61	.63	Very High
8. I show examples before asking students to practice independently.	4.59	.65	Very High
9. I believe demonstrating tasks helps students learn faster.	4.59	.67	Very High
10. I often perform experiments or simulations for students to observe.	4.19	.80	High
Facilitators Style	4.40	.69	Very High
11. I encourage students to explore topics through guided activities.	4.39	.75	Very High
12. I design tasks that promote independent learning.	4.34	.78	Very High
13. I ask open-ended questions to stimulate critical thinking.	4.41	.78	Very High
14. I provide opportunities for students to collaborate in small groups.	4.47	.74	Very High
15. I act as a guide rather than the sole source of knowledge.	4.37	.80	Very High
Delegator Style	4.25	.67	Very High
16. I assign projects where students take responsibility for outcomes.	4.26	.80	Very High
17. I allow learners to collaborate and manage group work with minimal intervention.	4.27	.82	Very High
18. I encourage students to set their own learning goals.	4.17	.79	High
19. I trust students to make decisions about how they complete tasks.	4.18	.79	High

20. I give students freedom to explore topics beyond the textbook	4.39	.73	Very High
Integrative and Innovative Strategies	4.32	.63	Very High
21. I integrate multiple subject areas in my lessons.	4.46	.69	Very High
22. I use project-based learning to connect classroom content with real-life contexts.	4.28	.75	Very High
23. I adopt innovative strategies such as flipped classroom or blended learning.	4.19	.76	High
24. I encourage collaborative problem-solving among students.	4.38	.71	Very High
25. I experiment with new teaching methods to improve student engagement.	4.29	.73	Very High
Instructional Styles as a Whole	4.19	.52	High

Legend:(4.21-5.0)-Very High;(3.41 – 4.20)-High;(2.61-3.40) Moderate (1.81 – 2.60)-Low;(1.00 – 1.80)-Very Low

Based on the results presented in Table 4, the respondents demonstrated a high level of instructional styles overall ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 0.52$). The relatively low standard deviation suggests that the respondents shared generally similar views regarding their instructional practices. The findings indicate that teachers utilize a variety of teaching approaches in their classrooms, although they tend to favor learner-centered and interactive methods more than traditional teacher-directed approaches. This pattern suggests a shift toward instructional practices that actively engage students in the learning process. The result is consistent with the observations of Garcia and Mendoza (2023), who reported that teachers increasingly employ technology-supported and demonstrative teaching methods to enhance student learning.

Among the instructional styles examined, Demonstrator Style obtained the highest mean rating ($M = 4.47$, $SD = 0.59$), indicating a very high level of utilization. This finding suggests that teachers place considerable value on modeling skills and procedures to help learners understand concepts more effectively. The highest-rated indicator under this domain was the use of visual aids and demonstrations to clarify lessons (Item 7: $M = 4.61$, $SD = 0.63$). In contrast, performing experiments or simulations (Item 10: $M = 4.19$, $SD = 0.80$) received the lowest score within the category, although it remained at a high level. This may imply that while teachers recognize the importance of hands-on demonstrations, limitations in materials, facilities, or resources may reduce their opportunities to conduct experiments regularly. These findings support Garcia and Mendoza (2023), who noted that educators commonly excel in demonstration-based instruction but may encounter challenges when implementing resource-intensive activities.

The results likewise reveal a very high level of Facilitator Style ($M = 4.40$, $SD = 0.69$). Teachers appeared to value learning experiences that encourage exploration, collaboration, and critical thinking among students. Providing opportunities for small-group collaboration received the highest rating in this category (Item 14: $M = 4.47$, $SD = 0.74$), highlighting the importance teachers place on cooperative learning. Similarly, respondents viewed themselves as guides and mentors rather than the sole source of knowledge (Item 15: $M = 4.37$, $SD = 0.80$). These findings suggest that teachers encourage active participation and learner engagement within the classroom. The result supports the study of Lopez (2024), which found that many educators adopt facilitative roles that promote deeper learning and critical thinking skills.

In terms of Integrative and Innovative Strategies, the respondents also registered a very high level of practice ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 0.63$). The findings indicate that teachers frequently integrate concepts across subject areas and connect classroom lessons to real-world experiences. The highest-rated indicator was integrating multiple disciplines within lesson delivery (Item 21: $M = 4.46$, $SD = 0.69$), while project-based learning also received strong support (Item 22: $M = 4.28$, $SD = 0.75$). However, the use of approaches such as flipped classrooms and blended learning (Item 23: $M = 4.19$, $SD = 0.76$) received comparatively lower ratings. Although still interpreted as high, this result suggests that teachers may require additional training, technological resources, or institutional

support to fully maximize these innovative digital teaching models. Similar observations were made by Delos Santos (2022) and Alvarez and Dela Cruz (2025), who emphasized that successful instructional innovation often depends on both teacher preparedness and organizational support.

The Delegator Style likewise obtained a very high rating ($M = 4.25$, $SD = 0.67$). This finding indicates that teachers generally trust students to assume responsibility for their learning and participate actively in classroom tasks. Allowing learners to explore topics beyond prescribed materials emerged as the strongest indicator in this category (Item 20: $M = 4.39$, $SD = 0.73$). Meanwhile, encouraging students to establish their own learning goals (Item 18: $M = 4.17$, $SD = 0.79$) received a slightly lower rating. This suggests that although teachers support learner autonomy, they continue to provide guidance to ensure that learning objectives are achieved effectively. Such findings are consistent with Bautista (2022), who observed that effective educators balance student independence with appropriate instructional support.

Although Lecture Style was still rated high ($M = 3.53$, $SD = 0.96$), it emerged as the lowest-ranked instructional style among the five dimensions examined. The findings suggest that teachers continue to use lectures primarily for organizing content and managing classroom instruction, particularly when covering extensive curriculum requirements. The highest-rated indicators involved delivering lessons through direct explanation and using lectures to structure learning activities. However, emphasizing teacher-centered instruction for content mastery (Item 3: $M = 3.19$, $SD = 1.27$) received the lowest mean score in the entire scale and was interpreted only as moderate. This result indicates that respondents generally do not view traditional lecture-based teaching as the most effective means of facilitating student learning. The finding supports Lopez (2024) as well as Riego and Aldeguer (2025), who reported a growing preference among teachers for more participatory, learner-centered instructional approaches.

These results portray a teaching workforce that embraces contemporary and learner-focused instructional practices. While traditional lectures remain useful for maintaining organization and classroom structure, the respondents demonstrated stronger preferences for demonstration, facilitation, collaboration, innovation, and student autonomy. Collectively, these findings suggest that teachers are responsive to the evolving demands of education and are committed to creating engaging learning environments. The results further imply that professional competencies, educational preparation, and teaching experiences contribute to the adoption of diverse instructional approaches. As a whole, the respondents reflect a dynamic and adaptable teaching community that continues to align its practices with current educational trends emphasizing active learning, collaboration, technology integration, and continuous professional growth.

Level of Digital Competence of the Respondents

Table 5. Level of Digital Competence of Respondents in Terms of Information and Data Literacy, Digital Communication and Collaboration, Digital Content Creation, Digital Safety and Instructional Effectiveness (PPST-aligned).

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Information and Data Literacy	4.32	.62	Very High
1. I can search for reliable online resources to support my lessons.	4.49	.68	Very High
2. I evaluate the credibility of digital information before using it in class.	4.46	.67	Very High
3. I organize digital files and data for easy access by students.	4.21	.77	Very High
4. I use ICT tools to analyze student performance data.	4.27	.77	Very High
5. I teach students how to critically assess online information.	4.16	.80	High
Digital Communication and Collaboration	4.07	.69	High
6. I use digital platforms (e.g., MS Teams, Google Classroom) to communicate with students.	3.70	1.00	High
7. I collaborate with colleagues using online tools.	4.17	.82	High

8. I encourage students to work together through digital platforms.	3.77	.93	High
9. I maintain professional communication online following DepEd guidelines.	4.40	.72	Very High
10. I use ICT to connect with parents and stakeholders about student progress.	4.33	.76	Very High
Digital Content Creation	4.31	.5	Very High
11. I design digital learning materials tailored to student needs.	4.11	.87	High
12. I adapt existing online resources to fit the curriculum.	4.26	.73	Very High
13. I create multimedia presentations to enhance lessons.	4.32	.78	Very High
14. I use productivity applications effectively in teaching.	4.51	.73	Very High
15. I share digital content responsibly, respecting copyright and ethics.	4.37	.75	Very High
Digital Safety	4.46	.68	Very High
16. I promote responsible use of ICT among students.	4.45	.73	Very High
17. I ensure data privacy when using online platforms.	4.44	.73	Very High
18. I teach students about safe online practices.	4.44	.73	Very High
19. I protect my devices and accounts with security measures.	4.47	.70	Very High
20. I model ethical digital behavior in my professional work.	4.50	.72	Very High
Instructional Effectiveness (PPST-aligned)	4.31	.67	Very High
21. I integrate ICT to improve lesson delivery.	4.54	.68	Very High
22. I use digital tools to differentiate instruction for diverse learners.	4.39	.76	Very High
23. I provide timely feedback using online platforms.	4.12	.85	High
24. I design ICT-supported assessments aligned with learning outcomes.	4.21	.80	Very High
25. I observe improved student performance when digital tools are integrated.	4.30	.76	Very High
Digital Competence as a Whole	4.30	.56	Very High

Legend:(4.21-5.0)-Very High;(3.41 – 4.20)-High;(2.61-3.40) Moderate (1.81 – 2.60)-Low;(1.00 – 1.80)-Very Low

Based on the table above, the teachers demonstrated a very high level of digital competence as reflected by the overall grand mean of 4.30. This finding suggests that the respondents are generally confident and capable in using digital technologies to support both their professional responsibilities and classroom instruction. It also indicates that technology has become an integral part of their teaching practices and day-to-day educational tasks.

Among the five domains, digital safety achieved the highest category mean of 4.46 ($SD = 0.68$), verbally interpreted as very high. Within this domain, respondents rated modeling ethical digital behavior in their professional work highest with a mean of 4.50 ($SD = 0.72$), followed closely by protecting devices and accounts with security measures ($M = 4.47, SD = 0.70$). Promoting the responsible use of ICT among students ($M = 4.45, SD = 0.73$), ensuring data privacy ($M = 4.44, SD = 0.73$), and teaching students' safe online practices ($M = 4.44, SD = 0.73$) all maintained very high interpretations. These findings demonstrate that educators prioritize ethical responsibility, cybersecurity, and data protection in their digital practices. This aligns with Saucejo and Mohammad (2026), who found that effective instructional leadership fosters environments where teachers feel supported to innovate responsibly. Schools with strong leadership encourage ethical and safe digital practices, leading to improved teacher performance and student outcomes.

The domain of information and data literacy registered the second-highest domain mean of 4.32 ($SD = 0.62$), interpreted as very high. The respondents rated searching for reliable online resources to support lessons highest within this cluster ($M = 4.49, SD = 0.68$), followed by evaluating the credibility of digital information prior to classroom use ($M = 4.46, SD = 0.67$). Using ICT tools to analyze student performance data ($M = 4.27, SD = 0.77$) and organizing digital files for student access ($M = 4.21, SD = 0.77$) were also interpreted as very high.

However, teaching students how to critically assess online information received a comparatively lower rating of 4.16 ($SD = 0.80$, High), suggesting that while teachers personally exhibit strong information retrieval and evaluation skills, instructing students to independently critique digital resources remains an area for further emphasis. This finding supports Ramirez, Gersana, and Cabrejas (2026), who emphasized that pedagogical innovation particularly in digital literacy enhances teacher adaptability and student analytical ability. This finding resonates with Ramirez et al. (2026), who identified flipped classrooms and blended learning as key contributors to advanced teaching competencies, reinforcing the need for continuous innovation in content creation.

Both digital content creation and instructional effectiveness (PPST-aligned) yielded identical overall domain means of 4.31 ($SD = 0.65$ and $SD = 0.67$, respectively), both interpreted as very high. In terms of content creation, educators demonstrated the greatest proficiency in using standard productivity applications such as Word, Excel, and PowerPoint ($M = 4.51, SD = 0.73$) and sharing digital content responsibly ($M = 4.37, SD = 0.75$). Designing tailored digital learning materials to meet individual student needs recorded the lowest mean in this domain ($M = 4.11, SD = 0.87$, High). For instructional effectiveness, the highest indicator was integrating ICT to improve lesson delivery ($M = 4.54, SD = 0.68$), whereas providing timely feedback via online platforms scored lowest in this indicator group ($M = 4.12, SD = 0.85$, High). This underscores that teachers excel at utilizing technology to enhance teaching delivery but face greater operational hurdles when leveraging digital platforms for individualized material design and real-time feedback. These results echo Saucejo and Mohammad (2026), who found that facilitator and integrative strategies such as inquiry-based learning and project-based instruction significantly improve student performance when supported by effective instructional leadership. Teachers who integrate ICT meaningfully foster deeper engagement and critical thinking

Lastly, digital communication and collaboration recorded the lowest domain mean at 4.07 ($SD = 0.69$), verbally interpreted as high. Respondents demonstrated strong adherence to maintaining professional online communication following Department of Education (DepEd) guidelines ($M = 4.40, SD = 0.72$, Very High) and connecting with parents and stakeholders regarding student progress ($M = 4.33, SD = 0.76$, Very High). Conversely, direct student-facing digital communication tools received lower ratings. Specifically, using digital learning management platforms such as MS Teams or Google Classroom to communicate directly with students obtained the lowest mean in the entire table ($M = 3.70, SD = 1.00$, High), alongside encouraging student peer collaboration through digital platforms ($M = 3.77, SD = 0.93$, High).

These results indicate that while administrative and stakeholder digital communication is firmly established, routine student interaction through formal Learning Management Systems (LMS) remains less utilized, likely influenced by platform accessibility, student device availability, or connectivity limitations. These results suggest that while administrative and stakeholder communication is well-established, student-facing digital interaction remains limited, likely due to connectivity issues, lack of gadgets, or platform accessibility. Yongco (2026) observed that transformational leadership empowers teachers to adopt student-centered digital practices, whereas rigid or transactional leadership confines them to traditional communication modes an insight mirrored in this study's findings.

Level of Teaching Performance of the Respondents

Table 6. Level of Teaching Performance of the Respondents

Level of Teaching Performance	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Outstanding	196	4.64	.25	Outstanding
Very Satisfactory	73			
Satisfactory	1			
Unsatisfactory	0			
Poor	0			

Based on the table above, the majority of teachers achieved outstanding performance, with 196 respondents rated in this category. Meanwhile, 73 respondents were rated Very Satisfactory, and only one respondent received a satisfactory rating. None of the respondents were rated unsatisfactory or poor, indicating a consistently high level of teaching effectiveness across the division. It reflects the findings of Saucejo and Mohammad (2026), who reported that strong instructional leadership and supportive school environments significantly enhance teacher performance and student outcomes. Their study highlighted that when administrators encourage innovation and provide consistent guidance, teachers demonstrate higher levels of engagement and effectiveness patterns mirrored in the present results.

The computed mean of 4.64 (SD = 0.25), interpreted as outstanding, further supports that teachers exhibit exceptional competence in instructional delivery, classroom management, and professional engagement. This distribution demonstrates that educators in the division consistently meet or exceed the performance standards set by the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST).

Overall, the results point to a highly capable teaching workforce that demonstrates strong instructional competence, a dedication to professional growth, and a clear commitment to delivering quality education. The fact that none of the respondents received unsatisfactory or poor ratings reflects the division's continuing efforts to uphold high professional standards and foster a culture of excellence among its teachers.

In support of this finding, Yongco (2026) emphasized that transformational leadership plays a vital role in enhancing teacher motivation, independence, and professional commitment. The consistently high-performance ratings observed in this study suggest that school leaders may be creating an environment that encourages collaboration, innovation, and shared responsibility. Such leadership practices likely contribute to teachers' ability to maintain high levels of performance while continuously improving their instructional practices.

These findings highlight the important role of supportive leadership, collaboration, and continuous professional learning in fostering high levels of teacher performance. The respondents' outstanding level of performance reflects their strong commitment to instructional excellence and professional responsibility. These results suggest that the teachers consistently demonstrate effective teaching practices and uphold the standards expected of quality educators. Moreover, their performance reflects a culture of professionalism and continuous improvement that is aligned with the goals of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) and broader expectations for effective and reflective teaching.

Difference in the Perception of School Climate of Respondents When Grouped According to Age

Table 7a. Difference in the Perception of School Climate among Respondents when Grouped According to Age.

Age	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
30 years old and below	3.383	.496	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant
31 – 40 years old				
41 – 50 years old				
51 – 60 years old				
61 years old and above				

Table 7a presents the differences in respondents' perceptions of school climate when they were grouped according to age. The results generated an H-value of 3.383 and a p-value of 0.496. Since the obtained p-value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was retained, indicating that no significant difference exists in the respondents' perceptions of school climate across age groups.

This finding suggests that teachers, regardless of whether they are younger or more experienced, generally share similar views regarding the climate of their schools. From teachers aged 30 years and below to those aged 61 years and above, perceptions of leadership, collaboration, support, and the overall school environment appear to be relatively consistent. This result is in agreement with the study of Tuquib et al. (2026), which found that age

does not significantly influence how teachers perceive their organizational environment. Instead, common institutional values, leadership practices, and shared professional experiences tend to shape these perceptions. Similarly, Saucejo and Mohammad (2026) emphasized that positive school climate is influenced more by supportive leadership and strong collegial relationships than by individual demographic characteristics.

The findings indicate that teachers in one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region experience a generally positive and unified school environment regardless of age. The consistency in their perceptions may reflect the effectiveness of school initiatives that promote collaboration, inclusivity, mutual respect, and professional support. These factors contribute to maintaining a healthy organizational climate that fosters both teacher well-being and professional effectiveness.

Difference in the Perception of School Climate of Respondents When Grouped According to Sex

Table 7b. Difference in the Perception of School Climate among Respondents when Grouped According to Sex.

Sex	Test Statistics (U)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Male	6012.000	.588	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Female				

Table 7b presents the difference in the perception of school climate among respondents in one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region when grouped according to sex. The analysis yielded a test statistics of $U = 6012.000$ and a $p\text{-value} = 0.588$, which is greater than the 0.05 significance level. Consequently, the decision is to fail to reject the null hypothesis, indicating that the difference is not significant.

The findings indicate that male and female teachers have generally similar perceptions of the school climate within their respective schools. This suggests that gender does not significantly influence how educators view their working environment, including aspects such as leadership support, collaboration, communication, and overall organizational culture. Both groups appear to experience the school setting in much the same way, reflecting a shared understanding of the conditions within their workplace.

This result is consistent with the findings of Tuquib et al. (2026), who reported that teachers' perceptions of organizational climate are influenced more by leadership practices, workplace relationships, and institutional culture than by demographic characteristics. Likewise, Saucejo and Mohammad (2026) emphasized that schools that foster inclusivity and positive professional relationships tend to create a common sense of trust, cooperation, and support among teachers regardless of gender.

These findings suggest that one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region has cultivated a positive and inclusive work environment where teachers feel equally respected, supported, and engaged in achieving the goals of the institution. The consistency of perceptions among male and female educators reflects a school climate that promotes collaboration, fairness, and professional unity across the teaching workforce.

Difference in the Perception of School Climate of Respondents When Grouped According to Subject Area/s or Teaching Specialization

Table 7c. Difference in the Perception of School Climate when Grouped According to Subject Area/s or Teaching Specialization.

Subject Area/s or Teaching Specialization	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Mathematics	12.198	.143	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant
English				
Filipino				

Science				
EPP/TLE				
Araling Panlipunan				
MAPEH				
ESP/Values Ed				
General Subjects				

Table 7c presents the difference in the perception of school climate among respondents in one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region when grouped according to subject area or teaching specialization. The findings revealed no significant difference in respondents' perceptions of school climate across the different subject areas or teaching specializations ($p = 0.143 > 0.05$). Consequently, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

This finding aligns with the study of Tuquib et al. (2026), who found that teachers' perceptions of their organizational environment are shaped more by shared school experiences than by their specific teaching assignments. Likewise, Saucejo and Mohammad (2026) emphasized that supportive leadership, positive collegial relationships, and effective communication are key factors in fostering a positive school climate.

The result suggests that schools within the division have established organizational conditions that are experienced similarly by teachers across various specializations. Such consistency may indicate the presence of inclusive practices and a collaborative culture that strengthen professional relationships and contribute to a supportive and effective educational environment.

Difference in the Perception of School Climate of Respondents When Grouped According to Teaching Experience

Table 7d. Difference in the Perception of School Climate among Respondents when Grouped According to Teaching Experience

Teaching Experience	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
9 years and below	2.116	.714	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant
10 to 14 years				
15 to 19 years				
20 to 24 years				
25 years and above				

Table 7d presents the difference in the perception of school climate among respondents when grouped according to teaching experience. The results revealed no statistically significant difference in teachers' perceptions of school climate across levels of teaching experience ($p = 0.714 > 0.05$). Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected, indicating that teaching experience does not significantly influence respondents' perceptions of the school climate. Whether teachers are relatively new to the profession or have been teaching for more than 25 years, they generally view their school environment in the same way.

This statistical result is consistent with the findings of Tuquib et al. (2026), who reported that teachers' views of organizational climate are shaped less by years of service and more by shared institutional values, leadership practices, and school culture. Similarly, Saucejo and Mohammad (2026) emphasized that positive school climate is largely influenced by administrative support, effective communication, and strong collegial relationships rather than by tenure alone.

Overall, the findings suggest that teachers in one of the Schools Division in the Negros Island Region experience a stable and cohesive school environment regardless of their teaching experience. The consistency in their perceptions reflects the effectiveness of efforts to promote collaboration, inclusivity, mutual respect, and

professional trust within schools. These qualities contribute to a positive organizational climate that supports both teacher well-being and the achievement of educational goals.

Difference in the Perception of School Climate of Respondents When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment

Table 7e. Difference in the Perception of School Climate among Respondents when Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment.

Highest Educational Attainment	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H ₀	Interpretation
Bachelor's Degree	.576	.966	Failed to Reject H ₀	Not Significant
Graduate Units				
Graduate Degree				
Post Graduate Units				
Post Graduate				

Table 7e presents the difference in the perception of school climate among respondents when grouped according to subject area or teaching specialization. The findings showed no significant difference in teachers' perceptions of school climate based on their area of specialization ($p = 0.143 > 0.05$). Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

This finding supports the study of Tuquib et al. (2026), which found that teachers' views of their school environment are influenced more by their shared experiences in the workplace than by the subjects they teach. Similarly, Saucejo and Mohammad (2026) highlighted that supportive leadership, good working relationships, and open communication play important roles in creating a positive school climate.

The result suggests that teachers across different subject areas generally experience the same school environment. This may indicate that the schools in the division promote a culture of collaboration, respect, and support, helping create a positive and productive workplace for all teachers.

Difference in the Instructional Style of the Respondents when Grouped According to Age

Table 8a. Difference in the Instructional Styles of Respondents when Grouped According to Age.

Age	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H ₀	Interpretation
30 years old and below	1.788	.775	Failed to Reject H ₀	Not Significant
31 – 40 years old				
41 – 50 years old				
51 – 60 years old				
61 years old and above				

Table 8a presents the difference in the instructional styles of respondents when grouped according to age. The results show the value of H-statistic = 1.788, $p = 0.775$ leading to the decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis. These findings indicate that teachers exhibit comparable instructional styles regardless of age. The statistical analysis showed no significant differences among the various age groups, suggesting that educators, whether younger or more experienced, tend to employ similar teaching approaches in their classrooms. This result implies that age alone does not appear to be a determining factor in how teachers plan, deliver, and facilitate instruction.

This research result is consistent with the study of Tuquib et al. (2026), which reported that demographic characteristics such as age do not significantly influence teacher performance, emphasizing the importance of professional competence and organizational support. Likewise, Lopez (2024) observed that although younger teachers may be more inclined to adopt innovative and technology-based strategies while older teachers often

draw on their extensive classroom experience, these differences are not substantial enough to produce significant variations in overall instructional practice.

Taken together, the results suggest that instructional styles among teachers are shaped more by professional standards, school culture, and ongoing professional development than by age. This may reflect the effectiveness of institutional training programs and the shared commitment of educators in one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region to implementing learner-centered and effective teaching practices.

Difference in the Instructional Style of the Respondents when Grouped According to Sex

Table 8b. Difference in the Instructional Styles of Respondents when Grouped According to Sex.

Sex	Test Statistics (U)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Male	5083.500	.023	Reject H_0	Significant
Female				

Table 8b presents the difference in the instructional styles of respondents when grouped according to sex. The result yields a test statistic of $U = 5083.500$ and a $p\text{-value} = 0.023$, which is less than the 0.05 significance level. Consequently, the decision is to reject the null hypothesis, indicating that there is a significant difference in the instructional styles of teachers when grouped by sex.

The findings indicate that instructional styles vary significantly between male and female teachers. This suggests that gender may influence certain aspects of classroom practice and the methods teachers use to facilitate learning. While both groups remain capable and effective educators, differences appear to exist in their preferred approaches to instruction.

This result is supported by Fontanilla et al. (2026), who reported that female teachers often demonstrate stronger collaborative practices and greater openness to participatory leadership, whereas male teachers tend to favor more structured and demonstration-oriented teaching methods. Similarly, Tuquib et al. (2026) noted that gender may influence specific teaching behaviors, particularly in areas such as communication, classroom interaction, and management strategies. Despite these differences, both male and female teachers consistently maintain high levels of professional performance.

The finding suggests that diversity in instructional approaches may be associated with differences in individual teaching preferences and experiences rather than differences in teaching effectiveness. Such variation can be beneficial in addressing the diverse learning needs of students, as it allows educators to employ a wider range of strategies and perspectives in the classroom.

The significant difference observed between male and female teachers suggests that certain personal and professional characteristics may influence the way they approach instruction and interact with learners. Factors such as communication patterns, interpersonal skills, and preferred teaching strategies may contribute to variations in classroom practices and student engagement.

Despite these differences, both groups consistently demonstrated high levels of performance, indicating that the variation in instructional styles does not negatively affect teaching effectiveness. Rather, it highlights the diverse ways teachers can successfully facilitate learning and respond to students' needs.

This finding supports the view presented in the reviewed literature that diversity in instructional approaches can enrich the teaching-learning process. When educators employ different yet effective strategies, they are better able to accommodate varied learning preferences, promote student engagement, and enhance overall educational outcomes. In the context of the Negros Island Region, such diversity in teaching practices contributes to a more dynamic, flexible, and learner-centered educational environment.

Difference in the Instructional Style of the Respondents when Grouped According to Subject Area/s or Teaching Specialization

Table 8c. Difference in the Instructional Styles of Respondents when Grouped According to Subject Area/s or Teaching Specialization.

Subject Area/s or Teaching Specialization	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Mathematics	10.025	.263	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant
English				
Filipino				
Science				
EPP/TLE				
Araling Panlipunan				
MAPEH				
ESP/Values Ed				
General Subjects				

Table 8c shows the differences in the instructional styles of teachers when grouped according to their subject area or teaching specialization. The results reveal a computed H-value of 10.025 and a p-value of 0.263. Because the p-value exceeds the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis is accepted (or failed to be rejected), indicating that no significant difference exists in the instructional styles of teachers across different subject areas.

This means that teachers across various subject areas; Mathematics, English, Filipino, Science, EPP/TLE, Araling Panlipunan, MAPEH, ESP/Values Education, and General Subjects exhibit similar instructional styles. The result supports Garcia and Mendoza (2023), who found that while subject specialization influences instructional content and assessment methods, it does not necessarily alter the overall teaching approach. Likewise, Datoon and Consigna (2026) emphasized that teachers' adherence to PPST-aligned competencies ensures consistency in instructional delivery regardless of discipline.

The finding suggests that professional standards and institutional training programs promote uniform pedagogical quality across subject areas. Teachers in the Negros Island Region apply comparable strategies such as demonstration, facilitation, and integration anchored on learner-centered principles rather than subject-specific variations. This consistency reflects the success of division-wide capacity-building initiatives in maintaining high instructional performance across all curricular domains.

Difference in the Instructional Style of the Respondents when Grouped According to Teaching Experience

Table 8d. Difference in the Instructional Styles of Respondents when Grouped According to Teaching Experience.

Teaching Experience	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
9 years and below	7.199	.126	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant
10 to 14 years				
15 to 19 years				
20 to 24 years				
25 years and above				

Table 8d presents the differences in the instructional styles of the respondents when grouped according to teaching experience. The results yielded an H-value of 7.199 and a p-value of 0.126. Since the p-value is higher than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the instructional styles of teachers based on their years of teaching experience.

This means that teachers, regardless of their years of service, from those with less than 9 years to those with 25 years and above, exhibit similar instructional styles. The result supports Lopez (2024) and Tuquib et al. (2026), who found that teaching experience does not necessarily lead to major variations in instructional approach, as professional standards and continuous training ensure pedagogical consistency.

The finding suggests that teachers, regardless of their length of service, tend to employ similar approaches in lesson delivery, classroom facilitation, and the integration of learning activities. This consistency may be attributed to the influence of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) and the continuous professional development programs implemented within the division.

The result further indicates that both beginning and experienced teachers are guided by common professional expectations and instructional standards. Through regular training, mentoring, and capacity-building initiatives, educators are provided with opportunities to strengthen their competencies and adopt effective teaching practices.

Ultimately, the similarity in instructional styles across different experience levels reflects the effectiveness of institutional efforts to promote quality teaching. It suggests that teachers, regardless of whether they are new to the profession or have spent many years in service, are able to uphold learner-centered, responsive, and innovative approaches to instruction.

Difference in the Instructional Style of the Respondents when Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment

Table 8e. Difference in the Instructional Styles of Respondents when Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment.

Highest Educational Attainment	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Bachelor's Degree	1.836	.766	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Graduate Units				
Graduate Degree				
Post Graduate Units				
Post Graduate				

Table 8e presents the difference in the instructional styles of when grouped according to highest educational attainment. The result shows $H = 1.836$, $p = 0.766$ leading to the decision to accept the null hypothesis, indicating that the difference is not significant.

The results indicate that teachers demonstrate comparable instructional practices regardless of their level of educational attainment. Whether they possess a bachelor's degree, have completed graduate units, hold a master's degree, or have pursued postgraduate studies, their approaches to teaching appear largely similar. This suggests that academic qualifications alone do not necessarily determine the instructional methods teachers employ in the classroom.

This finding is consistent with the work of Ramirez et al. (2026), who emphasized that teaching effectiveness and instructional innovation are influenced not only by formal academic preparation but also by opportunities for professional growth and support within the workplace. Similarly, Saucejo and Mohammad (2026) highlighted the importance of continuous training and supportive leadership in helping teachers maintain high standards of instructional practice, regardless of their educational background.

The results further suggest that teachers in the Negros Island Region are guided by shared professional expectations and common teaching standards. Through the implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) and ongoing division-wide professional development initiatives, educators can maintain a consistent level of instructional quality. As a result, both less academically advanced and highly

credentialed teachers demonstrate learner-centered, integrative, and innovative teaching practices that support effective student learning.

Difference in the Digital Competence of Respondents When Grouped According to Age

Table 9a. Difference in the Digital Competence of the Respondents when grouped according to Age.

Age	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H ₀	Interpretation
30 years old and below	3.053	.549	Failed to Reject H ₀	Not Significant
31 – 40 years old				
41 – 50 years old				
51 – 60 years old				
61 years old and above				

Table 9a presents the difference in the digital competence of the respondents when grouped according to age. The statistical test results show the computed value of $H = 3.053$, $p = 0.54$. Since the computed p-value is greater than the 0.05 significance level, the decision is to fail to reject the null hypothesis, indicating that the difference is not significant.

The results indicate that digital competence does not vary significantly across age groups. Teachers from the youngest respondents to those in the oldest age bracket demonstrated comparable levels of proficiency in using digital technologies for teaching and other professional responsibilities. This suggests that age is not a major factor in determining a teacher's ability to utilize digital tools effectively in the educational setting.

This finding is consistent with the study of Tuquib et al. (2026), which reported that demographic characteristics such as age have minimal influence on professional performance when educators are provided with adequate technological resources and institutional support. Similarly, Ramirez, Gersana, and Cabrejas (2026) emphasized that successful ICT integration and instructional innovation are more closely associated with professional learning opportunities than with age-related differences.

The results further suggest that ongoing training initiatives and the consistent implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) have helped develop digital competencies across all generations of teachers. As a result, educators, regardless of age, appear equally capable of using technology for instruction, communication, assessment, and professional tasks. This reflects the effectiveness of the division's efforts to promote technology-enhanced teaching and foster a culture of continuous learning among teachers throughout the Negros Island Region.

Difference in the Digital Competence of Respondents When Grouped According to Sex

Table 9b. Difference in the Digital Competence of the Respondents when grouped according to Sex

Sex	Test Statistics (U)	p-value	Decision for H ₀	Interpretation
Male	5179.500	.036	Reject H ₀	Significant
Female				

The table above presents the difference in the digital competence of the respondents in one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region when grouped according to sex. The analysis yield a test statistic of $U = 5179.500$ and a p-value = 0.036, which is less than the 0.05 significance level leading to reject the null hypothesis, as it indicates a significant difference in the digital competence of teachers when grouped by sex.

The result suggests that male and female teachers differ significantly in their level of digital competence. The finding supports Fontanilla et al. (2026), who observed that female teachers tend to demonstrate higher adaptability and engagement in digital platforms, while male teachers often emphasize technical proficiency and

system management. Similarly, Ramirez, Gersana, and Cabrejas (2026) found that gender influences certain aspects of ICT integration, particularly in communication and instructional design.

The significant difference observed between male and female teachers suggests that gender may influence certain aspects of technology use in the educational setting. Variations in factors such as confidence in using digital tools, communication preferences, and engagement with technology could affect how educators incorporate ICT into their instructional and professional responsibilities.

Despite this difference, both groups demonstrated high levels of digital competence, indicating that male and female teachers are generally well-equipped to utilize technology in teaching and learning. This may reflect the effectiveness of the division's digital literacy initiatives, as well as teachers' continued adherence to the competencies promoted by the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST).

The findings further suggest that differences in digital competence do not diminish teaching effectiveness. Rather, they contribute to a broader range of perspectives and approaches in technology integration. Such diversity can encourage creativity, innovation, and flexibility in instructional practice, ultimately supporting a more inclusive and technology-responsive learning environment across one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region.

Difference in the Digital Competence of Respondents When Grouped According to Subject Area/s or Teaching Specialization

Table 9c. Difference in the Digital Competence of the Respondents in when grouped according to Subject Area/s or Teaching Specialization.

Subject Area/s or Teaching Specialization	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Mathematics	15.863	.044	Reject H_0	Significant
English				
Filipino				
Science				
EPP/TLE				
Araling Panlipunan				
MAPEH				
ESP/Values Ed				
General Subjects				

As shown in Table 9c, the analysis revealed an H-value of 15.863 and a p-value of .044, which is lower than the 0.05 level of significance. As a result, the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating a significant difference in the digital competence of teachers when grouped according to their subject area or teaching specialization. This result suggests that teachers' digital competence is influenced, to some extent, by the nature and requirements of the subjects they teach. Different learning areas often require varying levels and types of technology integration, which may affect teachers' exposure to and utilization of digital tools in instructional practice. The study of Ramirez, Gersana, and Cabrejas (2026) reported that subject specialization can shape the extent to which educators adopt and integrate ICT into teaching and learning activities. Similarly, Saucejo and Mohammad (2026) emphasized that the technological demands of specific disciplines may influence teachers' digital engagement and proficiency.

Given the presence of a significant difference among the groups, a pairwise comparison analysis was conducted and is presented in Table 9c.1 to identify the specific subject areas where significant differences in digital competence exist.

Table 9c.1 Pairwise Comparisons of Subject Area/s or Teaching Specialization

Subject Area/s or Teaching Specialization		Test-statistic	P-Value	Interpretation
Mathematics	English	-20.557	.196	Not Significant
	Filipino	5.516	.732	Not Significant
	Science	-2.852	.871	Not Significant
	EPP/TLE	-22.245	.237	Not Significant
	Araling Panlipunan	-52.970	.009	Significant
	MAPEH	28.021	.218	Not Significant
	ESP/Values Ed	9.597	.759	Not Significant
	General Subjects	11.424	.506	Not Significant
English	Filipino	26.073	.126	Not Significant
	Science	17.705	.336	Not Significant
	EPP/TLE	-1.688	.931	Not Significant
	Araling Panlipunan	-32.413	.125	Not Significant
	MAPEH	48.578	.038	Significant
	ESP/Values Ed	30.154	.343	Not Significant
	General Subjects	31.981	.077	Not Significant
Filipino	Science	-8.367	.652	Not Significant
	EPP/TLE	-27.761	.161	Not Significant
	Araling Panlipunan	-58.486	.006	Significant
	MAPEH	22.506	.339	Not Significant
	ESP/Values Ed	4.082	.898	Not Significant
	General Subjects	5.909	.746	Not Significant
Science	EPP/TLE	-19.394	.355	Not Significant
	Araling Panlipunan	-50.119	.025	Significant
	MAPEH	30.873	.208	Not Significant
	ESP/Values Ed	12.449	.703	Not Significant
	General Subjects	14.276	.464	Not Significant
EPP/TLE	Araling Panlipunan	-30.725	.189	Not Significant
	MAPEH	50.267	.049	Significant
	ESP/Values Ed	31.843	.340	Not Significant
	General Subjects	33.670	.104	Not Significant
Araling Panlipunan	MAPEH	80.992	.002	Significant
	ESP/Values Ed	62.568	.068	Not Significant
	General Subjects	64.395	.004	Significant
MAPEH	ESP/Values Ed	-18.424	.606	Not Significant
	General Subjects	-16.597	.495	Not Significant
ESP/Values Ed	General Subjects	1.827	.955	Not Significant

Based on the table, several significant differences among subject areas exist. Specifically, significant differences were found between Mathematics and Araling Panlipunan ($p = .009$), English and MAPEH ($p = .038$), Filipino and Araling Panlipunan ($p = .006$), Science and Araling Panlipunan ($p = .025$), EPP/TLE and MAPEH ($p = .049$), Araling Panlipunan and MAPEH ($p = .002$), and Araling Panlipunan and General Subjects ($p = .004$). These findings indicate that the level of digital competence is not uniform across all specializations. Teachers often use technology based on the instructional requirements and learning activities of their respective subject areas. For example, teachers handling EPP/TLE and MAPEH may regularly use multimedia resources, design applications, simulations, video-based instruction, and other interactive digital platforms that support practical and performance-oriented activities. In contrast, teachers in language, social studies, and related fields may focus more on digital communication, content development, online research, and information management tools.

The observed differences highlight the importance of recognizing the unique technological demands of each learning area. While all teachers are expected to possess essential digital competencies, the specific tools and applications relevant to their instructional responsibilities may vary considerably. As such, professional development initiatives may be more effective when designed to address the particular technological needs of different subject disciplines rather than adopting a one-size-fits-all approach.

Overall, the findings underscore the need for targeted and discipline-responsive digital training programs. Strengthening teachers' digital competencies based on the specific demands of their specializations can help promote more meaningful ICT integration, enhance instructional effectiveness, and support the implementation of technology-enhanced learning across all subject areas. Such efforts are consistent with the goals of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), which encourage the effective and purposeful use of technology to improve teaching and learning outcomes.

Difference in the Digital Competence of Respondents When Grouped According to Teaching Experience

Table 9d. Difference in the Digital Competence of the Respondents when grouped according to Teaching Experience.

Teaching Experience	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
9 years and below	4.809	.307	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant
10 to 14 years				
15 to 19 years				
20 to 24 years				
25 years and above				

Table 9d presents the difference in the digital competence of the respondents in one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region when grouped according to teaching experience. The analysis yielded a statistical result of $H = 4.809$, $p = 0.307$ values. Since the computed p-value is greater than the 0.05 significance level, the decision is to fail to reject the null hypothesis, indicating that the difference is not significant.

This means that teachers, regardless of their years of service, from those with less than 9 years to those with 25 years and above, exhibit similar levels of digital competence. The result supports Tuquib et al. (2026), who found that teaching experience does not necessarily lead to major variations in digital skills, as continuous professional development and institutional training ensure consistent technological proficiency. Likewise, Ramirez, Gersana, and Cabrejas (2026) emphasized that digital competence is shaped more by exposure to ICT tools and ongoing capacity-building programs than by tenure.

The finding implies that both novice and veteran teachers in one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region maintain comparable digital literacy levels, reflecting the success of division-wide initiatives that promote technology-enhanced teaching and learning aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST).

Difference in Digital Competence of Respondents When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment

Table 9e. Difference in Digital Competence when grouped according to Highest Educational Attainment.

Highest Educational Attainment	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Bachelor's Degree	4.528	.339	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Graduate Units				
Graduate Degree				
Post Graduate Units				
Post Graduate				

Table 9e presents the difference in the digital competence of the respondents in one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region when grouped according to highest educational attainment. The analysis used a non-parametric test ($H = 4.528$, $p = 0.339$) to determine whether educational attainment significantly influences teachers' digital competence. Since the computed p-value is greater than the 0.05 significance level, the decision is to fail to reject the null hypothesis, indicating that the difference is not significant.

The findings show that teachers possess relatively similar levels of digital competence regardless of their educational qualifications. Whether they hold a bachelor's degree, have completed graduate coursework, earned a master's degree, or pursued postgraduate studies, their ability to use digital technologies for instructional and professional purposes remains comparable. This suggests that digital competence is not determined solely by academic attainment.

This result supports the study of Ramirez, Gersana, and Cabrejas (2026), who argued that teachers develop digital proficiency primarily through hands-on experience, regular access to technology, and continuous professional learning opportunities rather than through formal academic credentials alone. Likewise, Saucejo and Mohammad (2026) emphasized that sustained training initiatives and strong institutional support play a vital role in strengthening teachers' technology integration skills.

The findings further indicate that teachers in one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region benefit from shared learning opportunities that promote digital literacy and effective technology use. Through ongoing professional development programs and the consistent implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), educators are able to build and sustain the digital skills needed for contemporary teaching. As a result, teachers across different educational backgrounds demonstrate a common capacity to utilize technology effectively in instruction, assessment, communication, and other professional responsibilities.

Difference in the Performance of Respondents when Grouped According to Age

To determine whether teachers' performance varies across different age groups, a statistical test was conducted using the respondents' Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) ratings. Examining differences in performance according to age provides valuable insights into how career stage and professional experience may influence teachers' effectiveness in carrying out their responsibilities.

Table 10a. Difference in the Performance of the Respondents when Grouped According to Age.

Age	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
30 years old and below	10.233	.037	Reject H_0	Significant
31 – 40 years old				
41 – 50 years old				
51 – 60 years old				
61 years old and above				

Pairwise Comparison by Age

The table above shows the difference in teachers' performance when grouped according to age. The analysis yielded an H-value of 10.233 and a p-value of 0.037. Since the p-value is less than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected. This indicates a significant difference in teachers' performance across age groups. In other words, teachers belonging to different age categories do not exhibit the same level of performance.

The findings suggest that age may be associated with variations in teacher performance. Differences in professional maturity, teaching experience, adaptability, and exposure to instructional responsibilities may contribute to these variations. To determine which age groups differed in teaching performance, a pairwise comparison was conducted.

Table 10a.1. Pairwise Comparisons Between Age.

Age Group	Compared Age Group	Test-statistic	P-Value	Interpretation
30 years old and below	31–40 years old	-43.296	.008	Significant
	41–50 years old	-52.156	.002	Significant
	51–60 years old	-49.055	.007	Significant
	61 years old and above	-32.310	.571	Not Significant
31–40 years old	41–50 years old	-8.860	.441	Not Significant
	51–60 years old	-5.759	.665	Not Significant
	61 years old and above	10.986	.844	Not Significant
41–50 years old	51–60 years old	3.101	.824	Not Significant
	61 years old and above	19.846	.723	Not Significant
51–60 years old	61 years old and above	16.745	.766	Not Significant

These findings indicate that younger teachers differ significantly in performance from their more experienced counterparts. This may be attributed to the fact that early-career teachers are still developing their instructional competence, classroom management skills, and professional confidence. As teachers gain experience and become more familiar with the demands of the profession, they are better able to refine their teaching practices and enhance their effectiveness.

These results support the findings of Tuquib et al. (2026), who reported that teachers in the middle stages of their careers often demonstrate higher levels of effectiveness because of their accumulated experience, professional maturity, and well-developed classroom management skills. Similarly, Ramirez, Gersana, and Cabrejas (2026) found that teacher performance tends to peak during the middle years of service, when educators can combine practical experience with openness to new instructional approaches and innovations.

Overall, the findings suggest that age plays a meaningful role in shaping teacher performance, particularly during the early stages of a teacher's career. While younger teachers may still be developing their professional competencies, mid-career and veteran teachers generally demonstrate more stable and consistent performance resulting from years of practice and experience. These results highlight the importance of providing beginning teachers with adequate mentoring, coaching, and professional development opportunities. Such support can help them strengthen their competencies, adapt more effectively to professional demands, and achieve performance levels comparable to those of their more experienced colleagues.

Difference in the Performance of the Respondents when Grouped According to Sex

Table 10b. Difference in the Performance of the Respondents when Grouped According to Sex.

Sex	Test Statistics (U)	p-value	Decision for H ₀	Interpretation
Male	5342.000	.073	Failed to Reject H ₀	Not Significant
Female				

Table 10b presents the difference in the performance of the respondents in one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region when grouped according to sex. The analysis used the Mann-Whitney U test, yielding a test statistic of $U = 5342.000$ and a $p\text{-value} = 0.073$, which is greater than the 0.05 significance level. Consequently, the decision is to fail to reject the null hypothesis, indicating that the difference is not significant. This means that both male and female teachers exhibit similar levels of performance, suggesting that gender does not influence how educators fulfill their professional duties. The result supports Tuquib et al. (2026), who found that performance indicators such as instructional delivery, classroom management, and learner engagement are shaped more by institutional support and professional development than by demographic factors. Likewise, Saucejo and Mohammad (2026) emphasized that equitable opportunities and shared accountability foster uniform performance outcomes among teachers, regardless of sex.

Overall, the finding implies that the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region maintain a gender-inclusive environment where both male and female educators perform effectively and uphold the standards set by the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). This consistency reflects the division's commitment to fairness, collaboration, and professional excellence.

Difference in the Performance of the Respondents when Grouped According to Subject Area/s or Teaching Specialization

Table 10c. Difference in the Performance of the Respondents when Grouped According to Subject Area/s or Teaching Specialization.

Subject Area/s or Teaching Specialization	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H ₀	Interpretation
Mathematics	22.875	.004	Reject H ₀	Significant
English				
Filipino				
Science				
EPP/TLE				
Araling Panlipunan				
MAPEH				
ESP/Values Ed				
General Subjects				

Table 10c revealed a computed value of $H = 22.875$ and a p-value of .004, which is less than 0.05 and so the null hypothesis was rejected. This means that there is a significant difference in teachers' performance when grouped according to teaching specialization. In other words, teachers from different subject areas do not have the same level of performance. The findings suggest that the nature and demands of the subjects being taught may influence teachers' performance. To determine which subject areas differed significantly, a pairwise comparison was conducted.

Table 10c.1. Pairwise Comparisons of Subject Area/s or Teaching Specialization.

Subject Area/s or Teaching Specialization	Test-statistic	P-Value	Interpretation
Mathematics	English	-.250	Not Significant
	Filipino	33.891	Significant
	Science	.629	Not Significant
	EPP/TLE	48.855	Significant
	Araling Panlipunan	3.730	Not Significant
	MAPEH	69.088	Significant
	ESP/Values Ed	64.140	Significant
	General Subjects	31.703	Not Significant
English	Filipino	34.141	Significant
	Science	.879	Not Significant
	EPP/TLE	49.105	Significant
	Araling Panlipunan	3.980	Not Significant
	MAPEH	69.338	Significant
	ESP/Values Ed	64.390	Significant
	General Subjects	31.953	Not Significant
Filipino	Science	-33.262	Not Significant
	EPP/TLE	14.963	Not Significant
	Araling Panlipunan	-30.162	Not Significant
	MAPEH	35.197	Not Significant

Science	ESP/Values Ed	30.249	.344	Not Significant
	General Subjects	-2.188	.905	Not Significant
	EPP/TLE	48.226	.022	Significant
	Araling Panlipunan	3.101	.890	Not Significant
	MAPEH	68.459	.005	Significant
	ESP/Values Ed	63.512	.052	Not Significant
EPP/TLE	General Subjects	31.074	.112	Not Significant
	Araling Panlipunan	-45.125	.054	Not Significant
	MAPEH	20.233	.428	Not Significant
	ESP/Values Ed	15.286	.647	Not Significant
Araling Panlipunan	General Subjects	-17.152	.407	Not Significant
	MAPEH	65.358	.014	Significant
	ESP/Values Ed	60.411	.078	Not Significant
MAPEH	General Subjects	27.973	.206	Not Significant
	ESP/Values Ed	-4.948	.890	Not Significant
ESP/Values Ed	General Subjects	-37.385	.124	Not Significant
	General Subjects	-32.437	.318	Not Significant

Table 10c.1 presents the pairwise comparisons used to identify the specific subject areas that differ in teachers' performance. The results showed significant differences between some subject specializations, particularly between Mathematics and Filipino, EPP/TLE, MAPEH, and ESP/Values Education. Significant differences were also found between English and Filipino, EPP/TLE, MAPEH, and ESP/Values Education. Likewise, significant differences were observed between Science and EPP/TLE, Science and MAPEH, and Araling Panlipunan and MAPEH. On the other hand, the remaining comparisons showed no significant differences, indicating that teachers in those subject areas had comparable levels of performance.

The findings suggest that teacher performance varies across some subject specializations. This may be due to differences in the nature of the subjects, teaching strategies used, and the competencies required in each learning area. These results highlight the importance of providing subject-specific support and professional development to help teachers effectively address the unique demands of their respective specializations.

Difference in the Performance of the Respondents when Grouped According to Teaching Experience

Table 10d. Difference in the Performance of the Respondents According to Teaching Experience.

Teaching Experience	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H ₀	Interpretation
9 years and below	22.136	<.001	Reject H ₀	Significant
10 to 14 years				
15 to 19 years				
20 to 24 years				
25 years and above				

Based on Table 10d there is a significant difference in teachers' performance based on teaching experience ($p < 0.001$) since the p-value is lower than the 0.05 level of significance. This means that teachers' performance varies across years of service, with those having 15 to 19 years of teaching experience showing a statistically significant difference compared to other groups. The result supports Tuquib et al. (2026), who found that mid-career educators often demonstrate higher effectiveness due to accumulated experience, professional maturity, and refined instructional strategies. Similarly, Ramirez, Gersana, and Cabrejas (2026) emphasized that performance tends to peak during the middle years of service, when teachers balance innovation with expertise.

Generally, the result implies that teaching experience plays a crucial role in shaping teacher performance, with mid-career educators contributing significantly to instructional quality and learner outcomes. This underscores

the importance of continuous professional development and mentoring programs to sustain high performance across all experience levels within one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region.

To identify the specific teaching experience groups that differed significantly in terms of performance, the Pairwise Comparisons Between Teaching Experience are presented in Table 10d.1.

Table 10d.1. Pairwise Comparisons Between Teaching Experience.

Teaching Experience		Test-statistic	P-Value	Interpretation
9 years and below	10 to 14 years	-43.921	<.001	Significant
	15 to 19 years	-48.336	<.001	Significant
	20 to 24 years	-44.758	.005	Significant
	25 years and above	-50.176	.002	Significant
10 to 14 years	15 to 19 years	-4.416	.764	Not Significant
	20 to 24 years	-.837	.962	Not Significant
	25 years and above	-6.256	.725	Not Significant
15 to 19 years	20 to 24 years	3.579	.835	Not Significant
	25 years and above	-1.840	.916	Not Significant
20 to 24 years	25 years and above	-5.419	.785	Not Significant

The table above presents the pairwise comparisons conducted to identify the specific teaching experience groups that differed significantly in terms of performance. The results revealed significant differences between teachers with 9 years and below of teaching experience and those with 10 to 14 years ($p < .001$), 15 to 19 years ($p < .001$), 20 to 24 years ($p = .005$), and 25 years and above ($p = .002$). In contrast, no significant differences were found among the groups with 10 years or more of teaching experience, as all obtained p-values greater than 0.05.

These findings indicate that the performance of teachers with 9 years and below of teaching experience differs significantly from that of those who have been teaching longer. However, teachers with 10 years or more of experience generally demonstrate comparable levels of performance.

The results suggest that teaching experience plays an important role during the early years of a teacher's career. As teachers gain experience and spend more years in the profession, their performance tends to become more consistent. This finding highlights the importance of providing mentoring, coaching, and professional development opportunities for early-career teachers to help them strengthen their instructional skills and adapt more effectively to the demands of the profession.

These findings imply that differences in performance are more evident between less experienced and more experienced teachers, while performance levels become relatively similar among teachers with longer years of service. These results emphasize the need to continuously support beginning teachers as they develop their professional competence and effectiveness.

Difference in the Performance of the Respondents when Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment

Table 10e. Difference in the Performance of the Respondents when Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment.

Highest Educational Attainment	Test Statistics (H)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Bachelor's Degree	20.182	<.001	Reject H_0	Significant
Graduate Units				
Graduate Degree				
Post Graduate Units				
Post Graduate				

Table 10e presents the difference in the performance of the respondents when grouped according to their highest educational attainment. The analysis yielded a computed value of $H = 20.182$ and a p-value of less than .00, reason for the null hypothesis to be rejected. This finding indicates that there is a significant difference in teacher performance based on educational attainment. In other words, teachers with different academic qualifications vary in their performance levels. The result suggests that educational attainment may influence how teachers perform their professional responsibilities.

The findings underscore the value of continuous learning and professional growth. Pursuing graduate and postgraduate studies may help teachers expand their knowledge, strengthen their teaching practices, and develop the competencies needed to meet the changing demands of the profession. This highlights the importance of encouraging teachers to engage in advanced studies as part of their ongoing professional development.

To determine which specific educational attainment groups differed significantly from one another, pairwise comparisons were conducted, and the results are presented in the next table.

Table 10e.1: Pairwise Comparisons Between Highest Educational Attainment

Highest Educational Attainment		Test-statistic	P-Value	Interpretation
Bachelor's Degree	Graduate Units	-47.602	<.001	Significant
	Graduate Degree	-45.484	<.001	Significant
	Post Graduate Units	-64.238	.002	Significant
	Post Graduate	-91.778	.001	Significant
Graduate Units	Graduate Degree	2.118	.851	Not Significant
	Post Graduate Units	-16.636	.376	Not Significant
	Post Graduate	-44.176	.104	Not Significant
Graduate Degree	Post Graduate Units	-18.754	.320	Not Significant
	Post Graduate	-46.294	.089	Not Significant
Post Graduate Units	Post Graduate	-27.540	.376	Not Significant

Based on the table above, there are significant differences between teachers whose highest qualification was a bachelor's degree and those with graduate units ($p < 0.001$), graduate degrees ($p < 0.001$), postgraduate units ($p = 0.002$), and postgraduate degrees ($p = 0.001$). However, no significant differences were found among teachers who had already pursued graduate or postgraduate education, regardless of the level attained.

These findings suggest that the most notable performance improvement occurs when teachers move beyond the undergraduate level and engage in advanced academic studies. Teachers who pursued graduate education generally demonstrated stronger performance than those whose qualifications were limited to a bachelor's degree. This observation supports the findings of Ramirez, Gersana, and Cabrejas (2026), who reported that advanced academic preparation enhances instructional competence, promotes evidence-based teaching practices, and strengthens professional confidence. Likewise, Saucejo and Mohammad (2026) emphasized that graduate education encourages reflective practice, innovation, and continuous professional growth, which are essential qualities of effective educators.

Taken as a whole, the results underscore the value of academic advancement in improving teacher performance. While differences among graduate and postgraduate groups were minimal, the transition from undergraduate to graduate education appears to have a meaningful impact on professional effectiveness. These findings highlight the importance of encouraging teachers to pursue higher studies as part of their continuing professional development, thereby strengthening instructional quality and supporting a culture of excellence within one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region.

Relationship Between the Respondents' Perceived School Climate and Performance

Table 11. Relationship Between School Climate and Teaching Performance.

Variable	Test Statistics	P-value	Decision for Ho	Interpretation
School Climate Vs Teaching Performance.	.198**	.001	Reject Ho	Significant

Based on Table 11, the analysis on the relationship between school climate yielded a test statistic of 0.198 and a p-value of 0.001, which is less than the 0.05 significance level. Consequently, the decision is to reject the null hypothesis, indicating that the relationship is significant. These findings indicate that teachers who perceive their school climate more positively also tend to demonstrate higher levels of performance. This suggests that a supportive work environment can contribute significantly to teachers' effectiveness and professional productivity. Factors such as strong leadership, positive relationships among colleagues, open communication, and a sense of trust within the school community may help create conditions that enable teachers to perform at their best.

This result is supported by the study of Tuquib et al. (2026), who found that supportive leadership, collaborative professional relationships, and a culture of trust positively influence teacher motivation and effectiveness. Similarly, Saucejo and Mohammad (2026) emphasized that a positive school climate promotes professional growth, emotional well-being, and opportunities for instructional innovation, all of which contribute to improved teaching performance.

The data confirms that a supportive school climate directly enhances teacher performance. Environments characterized by mutual respect and active collaboration naturally motivate educators to execute their duties more effectively. Consequently, school leadership must prioritize institutional support, as this investment in teachers ultimately translates to improved student outcomes.

Relationship Between the Level of Instructional Styles of the Respondents and their Performance

To determine whether a significant relationship exists between the instructional styles employed by the respondents and their performance, a correlation analysis was conducted. The analysis examined the relationship between the five dimensions of instructional styles, namely Lecture Style, Demonstrator Style, Facilitator Style, Delegator Style, and Integrative and Innovative Strategies, and teachers' performance as measured through their Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) ratings.

Table 12. Relationship Between Instructional Styles and Teaching Performance.

Variable	Test Statistics	P-value	Decision for Ho	Interpretation
Instructional Styles Vs Teaching Performance.	.069	.257	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant

The table above presents the relationship between instructional styles and teaching performance among respondents in one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region. The analysis yielded a test statistic of 0.069 and a p-value of 0.257, which is greater than the 0.05 significance level. Consequently, the null hypothesis was accepted, indicating that the relationship is not significant. This means that variations in instructional styles do not significantly affect teachers' overall performance. The result aligns with Tuquib et al. (2026), who found that teaching performance is shaped more by institutional culture, administrative support, and professional development opportunities than by individual teaching styles. Similarly, Saucejo and Mohammad (2026) emphasized that consistent adherence to the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) ensures uniform performance outcomes regardless of instructional approach.

This data implies that while instructional styles reflect teachers' creativity and pedagogical preferences, they do not independently determine performance levels. Instead, effective teaching performance depends on contextual factors such as collaboration, learner engagement, and continuous professional learning, which collectively sustain quality education across one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region.

Relationship Between the Level of Digital Competence of the Respondents and their Performance

Table 13. Relationship Between Digital Competence and Teaching Performance.

Variable	Test Statistics	P-value	Decision for Ho	Interpretation
Digital Competence Vs Teaching Performance.	.130*	.033	Reject Ho	Significant

The table above presents the relationship between digital competence and teaching performance among respondents in one of the Schools Division Offices in the Negros Island Region. The analysis yielded a test statistic of 0.130 and a p-value of 0.033, which is less than the 0.05 significance level. Consequently, the decision is to reject the null hypothesis, indicating that the relationship is significant.

This means that teachers' digital competence positively influences their teaching performance. The result supports Ramirez, Gersana, and Cabrejas (2026), who found that educators with strong digital skills demonstrate higher effectiveness in instructional delivery, assessment, and learner engagement. Similarly, Saucejo and Mohammad (2026) emphasized that digital proficiency enhances adaptability, creativity, and collaboration key components of high-quality teaching aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST).

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the summary of the findings of this research study, the researcher arrived at the following conclusions:

The respondents are mostly within the 31 to 40 age group, predominantly female, represent diverse teaching specializations, possess varied teaching experience, and have generally pursued graduate-level studies, indicating a professionally active and academically motivated teaching workforce.

Teachers demonstrate a high level of instructional style utilization, with greater emphasis on demonstrator, facilitator, delegator, and innovative teaching approaches than on traditional lecture-based instruction.

The respondents exhibit a very high level of digital competence, particularly in digital safety, instructional effectiveness, and the use of technology to support teaching and learning.

Teachers perceive their school climate as very positive, particularly in terms of teacher collaboration, leadership support, and the teaching and learning environment.

The respondents demonstrate an outstanding level of teaching performance, as reflected in their performance ratings.

Instructional styles differ significantly only when respondents are grouped according to sex, while no significant differences are found when grouped according to age, subject specialization, teaching experience, and educational attainment.

Digital competence differs significantly according to sex and subject specialization, but does not significantly vary according to age, teaching experience, and highest educational attainment.

Perceptions of school climate do not significantly differ across any of the profile variables, indicating that teachers generally share similar views regarding their school environment regardless of their demographic and professional characteristics.

Teaching performance significantly differs according to age, subject specialization, teaching experience, and educational attainment, but not according to sex.

Instructional styles are not significantly related to teaching performance, indicating that variations in instructional styles are not associated with differences in performance ratings among the respondents.

Digital competence has a significant positive relationship with teaching performance, indicating that teachers with higher levels of digital competence tend to demonstrate better performance.

School climate has a significant positive relationship with teaching performance, indicating that a supportive, collaborative, and positive school environment contributes to improved teacher performance.

Digital competence and school climate are significantly related to teacher performance, while instructional styles are not significantly associated with performance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher expresses her heartfelt gratitude to everyone who made this study possible. Foremost, to the Almighty God for His steadfast guidance and strength.

To her Dissertation Adviser, Dr. Citrobelle A. Aldeguer, for her invaluable expertise and support; her Statistician, Dr. Ma. Quincy Dones, for her patience and data analysis; and her sister, Dr. Marilou B. Yanson, for meticulously reviewing the manuscript. The researcher is also grateful to the esteemed panel members Dr. Mayleen Tongcua, Dr. Trudy Cerbo, Dr. Sharon Apohen, and Dr. Ma. Quincy Dones for their constructive critiques that enhanced this study.

To the Schools Division of La Carlota City, particularly Dr. Ermi V. Miranda, Dr. Sonia B. Oplas, and the participating school heads, department heads, and teachers, for their cooperation during data gathering.

Finally, to her husband, Engr. Aden Rey S. Villanueva, for his countless sacrifices and unwavering love; to her siblings and nieces for their joyful inspiration; and to all friends and colleagues who offered their prayers, time, and encouragement throughout this journey.

REFERENCES

1. Alang, A., & Ebisa, E. (2025). Digital competence and instructional adaptability as predictors of IPCRF ratings. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 44(3), 370–382. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.440308> (doi.org in Bing)
2. Alcontin, R. (2021). Teachers' digital competence and professional development in Philippine schools. *Philippine Journal of Education and Technology*, 5(2), 45–60.
3. Alvarez, C., & Dela Cruz, M. (2025). Institutional support, transparent processes, and teacher commitment in Negros Occidental schools. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 7(2), 145–156.
4. Bacus, R., Picardal, J., Perez, L., & Balo, M. (2024). Predictors of teaching performance under RPMS among beginning teachers across 16 regions. *International Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 8(4), 233–245.
5. Balauro, M., & Agatep, J. L. E. (2026). Digital competence and instructional effectiveness among public elementary teachers in Zambales using the DigCompEdu framework and PPST. *International Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 9(1), 1300–1312.
6. Bautista, R. (2022). Policies and administration responsiveness: Impact on teacher stress and classroom performance in Ilocos Norte. *Philippine Journal of Educational Policy Studies*, 5(2), 88–101.
7. Benjamin, R. (2025). Teacher Instructional Style Questionnaire. Unpublished instrument, University of the Philippines.

8. Cruz, A., & Estacio, B. (2020). Gender dynamics in school climate perceptions and performance ratings. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 3(1), 55–67.
9. Cubos-Genise, L. (2023). Interpersonal relationships, mentoring, and institutional support across teacher age groups in Negros Occidental. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(6), 321–333.
10. Datoon, J., & Consigna, P. (2026). Pedagogical capabilities and curriculum planning gaps among proficient teachers at Bislig City National High School. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 7(1), 112–124.
11. Dela Cruz, M. (2023). Subject specialization and instructional strategies in Philippine secondary education. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Education*, 9(2), 201–214.
12. Delos Santos, R. (2022). The influence of postgraduate qualifications on IPCRF ratings and instructional innovation. *International Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(3), 276–288.
13. Department of Education. (2026). DepEd Order No. 009, s. 2026: Implementing guidelines on the three-term school calendar. Department of Education, Philippines.
14. Department of Education. (2023). DepEd Memorandum No. 008, s. 2023: Multi-year guidelines on the Results-Based Performance Management System-Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (RPMS-PPST) for school years 2022–2023, 2023–2024, and 2024–2025. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
15. Department of Education. (2017). DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
16. Department of Education. (2017). Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). Department of Education, Philippines
17. Department of Education. (2018). Implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
18. De Vera, M., Santos, J., & Ramirez, L. (2021). Technology integration and instructional challenges among Filipino teachers in online learning environments. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Research*, 9(1), 112–130.
19. Eben, J., & Escarlos, P. (2026). Professional development, digital proficiency, and instructional competence among secondary teachers in Bukidnon. *International Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 9(2), 221–233.
20. Fontanilla, R., Trozo, M., Laturgo, S., Osiba, K., Labandero, J., & Cayogyog, L. (2026). Instructional supervision and school climate perceptions among secondary teachers in Region XI. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership*, 12(1), 77–92.
21. Froiland, J. M. (2021). Gender nuances in school climate: Perceptions of safety and collegial support. *Journal of School Psychology*, 85(2), 45–59.
22. Garcia, L., & Mendoza, R. (2024). Transformational leadership and school climate: Fostering collaboration, innovation, and adaptability in Nueva Ecija schools. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 6(4), 312–325.
23. Hero, J. L., Cruz, A., & Villanueva, P. (2021). ICT practices of teachers in the Philippines: Implications for faculty development. *International Journal of Pedagogical Innovations*, 7(3), 25–40.
24. Lopez, A. (2024). Age and teaching experience as predictors of innovation and classroom management. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Development*, 8(2), 144–158.
25. Lopez, A., & Ramos, J. (2023). Peer mentoring and professional learning communities: Impact on teacher satisfaction and instructional effectiveness in Cebu. *International Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(1), 98–110.
26. Macaraeg, P., Gante, J., & Galay-Limos, M. (2026). Compliance versus creativity: An assessment of IPCRF ratings among public secondary school teachers in Nueva Ecija. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 7(2), 201–214.
27. Oplas, R. (2024). Educational attainment, teaching experience, and leadership practices: Factors shaping instructional adaptability and IPCRF ratings. *Philippine Journal of Educational Policy Studies*, 6(1), 65–78.

28. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2019). TALIS 2018 results (Volume I): Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/1d0bc92a-en>
29. Pabelo, S., Valenzuela, T., Bides, K., & Bustarga, H. (2026). Content knowledge, pedagogy, and assessment practice gaps among elementary school teachers in Abra. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 7(5), 455–468.
30. Pimentel, J. (2026). Educational attainment and access to professional development opportunities in Antique. *International Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 9(3), 301–315.
31. Ramirez, F., Gersana, L., & Cabrejas, J. (2026). Pedagogical innovation skills and teaching styles as predictors of 21st century teaching competencies. *International Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 9(2), 245–258.
32. Ramirez, F. (2021). Age and specialization as determinants of digital competence and classroom management in Bacolod City. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Education*, 7(1), 55–68.
33. Redecker, C. (2017). European framework for the digital competence of educators: DigCompEdu (Y. Punie, Ed.). EUR 28775 EN, Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2760/159770>
34. Remandaban, K., Angangan, P., Gaviola, S., Cabolao, M., & Olarte, J. (2026). Structured peer cooperation, professional learning communities, and leadership agility among novice and experienced teachers. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Development*, 10(1), 77–90.
35. Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
36. Reyes, D. (2024). The multidimensional structure of school climate: Workplace dimensions and subject specialization dynamics in Philippine schools. *Philippine Journal of Educational Policy Studies*, 6(2), 134–148.
37. Riego, A. V., & Aldeguez, C. A. (2025). Experiences, challenges, and teaching strategies: Basis for classroom interactive performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 6(5), 321–332.
38. Santos, R., & Villanueva, P. (2025). Resource availability and supportive atmospheres: Cultivating integrative instructional strategies in Metro Manila schools. *International Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 8(1), 101–115.
39. Saucejo, M., & Mohammad, A. (2026). Instructional leadership and 21st century pedagogy: Predictors of critical thinking and student outcomes in science education. *Philippine Journal of Science Education*, 12(3), 211–225.
40. Tuquib, J., Damiles, R., Fernandez, H., Gastador, L., Lleses, P., Sareno, K., & Nery, M. (2026). Demographics, competence, and organizational support: An analysis of IPCRF ratings of public school teachers in Bukidnon. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 7(6), 401–415.
41. Turtoga, G. C., Estillore, M., Arcana, J., & Baura, P. (2026). Linking school climate, mental wellbeing, and job satisfaction of public elementary school teachers: Basis for district-based learning action cell. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 6(1), 1233–1247.
42. Villanueva, P. (2022). Postgraduate qualifications, teaching experience, and generational differences as predictors of IPCRF scores in Negros Occidental. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Education*, 8(2), 166–179.
43. Wong, L., Sy, J., & Wong, R. (2025). Generational gaps, institutional support, and mindsets toward ICT integration among public school teachers in Romblon. *International Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 8(2), 189–202.
44. Yongco, R. (2026). Leadership styles, transformational guidance, and student-centered instructional styles in Philippine secondary schools. *International Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 9(4), 412–425.