

Instructional Development Practices of Teachers and their Relationships to Instructional Effectiveness

Jemalyn C. Hinggo*¹, Mae Ann B. Enoy², Jessalyn T. Dela Cruz³, Maisora T. Tahir⁴

Authors Information:

¹⁻⁴Zamboanga Peninsula Polytechnic State University, Zamboanga City, Philippines

Correspondence:

hinggo.jemalynn@gmail.com

Article History:

Date Received: May 5, 2026

Date Revised: May 10, 2026

Date Accepted: May 17, 2026

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20395234>

Document ID: 2026IJROMS0076

Recommended Citation:

Hinggo, J. C., Enoy, M. A. B., Dela Cruz, J. T., & Tahir, M. T. (2026). Instructional Development Practices of Teachers and their Relationships to Instructional Effectiveness. *International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(4), 339–344. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20395234>

Abstract. This study explored teachers' instructional development practices and their connection to instructional effectiveness. The results showed that teachers exhibit a very high level of instructional development in all areas, including curriculum planning, instructional design, development of instructional materials, and assessment and evaluation, with mean scores ranging from 4.70 to 4.76. Among these domains, curriculum planning had the highest mean, while instructional materials development had the lowest, although it still fell within the very high category. The small standard deviation values indicate that teachers' responses were consistent across the group. In terms of instructional effectiveness, the findings also revealed a very high level across all measured indicators. Classroom management obtained the highest rating, followed by assessment of learning and lesson delivery, while learner engagement received the lowest mean but remained at a very high level. The low variability in responses suggests a strong consensus among teachers regarding their effectiveness in instruction. Additionally, the Spearman's rho analysis indicated a strong and statistically significant positive relationship between instructional development and instructional effectiveness ($\rho = 0.681$, $p < .001$). This implies that as instructional development practices improve, instructional effectiveness likewise increases. Overall, the study underscores the importance of strengthening instructional development to enhance teaching performance and support better learning outcomes.

Keywords: Curriculum Planning; Classroom Management; Instructional Development; Instructional Effectiveness; Teacher Performance

Introduction

Instructional development plays a significant role in improving teaching quality and enhancing student learning outcomes. Teachers are expected to continuously strengthen their competencies in curriculum planning, instructional design, assessment, and classroom management to ensure effective instruction. Professional development and instructional support have been identified as important factors that contribute to instructional effectiveness and overall classroom performance (Wilson, 2012).

Studies have shown that high-quality professional development enhances teachers' self-efficacy, which positively influences lesson delivery, classroom management, and learner engagement (Yoon & Goddard, 2023). Furthermore, supportive instructional leadership, collaboration, and feedback contribute to teacher growth and improved instructional practices (Tesfaw & Hofman, 2014; Tahir & Fatima, 2023). However, while the overarching benefits of professional growth are widely acknowledged, current literature frequently treats instructional development as a monolithic concept, leaving a critical gap in understanding how specific, localized development practices distinctively predict granular dimensions of classroom effectiveness. Without identifying which precise development areas yield the highest instructional return, educational stakeholders lack the empirical basis needed to design targeted, high-impact teacher interventions. This study directly addresses this gap by investigating the multi-dimensional relationship between teachers' actual instructional development practices and their specific instructional effectiveness to support systemic educational quality.

Research Questions

This study aims to assess teachers' instructional development practices and their instructional effectiveness. It also seeks to determine whether there is a significant relationship between these practices and how effectively teachers deliver instruction. Specifically, it aims to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of instructional development practices of teachers in terms of:
 - 1.1 curriculum planning,
 - 1.2 instructional design,
 - 1.3 instructional materials development, and
 - 1.4 assessment and evaluation?
2. What is the level of instructional effectiveness of teachers in terms of:
 - 2.1 lesson delivery,

- 2.2 classroom management,
- 2.3 learner engagement, and
- 2.4 assessment of learning?
3. Is there a significant relationship between instructional development practices of teachers and their instructional effectiveness?

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

This study examined the instructional development practices and instructional effectiveness of BEED faculty members at a state university in Zamboanga City during Academic Year 2026. It focused on curriculum planning, instructional design, instructional materials development, assessment and evaluation, lesson delivery, classroom management, learner engagement, and assessment of learning. A quantitative descriptive-correlational design using survey questionnaires was employed. However, the study was limited to twenty-five respondents from one institution, which may affect the generalizability of the findings. The study also relied on self-reported data and excluded other factors such as institutional support, student performance, and teaching resources.

Literature Review

The Interplay of Institutional Context and Professional Development

Professional development (PD) serves as a foundational vehicle for enhancing teaching quality and promoting instructional excellence across both K–12 and higher education landscapes. However, a major point of criticism in current literature is the historical tendency of PD initiatives to focus myopically on individual teacher performance while operating in a vacuum. As Amundsen and Wilson (2012) emphasized, while PD programs are designed to advance instructional practices and drive student achievement, tracking their direct impact is often obscured because researchers consistently neglect the unique institutional and organizational contexts that enclose and shape daily classroom instruction. This institutional limitation suggests that establishing true instructional effectiveness requires a holistic approach that bridges individual training with organizational structures. When PD features specific institutional design elements—such as a strong content focus, active learning opportunities, coherent alignment with curriculum standards, and sufficient duration—it transitions from a localized workshop into a systemic catalyst for both individual capability and organizational growth (Quick et al., 2009; Yoon & Goddard, 2023).

Self-Efficacy as a Catalyst for Instructional Practice

The success of these institutional professional development practices is heavily contingent upon underlying psychological mechanisms, most notably teacher self-efficacy. A vast body of empirical evidence demonstrates that high-quality, content-focused PD serves to fortify teachers' internal confidence in their instructional capabilities, which subsequently yields tangible improvements in classroom clarity, cognitive activation, and classroom management (Yoon & Goddard, 2023). This alignment with teachers' immediate subject-specific needs is critical; content-focused training paired with classroom-level coaching has been shown to yield the highest transfer of training into daily pedagogy (Quick et al., 2009). Nevertheless, this relationship is not automatic. As Hoge (2016) argued, instructional strategies achieve their intended effectiveness only when execution is intentionally aligned with explicit assessment standards and continuously sustained through expert professional consultation and diagnostic guidance.

The Role of Instructional Leadership and Collaborative Supervision

Beyond internal self-efficacy, external instructional leadership and school supervision form the structural scaffold necessary to maintain instructional quality. Supportive leadership practices—characterized by iterative feedback loops, authentic peer collaboration, and shared goal-setting—not only accelerate individual teacher growth but fundamentally establish a progressive school culture (Tesfaw & Hofman, 2014; Tahir & Fatima, 2023). Furthermore, this leadership style creates an environment where professional development can evolve into collective learning communities. When administrative oversight promotes collaborative inquiry, teachers engage in joint lesson planning and shared reflections, which directly translates to upgraded instructional design and superior student learning outcomes (Huffman et al., 2010; Sun et al., 2014). Despite these findings, many studies examine teacher development, program design, and contextual factors separately. Therefore, there remains a need to explore how these variables interact to influence instructional effectiveness. This study addresses this gap by examining teachers' instructional development practices and their relationship to instructional effectiveness.

Methodology

Research Design

The researchers utilized a descriptive research design using a quantitative and correlational approach to determine the instructional development practices of teachers and their relationship to instructional effectiveness. This design is appropriate for describing variables and examining the relationships among them without manipulation (Creswell, 2014). Data was collected through a survey using a Likert scale, a commonly used tool for measuring attitudes, perceptions, and levels of agreement in quantitative research (Likert, 1932).

Sampling Design

The study originally aimed for a universal sampling approach to capture the entire target population of fifty ($N = 50$) prospective respondents. However, due to field constraints, including tight research timelines and the heavy professional and academic workloads of the participants, the study instead utilized a non-probability convenience sampling technique. This resulted in an active final sample size of twenty-five ($n = 25$) complete responses. While non-probability sampling introduces self-selection dynamics, relying on the accessible segment of a small, specialized population is a pragmatic and methodologically acceptable alternative when full participation cannot be logistically enforced (Etikan et al., 2016). This strategy prioritizes genuine participant engagement while preventing investigator bias during recruitment (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Nonetheless, because the final turnout represents a 50% response rate from the total population pool, the findings must be interpreted carefully due to reduced statistical power and limited generalizability to broader educational contexts.

Research Locale

The study was conducted at a state university located in the university belt of Zamboanga City during Academic Year 2026. The institution was selected because it offers the Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) program and employs faculty members directly involved in instructional planning, teaching, and assessment. The university also provides an appropriate academic environment for examining teachers' instructional development practices and instructional effectiveness.

Research Participants

This study included students enrolled in the Master's degree program at a State University during Academic Year 2026. While total enumeration sampling was employed to target all fifty (50) prospective participants, only twenty-five (25) ultimately participated due to time constraints and competing academic and professional responsibilities.

Research Instrument

The research instrument used in this study was adapted from established teacher effectiveness frameworks developed by Danielson (2013), Stronge (2018), and Marzano (2017), which emphasize key domains of effective teaching, including lesson delivery, classroom management, learner engagement, instructional planning, curriculum alignment, and assessment of learning. The questionnaire was modified to suit the context and objectives of the present study and was designed to measure respondents' perceptions of instructional effectiveness and instructional development practices. The instrument consisted of two parts. Part I gathered the demographic profile of the respondents, including their age, gender, teaching experience, highest educational attainment, and current school assignment. Part II focused on instructional development practices and instructional effectiveness using a five-point Likert scale. Respondents indicated their level of agreement with each statement using the following scale: 5 – Strongly Agree, 4 – Agree, 3 – Neutral, 2 – Disagree, and 1 – Strongly Disagree. The adapted instrument provided a structured means of collecting quantitative data necessary for examining the instructional practices and effectiveness of teachers within the context of the study.

Data Gathering Procedure

Letter of permission was sought formal approval from the Dean of the Graduate School and the appropriate university officials of the State University located in the university belt of Zamboanga City. Upon approval, a letter was sent to the identified respondents explaining the purpose of the study and requesting their voluntary participation. The researchers personally administered the survey questionnaire to the fifty (50) elementary teachers who are currently enrolled in the master's degree program. Before distributing the instrument, the purpose of the study was clearly explained, and informed consent was obtained from each participant. The respondents were assured that their responses would be treated with confidentiality and used strictly for academic purposes. The survey questionnaire, which utilized a five-point Likert scale, was

distributed to the respondents. Adequate time was given for them to answer the questions honestly and completely. The researchers collected the completed questionnaires immediately after administration to ensure a high retrieval rate. The gathered data were organized, tallied, coded, and prepared for statistical analysis to determine the instructional development practices of teachers and their relationship to instructional effectiveness.

Results and Discussions

Research Question 1: What is the level of instructional development practices of teachers in terms of curriculum planning, instructional design, instructional materials development, and assessment and evaluation?

Table 1. Summary of Level of Instructional Development Practices of Teachers

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Curriculum planning	4.76	0.32	Very High
Instructional design	4.73	0.35	Very High
Instructional Materials Development	4.70	0.36	Very High
Assessment and Evaluation	4.72	0.34	Very High
Total Mean	4.72		Very High

The results show that teachers demonstrate a very high level of instructional development practices across all areas, including curriculum planning, instructional design, instructional materials development, and assessment and evaluation, as reflected by their high mean scores (4.70–4.76). Among the variables, curriculum planning obtained the highest mean (4.76), indicating it is the most strongly practiced area, while instructional materials development has the lowest mean (4.70), though still within the “very high” category. The low standard deviation values (0.32–0.36) suggest that responses are consistent, meaning teachers generally share similar perceptions and practices. The empirical findings reveal an exceptionally high level of engagement and competency among teachers across all four domains of instructional development. With mean scores tightly clustered between 4.70 and 4.76, these results align with the contemporary educational paradigm that positions teachers not merely as curriculum implementers, but as active curriculum designers (Shawer, 2017).

Research Question 2: What is the level of instructional effectiveness of teachers in terms of lesson delivery, classroom management, learner engagement, and assessment of learning?

Table 2. Summary of Level of Instructional Effectiveness of Teachers

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Lesson delivery	4.75	0.31	Very High
Classroom Management	4.85	0.29	Very High
Learner Engagement	4.74	0.32	Very High
Assessment of Learning	4.76	0.30	Very High
Total Mean	4.77		Very High

The results in Table 2 indicate that teachers demonstrate a very high level of instructional effectiveness across all measured variables. Among the indicators, Classroom Management obtained the highest mean score ($M = 4.85$, $SD = 0.29$), suggesting that teachers are highly effective in maintaining order, managing student behavior, and creating a conducive learning environment. Assessment of Learning ($M = 4.76$, $SD = 0.30$) and Lesson Delivery ($M = 4.75$, $SD = 0.31$) also received very high ratings, indicating that teachers are proficient in delivering content clearly and in evaluating student performance effectively. Meanwhile, Learner Engagement ($M = 4.74$, $SD = 0.32$) obtained the lowest mean among the indicators, although it is still interpreted as very high, showing that teachers are still highly capable of actively involving students in the learning process. The relatively low standard deviation values (ranging from 0.29 to 0.32) suggest that responses are consistent, indicating a strong agreement among respondents regarding the high instructional effectiveness of teachers. Overall, the findings imply that teachers demonstrate a very high level of instructional effectiveness across all measured variables. This uniformly high perception of teaching quality aligns with the framework of Hattie’s (2009) Visible Learning, which posits that deliberate, structured instructional practices are among the most powerful drivers of student achievement.

Research Question 3. Is there a significant relationship between instructional development practices of teachers and their instructional effectiveness?

Table 3. Instructional Development Practices of Teachers and their Instructional Effectiveness

Correlation Matrix			
		ID	IE
ID	Spearman's rho	—	
	df	—	
	p-value	—	
IE	Spearman's rho	0.681	—
	df	23	—
	p-value	<.001	—

The results of the Spearman's rho correlation analysis revealed a strong positive relationship between instructional development and instructional effectiveness ($\rho = 0.681$, $df = 23$, $p < .001$). This indicates that as the level of instructional development increases, instructional effectiveness also tends to increase. Furthermore, the p-value of less than .001 shows that the relationship is statistically significant, suggesting that the observed correlation is unlikely to have occurred by chance. Therefore, the findings imply that improved instructional development is associated with higher levels of instructional effectiveness. When teachers are provided with systematic instructional development, it enhances their pedagogical content knowledge and directly influences their confidence and practice in the classroom (Blank, 2010; Whitworth & Chiu, 2015).

Ethical Considerations

The researchers observed ethical standards throughout the conduct of the study. Prior to data collection, formal permission was obtained from the Dean of the Graduate School and the appropriate university authorities. Participants were informed about the purpose of the study, and their voluntary participation was secured through informed consent. Respondents were assured that their identities and responses would remain confidential and would be used solely for academic and research purposes. They were also informed that they could withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. Academic records were accessed only with proper authorization and handled in accordance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173). Furthermore, all collected data were handled responsibly and stored securely to protect the privacy of the participants.

Conclusion

The findings of this study demonstrate that teachers maintain an exceptional standard of instructional development across all domains, including curriculum planning, instructional design, materials development, and assessment. This high level of preparation is mirrored by their instructional effectiveness in classroom management, lesson delivery, learner engagement, and the assessment of learning. Furthermore, the data reveals a strong, statistically significant positive correlation between these two areas, underscoring that deliberate improvements in the development phase are directly associated with superior teaching performance. Consequently, it is concluded that robust instructional development is a critical determinant in fostering teaching excellence and driving positive student learning outcomes.

Recommendations

In light of the findings and conclusions of the study, several recommendations are proposed. School administrators should prioritize professional development programs focused on instructional innovation by providing targeted training in instructional materials development and conducting continuous workshops that enable teachers to adapt to emerging educational trends and practices. Educators are encouraged to sustain and enhance their instructional effectiveness through reflective practice, professional learning communities, and peer collaboration, fostering a culture of shared best practices and continuous improvement in classroom instruction. To further strengthen pedagogical effectiveness, teachers should place greater emphasis on learner engagement by adopting student-centered and interactive teaching strategies and integrating educational technologies that promote active participation and deeper conceptual understanding. Future researchers are encouraged to conduct similar studies involving larger sample sizes and more diverse educational settings to enhance the generalizability of the findings, while also examining additional variables that may influence instructional effectiveness and development. Furthermore, policymakers and educational leaders should utilize the results of this study in designing and implementing

evidence-based programs and policies that support instructional development, reinforce teaching effectiveness, and ultimately contribute to improved educational quality and student learning outcomes.

References

- Amundsen, C., & Wilson, M. (2012). Are we asking the right questions? A conceptual review of the educational development literature in higher education. *Review of Educational Research*, 82(1), 90–126. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654312438409>
- Blank, R. K. (2010). *Phase II of a study of the effects of intensive professional development on improving teacher instruction and student achievement in mathematics and science*. Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Chukwuemeka, E. J. (2026). *Shifting from theory to practice: Effective instructional design and learning material production*. Department of Educational Foundations, Faculty of Education, University of Abuja.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Danielson, C. (2013). *The framework for teaching evaluation instrument* (2013 ed.). The Danielson Group. <https://danielsongroup.org>
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- Hoge, D. M. (2016). *The relationship between teachers' instructional practices, professional development, and student achievement* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska at Omaha). University of Nebraska at Omaha.
- Huffman, D., Thomas, K., & Lawrenz, F. (2010). Relationship between professional development, teachers' instructional practices, and the achievement of students in science and mathematics. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 47(2), 174–195. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1949-8594.2003.tb18123.x>
- Quick, H. E., Holtzman, D. J., & Chaney, K. R. (2010). Professional development and instructional practice: Conceptions and evidence of effectiveness. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, 15(1–2), 121–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10824661003635176>
- Shawer, S. F. (2017). Teacher-driven curriculum development: An unconquered highway to operational curriculum responsiveness. *The Curriculum Journal*, 28(4), 496–515. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2017.1303531>
- Stronge, J. H. (2018). *Qualities of effective teachers* (3rd ed.). ASCD.
- Sun, M., Penuel, W. R., Frank, K. A., Gallagher, H. A., & Youngs, P. (2013). Shaping professional development to promote the diffusion of instructional expertise among teachers. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 35(3), 344–369. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373713482763>
- Tahir, I., & Fatima, N. (2023). Effect of principal's instructional leadership practices on teachers' professional development: A cross-sectional study of secondary school level from selected areas of Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan. *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, 10(2), 590–606. <https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2023.10.2.0986>
- Tesfaw, T. A., & Hofman, R. H. (2012). *Teachers' perceptions and preferences toward instructional supervision in secondary schools of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia* (Master's thesis). University of Groningen. <https://studenttheses.uu.nl>
- United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development* (A/RES/70/1). United Nations. <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>
- Whitworth, B. A., & Chiu, J. L. (2015). Professional development and teacher change: The missing leadership link. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 26(2), 121–137. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-014-9411-2>
- Wilson, M. E. (2012). *What is known about the relationship between instructional development approaches and effective teaching outcomes? A meta-study of the instructional development research literature* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Yoon, I., & Goddard, R. D. (2023). Professional development quality and instructional effectiveness: Testing the mediating role of teacher self-efficacy beliefs. *Professional Development in Education*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2023.2264309>