2026 Volume: 02 Issue: 09 www.ijrpa.com ISSN 2456-9995 Research Article

International Journal Research Publication Analysis

Page: 01-16

EFFECTIVENESS OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AND TEACHERS' PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES

***Maricris G. Mongcal and Erly M. Martir**

Guimaras State University.

Article Received: 30 July 2026
Article Revised: 20 August 2026
Published on: 10 September 2026

***Corresponding Author: Maricris G. Mongcal**
Guimaras State University.

DOI: https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijrpa.9470

ABSTRACT

This study determined the effectiveness of professional development programs and the pedagogical practices of public secondary school teachers in Buenavista, Guimaras. It also examined differences in the two variables when respondents were classified according to age, educational attainment, position, grade level taught, and school location, as well as their significant relationship. A quantitative descriptive-correlational design was employed. The respondents were 151 teachers from Buenavista 1 and Buenavista 2. Data were gathered using a validated and reliability-tested questionnaire and analyzed through frequency, percentage, mean, Mann–Whitney U test, Kruskal–Wallis H test, and Pearson's product–moment correlation at the .05 significance level. Results showed that professional development programs were rated Very High, with an overall mean of 4.32, indicating that they consistently provided relevant and effective opportunities for improving teachers' knowledge, skills, and instructional competence. Teachers' pedagogical practices were Mostly Practiced, with an overall mean of 2.52, showing frequent application of instructional delivery, classroom management, learner engagement, assessment, differentiation, and learner-centered approaches. No significant differences were found in professional development effectiveness or pedagogical practices across all profile variables. A negligible negative and nonsignificant relationship existed between professional development effectiveness and pedagogical practices ($r = -.033$, $p = .685$). The findings implied that favorable perceptions of professional development did not automatically correspond to more frequent classroom application. Schools should therefore strengthen follow-up coaching, mentoring, collaborative learning, reflective practice, technology integration, differentiated instruction, and monitoring of training transfer through classroom observations, instructional artifacts, and learner evidence to ensure sustained, contextualized, and measurable improvements in everyday teaching.

KEYWORDS: *Professional Development Programs, Pedagogical Practices, Secondary School Teachers, Instructional Competence, Teacher Learning.*

INTRODUCTION

Teachers are widely recognized as the most influential school-based factor affecting student achievement and educational quality. In the 21st century, educators face increasing demands brought about by technological advancements, curriculum reforms, inclusive education initiatives, and the development of higher-order thinking and lifelong learning skills among students. These challenges require teachers to continuously enhance their knowledge, competencies, and instructional practices through professional development programs. Professional development serves as a mechanism for equipping teachers with updated pedagogical knowledge, innovative teaching strategies, assessment techniques, and classroom management skills necessary to meet diverse learner needs. Studies have shown that effective professional development contributes significantly to teachers' professional growth, instructional effectiveness, and student learning outcomes by promoting continuous learning, collaboration, reflection, and the application of evidence-based teaching practices (Amemasor et al., 2025; UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning [UIL], 2025).

In the Philippine educational setting, professional development remains a priority as emphasized in the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) and various programs implemented by the Department of Education (DepEd), such as Learning Action Cells (LAC), in-service training programs, mentoring activities, and scholarship opportunities. These initiatives are intended to improve teachers' competencies and ensure the delivery of quality education. Recent literature suggests that professional development programs are most effective when they are sustained, relevant to teachers' needs, collaborative, and focused on practical classroom application rather than merely providing one-time training experiences (Amemasor et al., 2025). Moreover, teachers who actively engage in meaningful professional development activities demonstrate improved instructional delivery, assessment practices, classroom management, technology integration, and learner engagement (Kurteshi, 2025). Consequently, educational institutions continue to invest substantial resources in professional development initiatives to strengthen teaching quality and support educational reforms.

Despite the extensive implementation of professional development programs, there remains a need to determine whether these initiatives effectively translate into improved pedagogical practices in actual classroom settings. Existing studies have primarily focused on teachers' participation, satisfaction, or perceptions regarding professional development activities, while relatively few have

examined the direct relationship between the effectiveness of these programs and teachers' pedagogical practices. Furthermore, differences in educational contexts, institutional support, availability of resources, and teacher characteristics may influence the extent to which professional development impacts instructional practices. This gap in the literature highlights the need for localized investigations that assess not only the effectiveness of professional development programs but also their contribution to enhancing classroom instruction, assessment strategies, learner-centered approaches, and innovative teaching methods (Montefrio-Farrol, 2026).

Given these considerations, the present study seeks to determine the effectiveness of professional development programs and their influence on teachers' pedagogical practices. Specifically, it aims to examine how professional development initiatives contribute to improving instructional delivery, classroom management, assessment techniques, learner engagement, and the implementation of innovative teaching strategies. The findings of this study are expected to provide valuable insights for educational leaders, policymakers, and program implementers in designing and strengthening professional development programs that are responsive to teachers' needs and capable of producing meaningful improvements in pedagogical practices and educational outcomes.

Statement of the Problem

This study aims to determine the effectiveness of professional development program and teachers' pedagogical practices in Public Secondary Schools in the Municipality of Buenavista, Province of Guimaras, Philippines for School Year 2025-2026.

Specifically, this study will seek answers to the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of to age, educational attainment, position, grade level taught, and school location?
2. What is the level of effectiveness of professional development program as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole and when classified according to age, educational attainment, position, grade level taught, and school location?
3. What are the teachers' pedagogical practices when taken as a whole and when classified according to age, educational attainment, position, grade level taught, and school location?
4. Are there significant differences in the effectiveness of professional development program as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, educational attainment, position, grade level taught, and school location?
5. Are there significant differences in the teachers' pedagogical practices when classified according to age, educational attainment, position, grade level taught, and school location?

6. Is there significant relationship between effectiveness of professional development program and teachers' pedagogical practices?

METHODOLOGY

The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to determine the effectiveness of professional development programs and teachers' pedagogical practices among public secondary school teachers in Buenavista, Guimaras. The respondents were 151 teachers from Buenavista 1 and Buenavista 2 who met the study's inclusion criteria. Purposive sampling was used to include eligible teachers who were actively teaching and willing to participate. Data were gathered through a researcher-made, three-part questionnaire. Part I obtained the respondents' age, educational attainment, position, grade level taught, and school location. Part II measured the effectiveness of professional development programs through indicators on relevance, learning quality, applicability, collaboration, administrative support, and instructional improvement. Part III measured pedagogical practices involving instructional delivery, classroom management, learner engagement, assessment, differentiation, and learner-centered approaches. Three experts reviewed the instrument using the Good and Scates criteria, and revisions were incorporated before pilot testing. Internal consistency was assessed through Cronbach's alpha. After approval was secured from the Schools Division Superintendent and school principals, the validated instrument was administered to the respondents. Participation was voluntary, and confidentiality and anonymity were maintained. Completed questionnaires were checked, encoded, tabulated, and analyzed. Frequency and percentage described the respondents' profile; mean summarized program effectiveness and pedagogical practices; the Mann–Whitney U test examined differences between two-category groups; the Kruskal–Wallis H test examined differences across educational-attainment groups; and Spearman's rank-order correlation tested the relationship between professional development effectiveness and pedagogical practices. Inferential tests used a .05 level of significance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The Level of Effectiveness of Professional Development Program

Table 1 shows that the professional development programs obtained an overall mean of 4.32, described as Very High. This means that the programs consistently provided relevant, comprehensive, and effective learning opportunities that substantially improved teachers' professional knowledge, skills, and instructional competence. The highest means were recorded for improving the use of assessment results and feedback to adjust instruction (4.36) and addressing identified professional learning needs (4.36), followed by strengthening varied and learner-

centered teaching strategies (4.35). These findings indicate that the programs were particularly effective in connecting professional learning with assessment-informed instruction and teachers' identified needs. The lowest-rated indicators, although still Very High, involved the appropriate use of technology and digital resources (4.28), opportunities for collaboration and exchange of effective practices (4.28), and systematic reflection on teaching strengths and improvement needs (4.28). These areas may therefore receive additional emphasis in future program implementation.

The very high rating indicates that the professional development activities were perceived as relevant to classroom work and capable of supporting instructional improvement. This is consistent with evidence that effective professional development is most influential when it is focused on instructional content, responsive to teachers' needs, sustained over time, and supported by opportunities to practice, receive feedback, and collaborate with colleagues (Sims et al., 2023; Amemasor et al., 2025). The comparatively lower ratings for technology, collegial exchange, and systematic reflection also suggest that the programs may be strengthened through coaching, professional learning communities, peer observation, and follow-up activities that help teachers transfer new knowledge into sustained practice. Nīmante et al. (2025) likewise emphasized that collaborative and reflective professional learning can support teachers in translating training experiences into classroom-level improvement.

Table 1. The level of effectiveness of professional development program as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole.

The professional development programs…	mean	desc
improve my ability to use assessment results and feedback to adjust instruction.	4.36	Very high
address my identified professional learning needs.	4.36	Very high
strengthen my use of varied and learner-centered teaching strategies.	4.35	Very high
provide relevant knowledge applicable to the subjects and grade levels I teach.	4.34	Very high
help me apply newly acquired knowledge and skills in actual classroom situations.	4.34	Very high
enhance my ability to motivate learners and sustain their active participation.	4.34	Very high
improve my ability to manage the classroom and maintain a positive learning environment.	4.34	Very high
improve my ability to plan clear and outcomes-aligned lessons.	4.33	Very high
contribute to sustained improvement in my overall instructional competence.	4.33	Very high
develop my competence in providing differentiated instruction for diverse learners.	4.32	Very high

The professional development programs…	mean	desc
strengthen my use of formative and summative assessment methods.	4.32	Very high
provide follow-up support through coaching, mentoring, or professional learning communities.	4.30	Very high
improve my appropriate use of technology and digital resources in teaching.	4.28	Very high
provide opportunities to collaborate and exchange effective practices with colleagues.	4.28	Very high
encourage me to reflect systematically on my teaching strengths and improvement needs.	4.28	Very high
Overall	4.32	Very high

Table 2 shows that the effectiveness of professional development programs was rated Very High by all respondent groups. The means ranged from 4.31 to 4.34. Teachers aged 41 and above recorded a slightly higher mean (4.33) than those aged 40 and below (4.32). Bachelor's degree holders had the highest mean by educational attainment (4.34), followed by master's (4.32) and doctorate degree holders (4.31). Teacher I–VII respondents obtained 4.33, while Master Teachers I–IV obtained 4.32. Senior High School teachers rated the programs at 4.34 compared with 4.31 among Junior High School teachers. Buenavista 1 and Buenavista 2 recorded means of 4.33 and 4.32, respectively. The narrow differences indicate consistently very favorable assessments across the profile classifications.

The uniformity of the ratings implies that the professional development programs were broadly responsive to teachers despite differences in age, educational attainment, position, grade level taught, and school location. This may indicate that the program content and delivery were sufficiently generalizable while remaining relevant to different teaching contexts. Research on professional learning has stressed that coherence with curriculum, teachers' work, and school priorities helps professional development produce consistent benefits across participant groups (Sims et al., 2023; Siliņa-Jasjukeviča et al., 2025).

Table 2. The level of effectiveness of professional development program as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, educational attainment, position, grade level taught, and school location.

Profile	Profile	mean	desc
Age	40 years old and below	4.32	Very high
	41 years old and above	4.33	Very high
Educational Attainment	Bachelor's degree	4.34	Very high
	Master's degree	4.32	Very high
	Doctorate degree	4.31	Very high
Position	Teacher I–VII	4.33	Very high
	Master Teacher I–IV	4.32	Very high
Grade Level Taught	Junior High School	4.31	Very high
	Senior High School	4.34	Very high
School Location	Buenavista 1	4.33	Very high
	Buenavista 2	4.32	Very high
Total	Total	4.32	Very high

The Teachers' Pedagogical Practices

Table 3 shows that teachers' pedagogical practices obtained an overall mean of 2.52, described as Mostly Practiced. This means that the teachers consistently or frequently applied effective instructional delivery, classroom management, learner engagement, assessment, differentiated instruction, and learner-centered approaches. The highest-rated practices were providing timely, specific, and constructive feedback (2.60), encouraging learners to participate actively and express their ideas (2.59), using assessment results to modify instruction and provide intervention (2.56), and establishing clear classroom rules and expectations (2.56). The three lowest means were recorded for clearly communicating lesson objectives and expected outcomes (2.47), using collaborative activities and differentiating learning activities, resources, and support (both 2.46), and maintaining a safe, respectful, inclusive, and supportive environment (2.45). Although all indicators were Mostly Practiced, the lower-rated areas may benefit from focused instructional support.

The results suggest that teachers placed strong emphasis on feedback, participation, assessment-informed adjustment, and orderly classroom routines. These practices are important because effective feedback and formative assessment help learners understand current performance and

identify the next steps needed for improvement, while active participation supports deeper processing of lesson content. Recent studies have also highlighted the value of learner-centered, differentiated, and collaborative strategies in responding to diverse learning needs and strengthening engagement (Kahmann et al., 2022; Siliņa-Jasjukeviča et al., 2025). The relatively lower means for differentiation, collaboration, communication of outcomes, and inclusive environments therefore identify practical areas where future training, coaching, and classroom-based support may be concentrated.

Table 3. The teachers' pedagogical practices when taken as a whole.

As a teacher, I…	mean	desc
provide timely, specific, and constructive feedback on learners' performance.	2.60	Mostly
encourage learners to participate actively and express their ideas.	2.59	Mostly
use assessment results to modify instruction and provide appropriate intervention.	2.56	Mostly
establish clear classroom rules, procedures, and behavioral expectations.	2.56	Mostly
use questions and activities that promote analysis, reasoning, and creativity.	2.54	Mostly
reflect on the effectiveness of my lessons and improve succeeding instruction.	2.53	Mostly
connect new lessons with learners' prior knowledge and experiences.	2.53	Mostly
integrate appropriate instructional materials, technology, and digital resources.	2.53	Mostly
use formative assessments to monitor learners' understanding during instruction.	2.53	Mostly
explain concepts clearly and provide relevant examples or demonstrations.	2.49	Mostly
use varied instructional strategies according to the intended learning outcomes.	2.48	Mostly
clearly communicate lesson objectives and expected learning outcomes.	2.47	Mostly
use collaborative activities to promote communication and shared learning.	2.46	Mostly
differentiate learning activities, resources, and support according to learners' readiness and needs.	2.46	Mostly
maintain a safe, respectful, inclusive, and supportive learning environment.	2.45	Mostly
Overall	2.52	Mostly

Table 4 shows that pedagogical practices were Mostly Practiced across all profile groups, with means ranging from 2.49 to 2.56. Teachers aged 41 and above had a mean of 2.53, compared with 2.51 among those aged 40 and below. Doctorate degree holders obtained the highest mean by educational attainment (2.56), followed by bachelor's (2.52) and master's degree holders (2.50). Teacher I–VII respondents had a mean of 2.52, while Master Teachers I–IV had 2.49. Junior High School teachers obtained 2.54, compared with 2.49 among Senior High School teachers.

Buenavista 2 obtained 2.53 and Buenavista 1 obtained 2.51. These closely grouped results indicate that frequent application of the practices was generally shared across respondent classifications.

The consistency across groups suggests that the reported pedagogical practices may have been influenced more by common curriculum expectations, school routines, and shared professional standards than by profile characteristics alone. Teachers working in the same educational system are commonly exposed to similar instructional policies, assessment requirements, and professional development priorities, which may promote comparable classroom practices. Philippine evidence has likewise indicated that curriculum reform, access to professional learning, school support, and teachers' working conditions interact in shaping classroom implementation (Albert et al., 2025).

Table 4. The teachers' pedagogical practices when classified according to age, educational attainment, position, grade level taught, and school location.

Profile	**Profile**	**mean**	**desc**
Age	40 years old and below	2.51	Mostly
	41 years old and above	2.53	Mostly
Educational Attainment	Bachelor's degree	2.52	Mostly
	Master's degree	2.50	Mostly
	Doctorate degree	2.56	Mostly
Position	Teacher I–VII	2.52	Mostly
	Master Teacher I–IV	2.49	Mostly
Grade Level Taught	Junior High School	2.54	Mostly
	Senior High School	2.49	Mostly
School Location	Buenavista 1	2.51	Mostly
	Buenavista 2	2.53	Mostly
Total	Total	2.52	Mostly

Differences in the Level of Effectiveness of Professional Development Program

Table 5 shows no significant differences in the perceived effectiveness of professional development programs according to age (U = 3004.000, p = .318), position (U = 1589.500, p = .859), grade level taught (U = 3177.000, p = .120), or school location (U = 2784.000, p = .806). Since all p-values were greater than the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was not rejected for these variables. Thus, differences in the respondents' mean ranks were insufficient to establish that their assessments of program effectiveness varied according to age, position, grade level taught, or school location.

The absence of significant differences implies that the programs were perceived as similarly effective by teachers from the compared groups. This supports the view that professional development can have broad relevance when it is aligned with shared instructional responsibilities and offers learning opportunities that are applicable across roles and teaching assignments. Evidence from recent reviews has shown that coherent, practice-focused, and sustained professional development can support teachers across varying career stages, although contextual adaptation and follow-up support remain important (Sims et al., 2023; Amemasor et al., 2025). The result therefore favors maintaining common core program components while providing optional differentiated activities for specific teacher needs.

Table 5. Significant differences in the effectiveness of professional development program as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, position, grade level taught, and school location.

Profile	Profile	mean rank	U-value	p-value	remarks
Age	40 years old and below	78.88	3004.000	0.318	Not significant
	41 years old and above	71.75			
Position	Teacher I–VII	75.72	1589.500	0.859	Not significant
	Master Teacher I–IV	77.37			
Grade Level Taught	Junior High School	80.60	3177.000	0.120	Not significant
	Senior High School	69.57			
School Location	Buenavista 1	75.12	2784.000	0.806	Not significant
	Buenavista 2	76.84			

Table 6 shows no significant difference in the effectiveness of professional development programs according to educational attainment (H = 1.398, p = .497). The null hypothesis was therefore not rejected. Although doctorate degree holders obtained the highest mean rank (80.38), followed by master's degree holders (78.92) and bachelor's degree holders (70.94), these variations were not statistically sufficient to conclude that educational attainment influenced the respondents' assessment of program effectiveness.

This finding suggests that the professional development programs were perceived as relevant regardless of the teachers' highest academic qualification. Formal graduate education may deepen theoretical and specialized knowledge, but the perceived usefulness of professional development also depends on its fit with current classroom challenges, its practical application, and the support available after training. Nīmante et al. (2025) and Siliņa-Jasjukeviča et al. (2025) emphasized that

contextual relevance, collaboration, and opportunities to apply professional learning are central to sustained teacher growth. Thus, educational attainment alone may not determine how teachers evaluate the effectiveness of a well-aligned program.

Table 6. Significant differences in the effectiveness of professional development program as assessed by the respondents when classified according to educational attainment.

Profile	Profile	mean rank	H-value	p-value	remarks
Educational Attainment	Bachelor's	70.94	1.398	0.497	Not significant
	Master's	78.92			
	Doctorate	80.38			

Differences in the Teachers' Pedagogical Practices

Table 7 shows no significant differences in teachers' pedagogical practices according to age (U = 3047.500, p = .244), position (U = 1457.000, p = .401), grade level taught (U = 2377.500, p = .131), or school location (U = 3126.500, p = .294). Since all p-values exceeded .05, the null hypothesis was not rejected for these classifications. Accordingly, the observed differences in mean ranks did not provide sufficient evidence that teachers' pedagogical practices varied according to age, position, grade level taught, or school location.

The nonsignificant findings imply that effective pedagogical practices were generally shared among teachers across the examined groups. Common professional standards, curriculum requirements, school policies, and access to similar learning resources may have contributed to this consistency. Recent research has indicated that pedagogical practice develops through an interaction of teacher knowledge, professional learning, curriculum demands, and school-level support rather than through a single demographic characteristic (Kahmann et al., 2022; Albert et al., 2025). Schools may therefore continue providing system-wide instructional support while using classroom observation and learner evidence to identify individual needs that broad profile categories may not reveal.

Table 7. Significant differences in the teachers' pedagogical practices when classified according to age, position, grade level taught, and school location.

Profile	Profile	mean rank	U-value	p-value	remarks
Age	40 years old and below	79.36	3047.500	0.244	Not significant
	41 years old and above	71.04			
Position	Teacher I–VII	74.66	1457.000	0.401	Not significant
	Master Teacher I–IV	82.46			
Grade Level Taught	Junior High School	71.52	2377.500	0.131	Not significant
	Senior High School	82.26			
School Location	Buenavista 1	79.75	3126.500	0.294	Not significant
	Buenavista 2	72.40			

Table 8 shows no significant difference in teachers' pedagogical practices according to educational attainment (H = 3.061, p = .216). The null hypothesis was not rejected. Although master's degree holders had the highest mean rank (82.07), followed by bachelor's degree holders (74.14) and doctorate degree holders (65.12), the differences were not statistically significant. Hence, the level of formal academic qualification did not establish a meaningful difference in the teachers' reported pedagogical practices.

The result indicates that advanced educational attainment did not automatically correspond to more frequent use of the measured classroom practices. Pedagogical enactment requires more than formal credentials; it is also shaped by the relevance of professional learning, opportunities to rehearse new approaches, feedback, collaboration, instructional leadership, and classroom conditions. Sims et al. (2023) and Amemasor et al. (2025) found that professional development is more likely to influence practice when learning is sustained, active, and connected to teachers' daily work. This underscores the importance of continuing job-embedded support for teachers at every qualification level.

Table 8. Significant differences in the teachers' pedagogical practices when classified according to educational attainment.

Profile	Profile	mean rank	H-value	p-value	remarks
Educational Attainment	Bachelor's	74.14	3.061	0.216	Not significant
	Master's	82.07			
	Doctorate	65.12			

Relationship between Effectiveness of Professional Development Program and Teachers' Pedagogical Practices

Table 9 shows a negligible negative relationship between the effectiveness of professional development programs and teachers' pedagogical practices (r = -.033, p = .685). Since the p-value was greater than .05, the relationship was not significant, and the null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, the respondents' very high assessments of professional development effectiveness were not statistically associated with the frequency of their reported pedagogical practices in this sample.

The lack of a significant relationship does not necessarily mean that professional development had no instructional value. It may indicate that perceived program effectiveness and self-reported classroom practice measured different aspects of teachers' experiences, or that transfer into practice depended on mediating conditions such as coaching, implementation time, leadership support, resources, workload, and opportunities for collaborative reflection. Research has shown that professional development effects are not automatic and may weaken when follow-up, practice, feedback, and organizational support are insufficient (Sims et al., 2023; Nīmante et al., 2025).

Table 9. Significant relationship between effectiveness of professional development program and teachers' pedagogical practices.

Variables	Variables	Professional Development	Pedagogical Practices
Professional Development	r-value		-0.033
	p-value		0.685
	remarks		Not significant
Pedagogical Practices	r-value	-0.033	
	p-value	0.685	
	remarks	Not significant	

CONCLUSIONS

1. The respondents represented different ages, academic qualifications, teaching assignments, and school locations; however, most were classroom teachers below 41 years old who taught at the junior high school level. This implies that the findings primarily reflected the professional-development experiences and classroom practices of teachers directly engaged in regular instruction.

2. The professional development programs were relevant, responsive to teachers' needs, and capable of strengthening their professional knowledge and instructional competence. However,

technology integration, professional collaboration, and systematic reflection remained areas for further enhancement.

3. Teachers frequently applied effective pedagogical approaches, particularly feedback, learner participation, assessment-based intervention, and classroom management. Nevertheless, the relatively lower ratings for differentiation, collaboration, communication of learning outcomes, and inclusive learning environments indicate that these practices were not applied as strongly or consistently as the other practices.

4. The programs were perceived as comparably effective regardless of teachers' age, educational attainment, position, grade level taught, or school location. Thus, the programs appeared to provide broadly applicable learning opportunities across respondent groups.

5. Teachers generally used comparable instructional approaches across all profile classifications. Their practices may have been shaped more by shared professional standards, curriculum requirements, and school expectations than by their demographic and professional characteristics.

6. A very favorable perception of professional development did not automatically translate into more frequent pedagogical practice. The transfer of professional learning into classroom instruction may require sustained follow-up, coaching, adequate resources, implementation time, and monitoring beyond participation in training activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. School administrators may continue the professional development programs while strengthening components on technology integration, collaborative professional learning, reflective practice, differentiated instruction, and inclusive classroom management.

2. Professional development coordinators may conduct needs assessments before each program and provide follow-up coaching, mentoring, peer observation, demonstration teaching, and professional learning-community sessions after training.

3. Teachers may apply professional learning through lesson demonstrations, action plans, classroom-based projects, and reflective teaching logs, with particular attention to clear learning objectives, collaborative activities, differentiated support, and safe and inclusive learning environments.

4. School heads and instructional supervisors may monitor the transfer of training through classroom observations, lesson-plan reviews, teacher portfolios, assessment records, and learner-engagement evidence rather than relying solely on teachers' perceptions of program effectiveness.

5. The two school districts may maintain common professional development standards because the results were consistent across profile groups, while offering specialized sessions based on teachers' subjects, grade levels, career stages, and identified classroom needs.

6. Future researchers may use classroom observations, interviews, instructional artifacts, and learner outcomes to validate self-reported practices. They may also examine possible mediating factors such as coaching, administrative support, workload, resources, motivation, and the duration and quality of professional development participation.

REFERENCES

1. Amemasor, S. K., Oppong, S. O., Ghansah, B., Benuwa, B.-B., & Essel, D. D. (2025). A systematic review on the impact of teacher professional development on digital instructional integration and teaching practices. Frontiers in Education, 10, Article 1541031. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1541031
2. Audisio, A., Taylor-Perryman, R., Tasker, T., & Steinberg, M. P. (2024). Does teacher professional development improve student learning? Evidence from Leading Educators' fellowship model (EdWorkingPaper No. 22-597). Annenberg Institute at Brown University. https://doi.org/10.26300/ah2f-z471
3. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5(1), 7–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102
4. Eugenio, E. T. (2025). The professional and personal development of private and public senior high school teachers. International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research, 6(8), 4119–4144. https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.06.08.30
5. Farrell, T. S. C. (2024). Reflective practice for language teachers. British Council.
6. Hattie, J. (2023). Visible learning: The sequel: A synthesis of over 2,100 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003380542
7. Jiang, S., Guo, L., & Tomek, S. (2024). Profiles of teacher-student relationships and classroom management practices: How they relate to self-efficacy, work stress, and classroom climate. International Journal of Educational Methodology, 10(2), 241–259. https://doi.org/10.12973/ijem.10.2.241
8. Kahmann, R., Droop, M., & Lazonder, A. W. (2022). Meta-analysis of professional development programs in differentiated instruction. International Journal of Educational Research, 116, Article 102072. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.102072
9. Lingatong, E. E., Abrigo, M. R. M., Aranzanso, D. J. F., Berroya, J. D., Daga, E. D. J. C., Gonzales, J. F. D., Ignacio, M. A. C., Macaraig, D. L., Pablo, C. V., Pineda, C. C., Sister, J. M. A. A., & Villasor, R. M. (2025). Teaching through transition: What influences teachers' practices

amidst curriculum reform? (Discussion Paper Series No. 2025-45). Philippine Institute for Development Studies. https://doi.org/10.62986/dp2025.45

10. Nīmante, D., Kokare, M., Baranova, S., & Surikova, S. (2025). Transferring results of professional development into practice: A scoping review. Education Sciences, 15(1), Article 95. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15010095
11. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). Education policy outlook 2024: Reshaping teaching into a thriving profession from ABCs to AI. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/dd5140e4-en
12. Prudente, M. S., Garcia, J. A. S., Mistades, V. M., Roleda, L. S., & Talaue, F. T. (2024). Systematic review of professional development programs for teachers in the Philippines (Research Paper Series No. 003). Second Congressional Commission on Education. https://edcom2.gov.ph/publications/systematic-review-of-professional-development-programs-for-teachers-in-the-philippines/
13. Salo, P., Francisco, S., & Olin Almqvist, A. (2024). Understanding professional learning in and for practice. Professional Development in Education, 50(3), 444–459. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2024.2311108
14. Siliņa-Jasjukeviča, G., Lūsēna-Ezera, I., Iliško, D., & Surikova, S. (2025). Promoting effective vocational education and training teacher's professional development and its transfer to practice: A systematic review. Education Sciences, 15(5), Article 596. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15050596
15. Sims, S., Fletcher-Wood, H., O'Mara-Eves, A., Cottingham, S., Stansfield, C., Goodrich, J., Van Herwegen, J., & Anders, J. (2025). Effective teacher professional development: New theory and a meta-analytic test. Review of Educational Research, 95(2), 213–254. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543231217480
16. Talafian, H., Lundsgaard, M., Mahmood, M., Shafer, D., Stelzer, T., & Kuo, E. (2025). Responsive professional development: A facilitation approach for teachers' development in a physics teaching community of practice. Teaching and Teacher Education, 153, Article 104812. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104812
17. Tapadia, S. (2024). Teacher professional development and teaching quality. Journal of Educational Research and Policies, 6(11), 56–58. https://doi.org/10.53469/jerp.2024.06(11).12
18. Tomlinson, C. A., & Moon, T. R. (2013). Assessment and student success in a differentiated classroom. ASCD.
19. UNESCO Global Education Monitoring Report Team. (2023). Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education—A tool on whose terms? UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000385723