ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)

ISRG PUBLISHERS
Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci
ISSN: 2583-7672 (Online)
Journal homepage: https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjahss
Volume – IV Issue - II (March – April) 2026
Frequency: Bimonthly

INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES OF CSU LAL-LO FACULTY: ITS RELATIONSHIP TO STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

MAR-NELIE D. BUTAC

Cagayan State University-Aparri Campus Aparri, Cagayan

| **Received:** 31.03.2026 | **Accepted:** 04.04.2026 | **Published:** 14.04.2026

***Corresponding author:** MAR-NELIE D. BUTAC

Abstract

This study examined the instructional practices and classroom management strategies of faculty members and their relationship to student academic achievement. Specifically, it investigated how faculty manage classroom behavior, apply teaching techniques, and provide planning and support, and whether these practices vary according to faculty profiles such as age, sex, program taught, number of preparations, seminars attended, designations, and plantilla positions. The study also explored the correlations between instructional practices, classroom management strategies, and students' general weighted averages to determine which aspects of teaching and management significantly impact academic performance.

Findings revealed that faculty members generally demonstrate very good classroom management strategies and good to very good instructional practices. Among the dimensions, specific teaching techniques and assessment practices showed strong positive correlations with student academic achievement, while planning practices, general behavior management, and support strategies were not significantly related to performance. Moreover, differences in instructional and management practices were observed across programs taught and plantilla positions, indicating that teaching experience and program context influence faculty performance.

Based on these findings, a faculty development plan was proposed, focusing on reflective teaching, interactive instructional strategies, effective classroom management techniques, and collaborative professional learning communities. The study implies that integrating high-quality instructional practices with proactive classroom management is crucial in fostering student engagement and improving academic outcomes. These results provide practical guidance for faculty development initiatives aimed at enhancing teaching effectiveness and supporting student learning across various programs and faculty roles.

Keywords: Instructional Practices, Classroom Management Strategies, Student Academic Achievement

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19563287

INTRODUCTION

Higher education institutions increasingly demand that faculty members move beyond traditional lecture-based instruction. Contemporary educational paradigms emphasize learner-centered approaches, active engagement, and the cultivation of critical thinking skills. Faculty are now expected to design and implement instructional practices that accommodate diverse learning styles, foster meaningful interaction, and promote student autonomy. Effective instructional practices—such as clarity of presentation, relevance of content, instructional competence, and responsiveness to student needs—are consistently recognized as vital for improving student engagement and academic achievement. Likewise, classroom management serves as a cornerstone of effective teaching, involving the establishment of a positive, productive, and inclusive learning environment where students feel supported and motivated to participate.

Despite the increasing recognition of these pedagogical demands, many college faculties begin their teaching careers with limited formal training in instructional practices and classroom management strategies, relying primarily on their content expertise. This lack of preparation often results in variability in teaching effectiveness, with some faculties struggling to balance content delivery with the creation of supportive yet intellectually challenging learning environments. Research suggests that active and inquiry-based teaching methods, such as project-based learning and interactive activities, enhance student achievement when aligned with culturally relevant pedagogical practices. However, the adoption of such approaches remains inconsistent due to limited pedagogical content knowledge, insufficient familiarity with student-centered strategies, and institutional barriers that restrict access to ongoing professional training.

While numerous studies have highlighted the importance of both instructional practices and classroom management, there remains limited empirical evidence on how these dimensions interact to influence student academic performance, particularly within the context of Philippine higher education institutions. Existing research often treats instructional methods and management strategies as separate constructs, overlooking their synergistic relationship in shaping the learning environment and determining student success. This gap in the literature hinders efforts to design comprehensive faculty development programs that address both pedagogical competence and classroom management skills.

Addressing this gap, the present study seeks to examine the relationship between the instructional practices and classroom management strategies of college faculty and its relationship to student academic achievement. By analyzing how instructional and managerial competencies jointly affect learning outcomes, the study aims to provide a deeper understanding of effective teaching practices in higher education. The findings are expected to contribute to the formulation of evidence-based faculty development initiatives and institutional policies that promote reflective practice, pedagogical innovation, and overall instructional excellence in diverse college settings.

Extensive research has consistently shown a strong positive relationship between effective classroom management strategies, sound instructional practices, and students' academic achievement across different educational levels and subject areas. In this context, the present study seeks to examine how effectively college faculty deliver instruction by integrating appropriate instructional practices with classroom management strategies. It also aims to determine how this combination contributes to improving students' academic achievement.

Statement of the Problem

This study aims to examine the instructional practices and classroom management strategies of faculty members at Cagayan State University Lal-lo Campus and determine how these variables relate to student academic achievement for the First Semester of the Academic Year 2025-2026. Specifically, it seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the faculty respondents in terms of:

   1.1. Profile

   1.1.1. Age

   1.1.2. Sex

   1.1.3. Course/Program currently taught

   1.1.4. Subject currently taught

   1.1.5. Seminars and trainings attended (3-5 years)

   1.1.6. Campus/Collage Designation/position

   1.1.7. Employment status (Part-time, Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor)

2. What is the level of instructional practices employed by faculty members as perceived by the faculty members and students along the following dimensions?

   a) Planning Practices

   b) Teaching Practices

   c) Assessment Practices

3. What is the level of classroom management strategies of faculty members, as perceived by the faculty members and student in terms of:

   a) Managing Classroom Behavior

   b) Specific Teaching Techniques

   c) Planning and Support

4. What is the academic achievement of students in terms of their general weighted average (GWA)?

5. Is there a significant difference in the level of instructional practices and classroom management strategies of the faculty members when grouped by profile?

6. Is there a significant relationship between the academic achievement of the students and the level of instructional practices and classroom management strategies of the faculty members?

7. What faculty development activity can be proposed based on the findings of this study?

Methodology

The following were the researcher's methodologies which were instrumental in the completion of this study.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19563287

Research Design

This study utilized a quantitative methodology to provide an understanding of curriculum delivery, pedagogical competence, and student engagement. This design allowed for the integration of numerical data and rich narrative insights, offering a multidimensional view of how faculty practices influenced learning outcomes. The quantitative component involved the administration of structured surveys to faculty and students to measure variables such as classroom management, instructional practices, and student academic achievement.

Locale of the Study

Figure 2. Map of CSU Lal-lo

The study was conducted at Cagayan State University – Lal-lo Campus. This setting provided a diverse academic environment composed of faculty members with varied professional backgrounds and students from different socio-cultural contexts, making it an ideal locale for examining the relationship between demographic profiles, classroom management strategies, instructional practices, and student academic achievement. The institution's strong commitment to instructional quality, institutional research, and community engagement further underscored its suitability as the study site, ensuring that the findings were both relevant and applicable to local and regional educational contexts.

Respondents/Participants and Sampling Technique

The respondents of this study consisted of faculty members and students at Cagayan State University – Lal-lo Campus. Faculty respondents included instructors who were actively engaged in teaching within the institution, while student respondents were those officially enrolled in undergraduate programs during the academic year of the study.

The selection of respondents employed stratified random sampling, as this technique ensured that only individuals directly involved in classroom management practices and student learning processes were included. This method was justified because the study required participants who could provide relevant insights into the relationship between demographic profiles, classroom management practices, and academic achievement.

The inclusion criteria for faculty respondents were: (1) currently teaching at CSU Lal-lo, and (2) having at least one year of teaching experience. For student respondents, inclusion required (1) current enrollment in the College of Teacher Education, College of Hospitality Management, College of Agriculture, and College of Information and Computing Science, and (2) completion of at least one semester of coursework. Exclusion criteria included faculty members on leave or administrative assignment and students who were irregular enrollees or not actively participating in classroom instruction. The total number of respondents was stratified into two groups—faculty and students—to ensure balanced representation. The matrix below presented the distribution:

Respondent Group	Population	Sampling
Faculty Members	65	56
Students	2,503	336
Total	2,568	392

Research Instruments

The primary instrument utilized in this study was adapted from research entitled *"Teachers' Practices and Its Effect on Students' Academic Performance"* by Francisco and Celon (2020), as well as the *"Teacher Classroom Management Strategies Questionnaire"* developed by the Incredible Years. These instruments were selected due to their foundation in evidence-based strategies that supported the improvement of student academic achievement. The tool was further modified to ensure its alignment with the specific statements of the problem of the present study.

This instrument consisted of structured items organized into domains that measured teachers' classroom management strategies, instructional practices, and student academic achievement. Responses were gathered using a Likert-scale format, allowing for quantifiable analysis of perceptions and practices. The questionnaire was selected because of its established validity and reliability in assessing the link between teachers' instructional practices, classroom management strategies, and student achievement, ensuring that the data collected was both credible and comparable to similar studies in the field. These instruments were adapted to the local context of Cagayan State University – Lal-lo Campus to ensure cultural relevance and applicability.

Data Gathering Procedure

The data collection process for this study used a quantitative approach to ensure understanding of curriculum delivery, classroom management, and student engagement. Structured surveys were administered to faculty and students. These surveys included Likert-scale items to measure perceptions of teaching effectiveness, use of active-learning strategies, technological integration, and motivational factors influencing attendance and participation. Institutional data such as seminars and trainings, subjects and courses currently taught, and academic performance metrics were collected, subject to ethical approval, to support statistical analysis and triangulate findings.

All data collection procedures adhered to ethical research standards, including informed consent, confidentiality, and voluntary participation. This multi-source approach enriched the study's validity and provided nuanced perspectives on the research questions.

Data Analysis

The data analysis for this study involved both statistical and thematic procedures to interpret the quantitative data collected. For the quantitative component, survey responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics to summarize trends and inferential statistics (e.g., correlation, regression analysis) to examine relationships between variables such as teaching strategies, student motivation, and engagement levels. Statistical software such as SPSS or R was used to ensure accuracy and rigor in handling numerical data.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19563287

The study generated a holistic understanding of the instructional dynamics and informed evidence-based recommendations for faculty development and curriculum improvement.

Ethical Consideration

This study strictly adhered to established ethical principles to ensure the rights, privacy, and safety of all participants. Prior to data collection, participants were fully informed about the purpose, objectives, and scope of the study, as well as the procedures involved in their participation. An informed consent form was provided, clearly stating that participation was voluntary and that respondents had the right to withdraw from the study at any point without penalty or consequence.

To protect confidentiality, no personally identifiable information was disclosed in the reporting of results. Responses were treated with strict anonymity, and all data were securely stored and accessed only by the researcher for academic purposes. The study emphasized data protection measures, ensuring that information gathered was used solely for research and institutional development.

Furthermore, ethical clearance was sought and secured from the appropriate institutional review body prior to the conduct of the study. All procedures were carried out in accordance with recognized ethical research standards, including respect for persons, beneficence, and justice. By observing these measures, the study safeguarded the dignity and rights of participants while ensuring the integrity and credibility of the research process.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section of this study discusses the different results that surfaced based from the analysis and interpretation of all data gathered.

Profile of the Faculty Members

Table 1. Distribution of the faculty members in terms of their profile

Variables	Frequency (n=56)	Percentage
Age		
25 or below	12	21.4
26 to 30	16	28.6
31 to 40	13	23.2
41 to 50	10	17.9
51 or above	5	8.9
	Mean= 33.82	***SD= 10.41***
Sex		
Female	34	60.7
Male	22	39.3
Program currently taught	*(multiple response)*	
Bachelor of Secondary Education	21	37.5
BS in Information Technology	16	28.6
BS in Agriculture	15	26.8
BS in Hospitality Management	12	21.4
Bachelor of Elementary Education	11	19.6
Number of preparations handled		
1 to 2	24	42.9
3 to 4	29	51.8
5 or more	3	5.4
	Mean= 2.82 preps	*SD= 1.43*
No. of seminars and trainings attended		
None	33	58.9
1 to 2	13	23.2
3 or more	10	17.9
Number of designations held		
None	38	67.9
1 designation	14	25.0
2 or more designations	4	7.1
Plantilla position		
Part-time faculty	20	35.7
Instructor	15	26.8
Assistant Professor	10	17.9
Associate Professor	9	16.1
Professor	2	3.6

Table 1 presents the profile of faculty members in terms of age, sex, teaching load, professional development, and employment status. The findings reveal a relatively young workforce, with a mean age of 33.82 and the largest group in the 26–30 age bracket, indicating that many are in the early stages of their careers. As noted by Linda Darling-Hammond (2000), early-career teachers are often adaptable but still developing instructional expertise. In terms of sex, the majority are female, reflecting the broader trend of female dominance in the teaching profession. Most faculty members handle 3–4 course preparations, suggesting a moderate workload; however, as emphasized by John Hattie (2009), multiple preparations may constrain effective lesson planning. A significant concern is that most respondents have not attended seminars or trainings, which may hinder professional growth and instructional improvement. Additionally, the high proportion of part-time faculty indicates reliance on non-permanent staff, potentially affecting access to resources and development opportunities. These findings are limited by the small sample size, reliance on self-reported data, and focus on a single institution, which may affect generalizability.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19563287

Level of Instructional Practices employed by Faculty Members as Perceived by the Faculty Members and Students

Planning Practices

Table 2a. Weighted means and level of instructional practices employed by faculty members as perceived by the faculty members and students in terms of planning practices

Statements	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. The teacher presents lessons that clearly align with the objectives of the course.	3.72	Very good
2. The teacher uses instructional materials that help improve students' understanding of the lesson.	3.57	Very good
3. The teacher employs various teaching strategies to address the diverse learning needs of students.	3.62	Very good
4. The teacher provides activities that challenge students to think and actively participate in class.	3.55	Very good
5. The teacher connects the lesson to students' prior knowledge and experiences.	3.62	Very good
6. The teacher provides activities that allow students to actively engage in the learning process.	3.54	Very good
7. The teacher facilitates activities that promote collaboration among students.	3.50	Very good
8. The teacher integrates the lesson with other subjects or areas of learning.	3.59	Very good
9. The teacher moves around the classroom and interacts with students during activities.	3.62	Very good
10. The teacher asks questions or assigns tasks that promote higher-order thinking.	3.55	Very good
Dimension Mean	**3.59**	**Very good**

It is shown in the following table that the overall mean for planning practices is 3.59, interpreted as "Very Good," indicating that faculty members generally demonstrate effective lesson planning. The highest-rated indicator, alignment of lessons with course objectives, reflects the principle of constructive alignment proposed by John Biggs (1996), emphasizing coherence among objectives, activities, and assessments. Other indicators, including varied teaching strategies, connection to prior knowledge, and promotion of active engagement, were also rated "Very Good," suggesting the use of student-centered approaches. This supports the view of Lev Vygotsky (1978), who emphasized meaningful learning through active participation and prior knowledge integration. The use of instructional materials and interdisciplinary approaches further indicates efforts to enhance comprehension and relevance. However, none of the indicators reached an "Excellent" level, suggesting room for improvement in creativity and innovation. Limitations include reliance on self-reported data, absence of qualitative validation, and focus on a single institution, affecting generalizability.

Teaching Practices

Table 2b. Weighted means and level of instructional practices employed by faculty members as perceived by the faculty members and students in terms of teaching practices

Statements	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. The teacher provides activities that require students to work as a team and share responsibilities.	3.66	Very good
2. The teacher organizes students into different groups during activities.	3.35	Very good
3. The teacher reminds students to demonstrate courtesy and respect toward others.	3.56	Very good
4. The teacher utilizes varied activities during the lesson.	3.34	Very good
5. The teacher requires students to read or write as part of the lesson activities.	3.44	Very good
Dimension Mean	**3.47**	**Very good**

An overall mean of 3.47 in Table 2b, interpreted as "Very Good," indicates that faculty members generally employ effective teaching practices that support student participation and learning. The highest-rated indicator, the use of group activities, reflects collaborative learning (Villanueva, 2016), consistent with the social constructivist theory of Vygotsky (1978), which highlights the importance of interaction in learning. The promotion of courtesy and respect also received a high rating, suggesting a positive classroom climate that enhances engagement. However, slightly lower ratings in organizing groups and using varied activities imply that these strategies may not be consistently implemented. As emphasized by Tomlinson (2001), varied instruction is essential in addressing diverse learners' needs. The integration of reading and writing activities further supports literacy development. Despite these strengths, limitations include reliance on self-reported data, absence of observational validation, and confinement to a single institution, which may affect generalizability.

Assessment Practices

Table 2c. Weighted means and level of instructional practices employed by faculty members as perceived by the faculty members and students in terms of assessment practices

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19563287

Statements	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. The teacher administers pre-assessment activities to determine students' prior knowledge before the lesson.	3.19	Good
2. The teacher monitors students' performance and provides feedback on their work.	3.72	Very good
3. The teacher administers assessments that are aligned with the lessons taught in class.	3.76	Very good
4. The teacher uses rubrics or clear criteria in grading performance tasks.	3.55	Very good
5. The teacher employs varied assessment methods (e.g., quizzes, projects, performance tasks).	3.66	Very good
6. The teacher utilizes multiple approaches in evaluating students' learning.	3.58	Very good
7. The teacher provides support to students who experience difficulty in understanding the lesson.	3.58	Very good
8. The teacher encourages students to improve their academic performance.	3.54	Very good
Dimension Mean	**3.57**	**Very good**

Table 2c reveals an overall mean of 3.57, interpreted as "Very Good," indicating that faculty members generally implement effective assessment practices that support student learning. The highest-rated indicators—alignment of assessments with lessons and provision of feedback—reflect strong adherence to the principle of constructive alignment proposed by Biggs (1996), as well as the emphasis on feedback by Black and Wiliam (1998), who identified feedback as a key driver of learning. The use of varied assessment methods and clear grading criteria further suggests fairness and responsiveness to diverse learners. However, pre-assessment received the lowest rating, indicating that diagnostic practices are less consistently applied. This contrasts with the view of Tomlinson (2001), who stressed its importance in tailoring instruction. Overall, while assessment practices are strong, improving pre-assessment strategies could enhance instructional effectiveness. Limitations include reliance on self-reported data, lack of observational validation, and focus on a single institution.

Summary of Instructional Practices

Table 2d. Overall mean and level of instructional practices employed by faculty members as perceived by the faculty members and students

Dimension	Mean	Descriptive Value
1. Planning practices	3.49	Very good
2. Teaching practices	3.47	Very good
3. Assessment practices	3.57	Very good
Overall Mean	**3.51**	**Very good**

An overall mean of 3.51 in Table 2d, interpreted as "Very Good," reflects that faculty members consistently demonstrate effective instructional practices across planning, teaching, and assessment. Among the dimensions, assessment practices obtained the highest mean, followed by planning and teaching, indicating strength in aligning assessments, providing feedback, and using varied evaluation strategies. These findings support the principle of constructive alignment proposed by John Biggs (1996) and the work of Paul Black and Dylan Wiliam (1998), which emphasize the critical role of assessment and feedback in enhancing learning. The slightly lower rating in teaching practices suggests some inconsistency in applying varied and engaging strategies, echoing the observations of John Hattie (2009) on instructional challenges. Overall, while instructional practices are balanced and effective, further improvement in teaching strategies is needed. Limitations include reliance on perceptions, lack of observational data, and confinement to one institution.

Level of Classroom Management Strategies of the Faculty Members as Perceived by the Faculty Members and Students

Statistical limits for Classroom Management Strategies are as follows:

1:00 1.75	1.74 2.49	Poor Fair
2.50	3.24	Good
3.25	4.00	Very Good

Managing Classroom Behavior

Table 3a. Weighted means and level of classroom management strategies of the faculty members as perceived by the faculty members and students in terms of managing classroom behavior

Statements	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. The teacher manages classroom behavior effectively.	3.62	Very good
2. The teacher handles behavioral problems appropriately.	3.54	Very good
3. The teacher supports the development of students' emotional, social, and problem-solving skills.	3.63	Very good
Dimension Mean	**3.60**	**Very good**

The results in Table 3a indicate that faculty members demonstrated a very good level of classroom management strategies in managing classroom behavior, with an overall mean of 3.60. Supporting

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19563287

students' emotional, social, and problem-solving skills ranked highest, followed by managing behavior and handling problems appropriately, suggesting effective promotion of positive classroom environments. These findings align with Jacob Kounin (1970), who emphasized proactive management and student engagement, and Harry Wong and Rosemary Wong (2009), who highlighted structured routines and clear expectations. The strong emphasis on emotional and social development is also consistent with Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (2020), which promotes social-emotional learning for improved outcomes. However, slightly lower ratings in handling behavioral problems reflect challenges in reactive strategies, as noted by Edmund Emmer and Edward Sabornie (2015). Limitations include reliance on self-reported data and a limited sample.

Specific Teaching Techniques

Table 3b. Weighted means and level of classroom management strategies of the faculty members as perceived by the faculty members and students in terms of specific teaching techniques

Statements	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. The teacher promotes positive behaviors such as helping, sharing, and taking turns.	3.69	Very good
2. The teacher explains when a student's behavior is inappropriate.	3.50	Very good
3. The teacher provides recognition or praise for appropriate behavior.	3.75	Very good
4. The teacher allows students time to calm down when they become upset or aggressive.	3.32	Very good
5. The teacher addresses instances of misbehavior in the classroom.	3.23	Good
6. The teacher uses a firm tone when correcting inappropriate behavior.	2.82	Good
7. The teacher refers serious behavioral concerns to the appropriate school authority.	3.00	Good
8. The teacher provides warnings when behavior is inappropriate.	2.79	Good
9. The teacher communicates with parents regarding students' behavior when necessary.	2.78	Good
10. The teacher disregards minor misbehavior that does not disrupt the class.	2.55	Good
11. The teacher redirects students who are inattentive.	2.80	Good
12. The teacher assists students in resolving problems by discussing possible solutions.	2.82	Good
13. The teacher encourages students to regulate their emotions and remain calm.	3.06	Good
14. The teacher prepares students for transitions between activities.	3.43	Very good
15. The teacher reinforces positive behavior through group rewards or incentives.	3.42	Very good
16. The teacher provides clear instructions during activities.	3.39	Very good
17. The teacher explains the consequences of misbehavior.	3.50	Very good
18. The teacher implements clear classroom rules and discipline procedures.	3.67	Very good
19. The teacher communicates with students to support behavioral improvement.	3.50	Very good
20. The teacher considers students' interests to enhance the learning experience.	3.30	Very good
21. The teacher informs parents about students' positive behavior.	3.21	Good
22. The teacher models self-control and appropriate behavior in the classroom.	3.15	Good
23. The teacher teaches students to respect others and collaborate effectively.	3.24	Good

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19563287

24. The teacher promotes respect for cultural diversity in the classroom.	3.41	Very good
25. The teacher teaches strategies for managing anger and emotions.	3.45	Very good
Dimension Mean	**3.23**	**Good**

Findings in Table 3b indicate that faculty members demonstrated a good level of classroom management strategies in terms of specific teaching techniques, with an overall mean of 3.23. High ratings in providing praise, promoting positive behavior, and implementing clear rules suggest effective use of preventive strategies. These results support the behaviorist theory of B. F. Skinner (1953), emphasizing reinforcement in shaping behavior, and the work of Robert J. Marzano (2003), which highlights clear expectations and positive interactions. Strong ratings in social-emotional practices align with Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (2020), underscoring the role of SEL in behavior and achievement. However, lower ratings in parent communication and handling minor misbehavior contrast with Joyce Epstein (2011), who emphasized home-school collaboration. Limitations include reliance on self-reported data and a single institutional setting, suggesting the need for broader and more objective assessments.

Planning and Support

Table 3c. Weighted means and level of classroom management strategies of the faculty members as perceived by the faculty members and students in terms of planning and support

Statements	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. The teacher collaborates with other teachers to improve classroom practices.	3.48	Very good
2. The teacher reflects on classroom activities to enhance teaching effectiveness.	3.15	Good
3. The teacher maintains a positive classroom environment.	3.62	Very good
4. The teacher promotes cooperation and respect among students.	3.57	Very good
Dimension Mean	**3.46**	**Very good**

In Table 3c, faculty members demonstrated a very good level of classroom management strategies in terms of planning and support, with an overall mean of 3.46. High ratings in maintaining a positive environment and promoting respect reflect strong relational practices, consistent with Nel Noddings (2005). Collaboration among teachers also scored well, supporting Richard DuFour (2004) on the value of professional learning communities. However, reflective practice received a lower rating, suggesting inconsistency in applying the concept emphasized by Donald Schön (1983). While faculty foster supportive classrooms, strengthening reflection could enhance effectiveness. Limitations include reliance on self-reported data and a single institutional context, which may affect generalizability.

Summary of Classroom Management Strategies

Table 3d. Overall mean and level of classroom management strategies of the faculty members as perceived by the faculty members and students

Dimension	Mean	Descriptive Value
1. Managing Classroom Behavior	3.60	Very good
2. Specific Teaching Techniques	3.23	Good
3. Planning and Support	3.46	Very good
Overall Mean	**3.43**	**Very good**

An overall mean of 3.43 in Table 3d, interpreted as "Very Good," indicates that faculty members demonstrate effective classroom management strategies. Managing classroom behavior ranked highest, followed by planning and support, while specific teaching techniques received a slightly lower rating, suggesting areas for improvement. These findings align with Jacob Kounin (1970), who emphasized engagement and prevention of misbehavior, and Robert J. Marzano (2003), who highlighted structured practices and positive relationships. The results also support the framework of Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (2020), emphasizing social-emotional learning in fostering positive environments. However, lower ratings in some teaching techniques reflect inconsistencies, consistent with Edmund Emmer and Edward Sabornie (2015). Limitations include reliance on self-reported data and a single institutional setting, which may affect generalizability.

Academic Achievement of Students in terms of their General Weighted Average

Table 4. Distribution of the students' academic achievement in terms of their general weighted average

Academic Achievement	Frequency (n=336)	Percentage
Failed (74 or below)	0	-
Poor (75 to 79)	6	1.8
Fair (80 to 84)	62	18.5
Satisfactory (85 to 89)	218	64.9
Very satisfactory (90 to 94)	49	14.6
Excellent (95 or above)	1	0.3
Mean= 86.72 (Satisfactory)	***SD= 3.20***	

Table 4 reveals a performance distribution that is heavily concentrated around the middle range, with students attaining an overall mean GWA of 86.72 (SD = 3.20), interpreted largely as "satisfactory." Most learners (64.9%) fall within this category, while smaller groups are distributed across fair (18.5%) and very satisfactory (14.6%) levels. Only minimal proportions reached the extremes—0.3% excellent and 1.8% poor—with no failing cases

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19563287

recorded, indicating that minimum competency is consistently achieved across the cohort.

This clustering pattern reflects Benjamin Bloom (1976), who noted that student achievement commonly aggregates around average performance under uniform instructional conditions, and aligns with John Hattie (2009), who observed similar mid-level concentration in typical classroom impact ranges. The results also echo Robert J. Marzano (2003), emphasizing that effective instruction secures baseline achievement but may not always elevate high performers.

The limited number of high achievers suggests a possible need for enrichment and differentiation strategies to extend learning beyond proficiency levels.

Difference in the Level of Instructional Practices of the Faculty Members by Profile

Table 5a. Comparison statistics in the level of instructional practices of the faculty members when grouped by profile

Variables	F- or t-value	Probability	Inference
Instructional practices			
Age	1.707	0.163	Not significant
Sex	0.422	0.519	Not significant
Program currently taught	2.121	0.042	Significant
No. of preparations	0.395	0.676	Not significant
No. of seminars/trainings attended	1.456	0.242	Not significant
No. of designations held	0.235	0.792	Not significant
Plantilla position	2.969	0.028	Significant

**tested at 0.05 level of significance; see appendix for post-hoc analysis*

Table 5a presents a pattern of statistical "stability with selective variation" in instructional practices among faculty members. No significant differences were observed when grouped according to age (p = .163), sex (p = .519), number of preparations (p = .676), seminars attended (p = .242), and designations held (p = .792), indicating a generally uniform level of instructional practice across these personal and professional profiles. This suggests that pedagogical competence is relatively consistent regardless of demographic characteristics or workload.

In contrast, significant differences emerged in relation to the program taught (p = .042) and plantilla position (p = .028), implying that instructional practices are shaped more by contextual and institutional roles than by individual traits. This aligns with Lee Shulman (1987), who argued that teaching is deeply influenced by disciplinary content knowledge, and Linda Darling-Hammond (2000), who emphasized the role of professional status and experience in teacher effectiveness. Overall, instructional practice appears stable, yet sensitive to program demands and institutional hierarchy.

Difference in the Level of Classroom Management Strategies of the Faculty Members by Profile

Table 5b. Comparison statistics in the level of classroom management strategies of the faculty members when grouped by profile

Variables	F- or t-value	Probability	Inference
Classroom management strategies			
Age	0.325	0.860	Not significant
Sex	0.038	0.846	Not significant
Program currently taught	2.427	0.040	Significant
No. of preparations	1.991	0.147	Not significant
No. of seminars/trainings attended	1.187	0.313	Not significant
No. of designations held	2.103	0.132	Not significant
Plantilla position	2.800	0.031	Significant

**tested at 0.05 level of significance; see appendix for post-hoc analysis*

Table 5b presents a pattern of overall consistency with selective contextual variation in classroom management strategies. No significant differences were found when faculty members were grouped according to age (p = .860), sex (p = .846), number of preparations (p = .147), seminars attended (p = .313), and designations held (p = .132), indicating that classroom management approaches are generally uniform across these characteristics. This suggests that management practices are shaped more by professional practice than by personal attributes.

In contrast, significant differences emerged in program taught (p = .040) and plantilla position (p = .031), implying that discipline-specific demands and institutional rank influence classroom management approaches. This aligns with Jacob Kounin (1970), who emphasized adaptive management based on classroom conditions, and Robert J. Marzano (2003), who highlighted the role of experience and professional responsibility. The findings suggest that while classroom management is generally consistent, it becomes context-sensitive across programs and ranks. Limitations include reliance on self-reported data, restricted variables, and limited generalizability.

Relationship between the Instructional Practices and Classroom Management Strategies of the Faculty Members

Table 6a. Correlation statistics between the instructional practices and classroom management strategies of the faculty members

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19563287

Variables	r-value	Probability	Inference
Instructional practices	0.779	0.000	Significant
Classroom management strategies			

**tested at 0.05 level of significance*

Table 6a illustrates a notably strong association between instructional practices and classroom management strategies (r = .779, p < .05), indicating that these two domains move closely together in practice. In other words, faculty members who demonstrate more effective instructional practices also tend to exhibit stronger classroom management strategies, suggesting a tightly linked teaching process rather than isolated skill sets.

This interconnection reflects the view of Jacob Kounin (1970), who argued that instruction and management are simultaneously enacted in the classroom, where engagement itself functions as a form of behavior regulation. Likewise, Robert J. Marzano (2003) stressed that effective teaching and classroom management reinforce one another to produce improved learning outcomes. The findings further support the observations of Edmund Emmer and Edward Sabornie (2015), who noted that well-structured instruction reduces behavioral disruptions by sustaining student attention and involvement.

However, the relationship should be interpreted cautiously. While statistically significant, the correlation does not establish causality; it cannot determine whether strong instruction enhances management or vice versa. Other contextual factors such as learner characteristics, teaching experience, and institutional support may also shape both variables simultaneously. Overall, the results highlight a mutually reinforcing relationship between instructional quality and classroom management effectiveness.

Relationship between the Instructional Practices of the Faculty Members and the Academic Achievement of the Students

Table 6b. Correlation statistics between the instructional practices of the faculty members and the academic achievement of the students

Variables	r-value	Probability	Inference
Academic achievement			
Instructional practices			
Planning practices	0.102	0.062	Not significant
Teaching practices	0.352	0.000	Significant
Assessment practices	0.512	0.000	Significant

**tested at 0.05 level of significance*

Table 6b presents a differentiated pattern of relationships between instructional practices and students' academic achievement, highlighting that not all components contribute equally to student performance. Planning practices showed a weak positive but non-significant relationship (r = .102, p = .062), suggesting that lesson preparation alone does not directly translate into higher grades. In contrast, teaching practices (r = .352, p < .05) and assessment practices (r = .512, p < .05) both demonstrated significant positive relationships with academic achievement, indicating their stronger influence on student outcomes.

This pattern is consistent with the findings of John Hattie (2009), who identified instructional quality and classroom interaction as high-impact factors in learning. Similarly, Robert J. Marzano (2003) emphasized that feedback-rich assessment practices significantly enhance student achievement by guiding both instruction and learning adjustments. The weaker role of planning aligns with the view of Carol Ann Tomlinson (2014), who argued that planning becomes meaningful only when effectively translated into responsive teaching and assessment.

Overall, the results suggest that implementation-level practices (teaching and assessment) exert greater influence on academic performance than preparatory processes alone. Limitations include reliance on self-reported instructional data, use of general academic averages, and omission of contextual learner variables such as motivation and socio-economic background.

Relationship between the Classroom Management Strategies of the Faculty Members and the Academic Achievement of the Students

Table 6c. Correlation statistics between the classroom management strategies of the faculty members and the academic achievement of the students

Variables	r-value	Probability	Inference
Academic achievement			
Classroom management practices			
Managing classroom behavior	0.024	0.656	Not significant
Specific teaching techniques	0.697	0.000	Significant
Planning and support	0.088	0.107	Not significant

**tested at 0.05 level of significance*

The results in Table 6c show that the relationship between classroom management strategies and students' academic achievement varies depending on the type of strategy employed. Specifically, managing classroom behavior (r = .024, p = .656) and planning and support (r = .088, p = .107) showed no significant relationship with academic achievement, suggesting that these strategies alone may not directly influence student performance. In contrast, specific teaching techniques demonstrated a strong and significant positive relationship with academic achievement (r = .697, p < .05). This indicates that the way teachers implement instructional strategies and actively engage students has a meaningful impact on student learning outcomes.

These findings are consistent with the work of Jacob Kounin (1970), who emphasized that classroom management is most effective when it is closely integrated with instructional techniques

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19563287

that actively engage students. The significant correlation of specific teaching techniques supports this perspective, highlighting that proactive and interactive teaching approaches contribute to higher academic achievement. On the other hand, the non-significant relationship of general behavior management and planning aligns with research suggesting that while maintaining order and preparing lessons are essential, they are not sufficient on their own to directly enhance learning outcomes (Emmer & Sabornie, 2015).

The findings also resonate with Robert J. Marzano (2003), who argued that effective classroom management and academic success are most closely linked when teachers combine behavior management with active teaching strategies and feedback mechanisms. The strong impact of specific teaching techniques in this study highlights that students benefit most when teachers implement structured, engaging, and supportive instructional activities rather than relying solely on behavior control or planning.

Despite these insights, several limitations must be acknowledged. The study relied on self-reported faculty data and general weighted averages to measure student achievement, which may not fully reflect classroom dynamics or individual learning differences. Additionally, external factors such as student motivation, learning styles, and home environment were not considered, which may also influence academic performance. Future research could incorporate classroom observations and multi-dimensional measures of achievement to better understand the impact of classroom management practices.

Proposed Faculty development activity

Based on the findings of the study, a targeted Faculty Development Program on "Integrating Instructional Design, Effective Teaching, Classroom Management, and Assessment for Learning" is recommended to strengthen areas that showed variability and enhance overall instructional effectiveness. The program may include training workshops on constructive alignment, interactive and differentiated teaching strategies, formative and diagnostic assessment practices, and evidence-based classroom management techniques, with emphasis on consistent application across different programs and faculty ranks.

Special focus should be given to strengthening reflective teaching practices, improving the use of pre-assessment strategies, and enhancing specific teaching techniques such as handling minor misbehavior, parent communication, and varied instructional activities, which were identified as areas needing improvement. Mentoring and peer coaching sessions may also be incorporated to support younger and part-time faculty members, ensuring consistent application of best practices across the institution. Overall, the proposed development activity aims to bridge identified gaps and strengthen the link between instructional practices, classroom management, and student achievement.

Conclusion

The study concluded that faculty members of the institution demonstrate very good classroom management strategies and good to very good instructional practices, with strong interrelationships between these practices, particularly in specific teaching techniques, which significantly influence students' academic achievement. While planning practices and general behavior management showed weaker direct effects on learning outcomes, the findings highlight the critical role of effective teaching methods and assessment strategies in promoting student engagement and performance. Differences across programs taught and faculty positions indicate that targeted professional development is essential to ensure consistency in instructional and management practices. These results imply that faculty development activities focusing on reflective teaching, interactive instruction, effective classroom management, and collaborative learning communities are necessary to enhance teaching effectiveness and improve overall student achievement.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, a focused faculty development program is recommended to strengthen instructional practices, classroom management, and assessment strategies. Training sessions should emphasize interactive teaching, differentiated instruction, formative assessment, and effective classroom management techniques, as these were shown to influence student achievement. Faculty members should also be encouraged to enhance reflective teaching and lesson planning, particularly since planning showed weaker links to student performance. In addition, collaborative professional learning communities should be established to promote peer sharing and consistency across programs and plantilla positions. Strengthening communication with parents and regular monitoring through classroom observations are also recommended to support continuous improvement and ensure that improved teaching practices translate into better student learning outcomes.

Declaration of no conflict of interest

The author hereby declares no conflict of interest and this paper is her original work.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, P. (2006). Exploring social constructivism: theories and practicalities. In Education 3-13 (Vol. 34, Issue 3, pp. 243–257). Informa UK Limited. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004270600898893
2. Aji Wibowo, W. (2023). The Influence of Learning Styles, Parental Income Levels, and Student Learning Motivation on Student Learning Achievement. In Journal of Social Knowledge Education (JSKE) (Vol. 4, Issue 2, pp. 65–73). Cahaya Ilmu Cendekia. https://doi.org/10.37251/jske.v4i2.434
3. Akari Software. (2024, April 26). Curriculum delivery in higher education. https://akarisoftware.com/2024/04/26/curriculum-delivery-in-higher-education/
4. Buckley, E., Cooke, J., Whelton, H., & Barrett, A. (2024). 'Rules of engagement': Does competition drive engagement in faculty development. In The Clinical Teacher (Vol. 21, Issue 6). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1111/tct.13737
5. Bundick, M. J., Quaglia, R. J., Corso, M. J., & Haywood, D. E. (2014). Promoting Student Engagement in the Classroom. In Teachers College Record: The Voice of Scholarship in Education (Vol. 116, Issue 4, pp. 1–34). SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811411600411
6. Brophy, J. E. (1983). Classroom Organization and Management. In The Elementary School Journal (Vol. 83, Issue 4, pp. 265–285). University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.1086/461318
7. Churcher, K.M., Downs, E., & Tewksbury, D. (2014). "Friending" Vygotsky: A Social Constructivist Pedagogy of Knowledge Building Through Classroom Social Media Use. The Journal of Effective Teaching, 14, 33-50.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19563287

8. Dessler, D. (1999). Constructivism within a positivist social science. In Review of International Studies (Vol. 25, Issue 1, pp. 123–137). Cambridge University Press (CUP). https://doi.org/10.1017/s0260210599001230
9. Eranıl, A. K., Özcan, M., & Yakut Özek, B. (2019). Examination of Classroom Management Competencies of Faculty of Education Students. In Educational Administration: Theory and Practice (Vol. 25, Issue 1). UK Zhende Publishing Limited Company. https://doi.org/10.14527/kuey.2019.003
10. Evans, S. M. (2017). Personalities of Introductory Course Instructors and Course Completion. In Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice (Vol. 22, Issue 1, pp. 2–16). SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025117720389
11. Haydon, T. F., Dillon, C. L., Kennedy, A. M., & Scott, M. N. (2021). Classroom Management. In T. A. Collins & R. O. Hawkins (Eds.), Peers as Change Agents (pp. 226–237). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/medpsych/9780190068714.003.0019
12. Grevtsev, A. V. (2023). Interpretation of the Concept of Social Constructivism by L. S. Vygotsky through the Semiotics of Education, the Theory of Transcendence in Education and the Theology of Personality by V. N. Lossky. In Философская мысль (Issue 4, pp. 87–106). Aurora Group, s.r.o. https://doi.org/10.25136/2409-8728.2023.4.40103
13. Griffin, T. (2016). In Supporting New Teachers: A How-To Guide for Leaders (pp. 75–80). Corwin. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483394268.n7
14. Goldman, Z. W., Cranmer, G. A., Sollitto, M., Labelle, S., & Lancaster, A. L. (2016). What do college students want? A prioritization of instructional behaviors and characteristics. In Communication Education (Vol. 66, Issue 3, pp. 280–298). Informa UK Limited. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2016.1265135
15. Ikechukwu, O. K. (2017). Learning Styles as Predictors of Students' Academic Achievement in Rivers State. International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning , 4(6). ISSN 2394- 9686
16. Jacob, B. A., & Lefgren, L. (2004). The Impact of Teacher Training on Student Achievement. In Journal of Human Resources: Vol. XXXIX (Issue 1, pp. 50–79). University of Wisconsin Press. https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.xxxix.1.50
17. Kanter, D. E., & Konstantopoulos, S. (2010). The impact of a project-base science curriculum on minority student achievement, attitudes, and careers: The effects of teacher content and pedagogical content knowledge and inquiry-based practices. In Science Education (Vol. 94, Issue 5, pp. 855–887). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20391
18. Keaton, S. A., & Bodie, G. D. (2011). Explaining Social Constructivism. In Communication Teacher (Vol. 25, Issue 4, pp. 192–196). Informa UK Limited. https://doi.org/10.1080/17404622.2011.601725
19. Killen, R. (2013). Effective Teaching Strategies: Lessons from Research and Practice (6th ed.). Melbourne: Cengage Learning.
20. Kondrashova, L., Chuvasova, N., Kondrashov, M., Chuvasov, M., Kondrashova, K., & Volkova, N. (2022). Pedagogical design.In Nuances: Estudos sobre Educação (p. e022017). Nuances Estudos Sobre Educacao. https://doi.org/10.32930/nuances.v33i00.9495
21. Kuh, G. D., & Gonyea, R. M. (2015). The Role of the Academic Library in Promoting Student Engagement in Learning. In College & Research Libraries (Vol. 76, Issue 3, pp. 359–385). American Library Association. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.76.3.359
22. Iheoma, N.E. & Uchenna, O.P. (2020). Effective Classroom Management: A. Panacea for Enhancing Students Learning Experience and Satisfaction in Higher Education. In British Journal of Education (Vol. 8, Issue 1, pp. 10–19). European Centre for Research Training and Development. https://doi.org/10.37745/bje/vol8.no1.pp10-19.2020
23. Lynch, R., Asavisanu, P., Rungrojngarmcharoen, K., & Ye, Y. (2020). Educational Management. In Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.701
24. Manning, M., & Bucher, K.T. (2002). Classroom Management: Models, Applications, and Cases.
25. Marzano, R.J., & Marzano, J.S. (2003). The Key to Classroom Management.
26. Melnychuk, I., Drozdova, I., Savchak, I., & Bloshchynsky, I. (2019). Higher School Instructors' Pedagogical Skills Improvement as a Basis of Educational Strategy for Development of Students' Professional Training. In Revista Romaneascapentru Educatie Multidimensionala (pp. 170–184). SC LUMEN MEDIA SRL. https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/184
27. Nisar, M., Khan, I.A., & Khan, F. (2019). Relationship between classroom management and students' academic achievement. Pakistan Journal of Distance and Online Learning, 5(1), 209-220.
28. Orlich, D.C., Harder, R.J., Callahan, R.C., Trevisan, M.S., & Brown, A.H. (2012). Teaching Strategies: A Guide to Effective Instruction. Cengage Learning. 10th Edition. ISBN 1111832633, 9781111832636.
29. Salva, C. R., & Labitad, G. F. (2024). TEACHERS' PRACTICES AND STUDENTS' ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT: BASIS FOR SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM. Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 2(8), 46– 82. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13151110
30. Thi, T. T., & Nguyen, H.-T. T. (2021). The Effects of Classroom Management Styles on Students' Motivation and Academic Achievement in Learning English. In International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research (Vol. 20, Issue 1, pp. 223–239). Society for Research and Knowledge Management. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.1.12
31. Pedler, M., Yeigh, T., & Hudson, S. (2020). The Teachers' Role in Student Engagement: A Review. In Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Vol. 45, Issue 3, pp. 48–62). Edith Cowan University. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2020v45n3.4
32. Pfadenhauer, M., & Knoblauch, H. (Eds.). (2018). Social Constructivism as Paradigm? (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429467714

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19563287

33. Popkewitz, T. S. (1998). Dewey, Vygotsky, and the Social Administration of the Individual: Constructivist Pedagogy as Systems of Ideas in Historical Spaces. In American Educational Research Journal (Vol.35, Issue 4, pp. 535–570). American Educational Research Association (AERA). https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312035004535
34. Rieg, S.A., & Wilson, B.A. (2009). An Investigation of the Instructional Pedagogy and Assessment Strategies Used by Teacher Educators in Two Universities within a State System of Higher Education.Education 3-13, 130, 277-294.
35. Stoner, S. C., & Fincham, J. E. (2012). Faculty Role in Classroom Engagement and Attendance. In American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education (Vol. 76, Issue 5, p. 75). Elsevier BV. https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe76575
36. Toohey, S. (2000). Designing courses for higher education. Open University Press.
37. Tractenberg, R. E. (2020). Guidelines for curriculum and course development in higher education and training. SocArXiv. https://doi.org/10.31235/OSF.IO/7QEHT
38. The Lamp. (2020). Teaching strategies. The Lamp, 37 9, 21-5 .
39. Van Schooneveld, J & Ryan, M. (2023). In MANAGING DISCIPLINE IN SCHOOLS (pp. 60–77). Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203449998_chapter_6
40. Villanueva, L. B. (2016). The effect of constructivist approach in teaching short stories and poems to the English performance of students. Research World, 7(1), 1-12.
41. Wilkerson, L., & Irby, D. M. (1998). Strategies for improving teaching practices. In Academic Medicine (Vol. 73, Issue 4, pp. 387–96). Ovid Technologies (Wolters Kluwer Health). https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-199804000-00011

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19563287