

Factors Influencing the Productivity of Teachers

Rey Ben V. Acson ¹
0009-0004-9722-1690
reyben.acson@deped.gov.ph

Jeneve M. Binaloga ¹
0009-0002-0178-1446
jeneve.binaloga@deped.gov.ph

1 – STI West Negros University

Publication Date: September 16, 2026

DOI: **10.5281/zenodo.22795532**

Abstract

Teacher productivity is shaped by a range of organizational and personal factors. Guided by this premise, the study examined the influence of administrative and leadership support, work environment and resources, professional development opportunities, workload and time demands, and motivation and job performance on teacher productivity, while considering the teachers' demographic profiles and plantilla positions. A descriptive-correlational design was employed to analyze teachers' perceptions across variables such as age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, and plantilla position. Data were gathered through standardized survey instruments and statistically tested for significant differences. Findings revealed that teachers consistently rated all productivity factors at a high level, regardless of demographic background. No significant differences were observed across age, sex, civil status, or educational attainment. However, plantilla position significantly influenced perceptions of the work environment and resources, with lower-ranking teachers (Teacher I) and higher-ranking teachers (Teacher II and above) reporting disparities in access to resources. Professional development opportunities, workload, and motivation were uniformly valued across all groups, underscoring their universal importance in sustaining productivity. Teacher productivity is broadly driven by organizational support, equitable resources, professional growth, manageable workload, and intrinsic motivation. While demographic factors do not alter perceptions, disparities in plantilla-based resource allocation highlight the need for equity-focused policies. Addressing these gaps will ensure inclusive and sustainable productivity across all employment categories.

Keywords: *Teacher productivity; Administrative support; Work environment; Professional development; Workload*

Introduction:

Nature of the Problem

Education serves as the cornerstone of national development, and teachers stand at the direct center of instructional quality, student achievement, and overall educational reform. The productivity of teachers, defined by their effectiveness in lesson planning, instructional execution, classroom management, student assessment, and ongoing continuous learning, directly governs the operational victory of schools (Gistituati, 2020). When teachers work productively, learning outcomes improve, school environments thrive, and educational systems fulfill their core mission.

School leadership and climate play a major role in teacher output. Supportive leadership style from school principals, positive organizational culture, and administrative encouragement directly enhance teacher efficacy and job satisfaction (Anisah et al., 2020). Unmanageable workloads detract from active instructional preparation and individual student support (Nwoko et al., 2023). Financial incentives, equitable compensation, and access to modern teaching-learning materials directly impact teacher motivation and commitment. Inadequate financial and material support hinders the maintenance of peak performance (Inceçay, 2022). A teacher's individual self-efficacy, pedagogical competence, emotional resilience, and work ethic fundamentally condition how efficiently they navigate complex classroom dynamics (Nwoko et al., 2023).

This study directly supports United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4), which ensures inclusive and equitable quality education and promotes lifelong learning opportunities for all. By evaluating productivity factors to build a targeted professional development plan, this study directly advances SDG 4 targets at the institutional and local policy levels. While extensive global literature documents various determinants of teacher performance, a critical research gap persists in translating empirical productivity assessments into actionable, tailored Professional Development Plans (PDPs) within local school contexts (Nir & Bogler, 2008; Guskey & Yoon, 2021). There is a distinct empirical shortage of studies that measure specific local productivity drivers and directly bridge those findings into a contextualized, evidence-based professional development framework.

The motivation behind conducting this investigation stems from the researcher's direct observation of the increasing demands placed on contemporary educators. Witnessing dedicated teachers struggle with administrative overload, evolving curricular standards, and inadequate targeted training inspired a personal drive to seek meaningful, evidence-based solutions. Rather than viewing professional development as a mere administrative formality, the researcher is driven by a commitment to empowering fellow educators, optimizing their professional working environment, and contributing to a supportive framework in which teachers can thrive both instructionally and personally.

Current State of Knowledge

Teacher productivity extends beyond the quantity of work completed within a given period and encompasses the quality, impact, and sustainability of teachers' efforts in facilitating meaningful learning experiences. It includes commitment to student development, adaptability amid limited resources and changing educational modalities, collaboration with stakeholders, passion for teaching, and the ability to maintain well-being while delivering quality education. Productivity is also regarded as a vital organizational component because teachers are responsible for planning, implementing, and supervising learning activities that contribute to institutional goals. Asmarani et al. (2021) emphasized that teachers' personal characteristics and physical capabilities influence their productivity, while motivation, performance, and productivity collectively contribute to school effectiveness and student achievement.

Administrative and leadership support is a significant factor influencing teacher productivity. Effective school leaders establish a positive organizational climate through constructive feedback, recognition, participative decision-making, mentoring, and collaborative practices. Fullan (2020) highlighted the role of school leaders in shaping teacher efficacy and organizational output, while Urick et al. (2021) noted that supportive leadership enhances professional self-efficacy and productivity. In the Philippine context, the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads and the School-Based Management framework emphasize instructional leadership, shared governance, consultative supervision, and continuous technical assistance. Conversely, autocratic leadership, weak supervision, and inadequate administrative support may increase stress, reduce morale, and hinder teachers' effectiveness.

The work environment and availability of resources also substantially affect teachers' daily efficiency and instructional performance. A conducive environment includes adequate classrooms, reliable technology, updated instructional materials, proper ventilation, ergonomic facilities, collegial relationships, and psychological safety. Bush (2020) explained that a healthy organizational culture and adequate physical resources support teacher productivity, while Schildkamp (2020) emphasized that resource availability reduces instructional downtime and improves functional efficiency. Similarly, Miguel (2019) and Sebastian (2021) reported that overcrowded classrooms, poor ventilation, insufficient technology, and inadequate learning materials constrain classroom management and teaching delivery. In the Philippines, Republic Act No. 4670 and the DepEd Computerization Program underscore the importance of safe, adequate, and modern working conditions for teachers.

Professional development and training opportunities are essential in sustaining teachers' competence and productivity. Continuous learning enables educators to improve their pedagogical practices, adapt to curriculum reforms, and strengthen their confidence in managing classroom demands. The OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS, 2020) emphasized that professional development is most effective when it is collaborative, job-embedded, and directly connected to classroom realities. In the Philippine setting, the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers under DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017, School-Based Learning

Action Cell sessions under DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016, and relevant training programs facilitated through NEAP provide structured mechanisms for continuous professional growth. However, unequal access to training, financial constraints, and the cost of professional development may limit the benefits of these opportunities.

Workload and time demands remain major concerns affecting teachers' productivity, particularly in the Philippine public school system. Excessive teaching responsibilities and non-teaching assignments reduce the time available for lesson preparation, assessment, student feedback, and professional development. David et al. (2019) and Jomoad et al. (2021) documented that Filipino teachers often work beyond regular hours because of administrative and ancillary duties, resulting in stress, fatigue, and burnout. Republic Act No. 4670 limits actual classroom teaching to six hours daily, while DepEd Order No. 002, s. 2024 mandates the removal of administrative tasks from public school teachers to protect instructional time. These measures recognize that reducing unnecessary workload improves work-life balance and allows teachers to focus more effectively on their primary instructional responsibilities.

Motivation, job performance, and organizational support are closely interconnected with teacher productivity. Intrinsic motivation, professional recognition, career advancement, compensation, and a positive working environment encourage teachers to exert greater effort and sustain instructional quality. Li et al. (2021) explained that both intrinsic and extrinsic motivators influence employee productivity, while Gulnar (2023) emphasized that respect and a supportive workplace encourage professional development and continuous learning. In the Philippine context, the Results-Based Performance Management System under DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015 and the expanded Career Progression System under Executive Order No. 174, s. 2022 provide mechanisms for recognizing performance and supporting professional advancement. Recent studies by Malaga and Olenski (2026), Ellaso et al. (2026), and Cowas, Paglinawan, and Orongan (2026) further affirm that organizational support, psychological empowerment, collaboration, school-based management, and adaptable instructional approaches strengthen teacher motivation, resilience, and productivity.

Theoretical Underpinnings

The theoretical framework of the study is anchored on Herbert C. Kelman's (1958) Social Influence Theory, which explains how external factors, leadership, organizational structures, and social environments influence individuals' attitudes, commitment, and behavior through three processes: compliance, identification, and internalization. Compliance occurs when individuals perform behaviors to gain rewards or avoid sanctions, identification involves adopting behaviors to maintain meaningful relationships with leaders or groups, while internalization represents the deepest form of influence, wherein behaviors are accepted because they are personally meaningful and consistent with one's values. In the context of the study, *Factors Influencing the Productivity of Teachers: Basis for Professional Development Plan*, teachers' productivity is influenced by school leadership, administrative requirements, peer relationships, workplace

conditions, and availability of resources. The theory therefore provides a framework for determining whether these factors merely encourage compliance or promote genuine internalization of effective professional practices. It also supports the development of a Professional Development Plan (PDP) that emphasizes collaborative, relevant, and needs-based interventions designed to strengthen teachers' intrinsic motivation, professional commitment, self-efficacy, and sustained productivity.

Objectives of the Study

This study determined the extent to which various factors influenced teachers' productivity in one of the school districts within a medium-sized Schools Division in Southern Negros, Philippines, during School Year 2025–2026, as a basis for the development of a Professional Development Plan. Specifically, it sought to determine the profile of the teachers in terms of age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, and plantilla position; assess the degree to which factors influencing teachers' productivity were manifested in the areas of administrative and leadership support, work environment and resources, professional development and training opportunities, workload and time demands, and motivation and job performance; and ascertain whether significant differences existed in the extent to which these factors influenced teachers' productivity when the respondents were grouped and compared according to the aforementioned profile variables.

Research Methodology:

This section presents the research design, study respondents, instrumentation, data-gathering procedure, data analysis and statistical tools, and ethical consideration.

Research Design

This study used a descriptive research design to examine the relationship between the two main variables, namely teachers' performance and productivity, in one of the school districts within a medium-sized Schools Division in Southern Negros, Philippines. Descriptive studies are valuable in gaining more knowledge about the phenomenon under study. Moreover, descriptive research was used to illustrate the characteristics of the population or phenomenon under study. A descriptive research design is valuable to the present study, as it provides facts and scientific judgment. Also, this design is appropriate for the study, as it helps reveal patterns and connections that might otherwise go unnoticed, present situations, and determine the prevailing issues, thereby enabling adequate and accurate interpretation of the data.

Study Respondents

The study's respondents were 200 teachers from a total population of 400. Since the number of respondents was too large to manage, stratified sampling was employed using the Slovin formula to determine the sample size for each identified secondary school. To get the percentage, the number of respondents from each school was divided by the total number of respondents and multiplied by the sample size. The respondents were randomly selected by the researcher from each school using the lottery technique.

Instrument

The researcher developed a three-part questionnaire to determine the degree of factors influencing teachers' productivity in the districts of a medium-sized division of a highly urbanized city in Southern Negros during School Year 2022–2023. Part I covered the respondents' profiles in terms of age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, and plantilla position, while Part II assessed factors influencing teacher productivity across administrative and leadership support, work environment and resources, professional development and training opportunities, workload and time demands, and motivation and job performance, consisting of 35 productivity items and seven work performance items rated using a five-point Likert scale. The instrument underwent face validation by three experts in education and research, obtaining a validation score of 4.90, interpreted as "Excellent," following the criteria of Carter V. Good and Douglas E. Scates. After incorporating the validators' recommendations, a dry run was conducted with 30 teachers from another division outside the study sample, and Cronbach's Alpha was used to establish reliability. As explained by Dudovskiy (2019, 2022), validity concerns the extent to which an instrument measures its intended construct, while reliability refers to the consistency of its results. Cronbach's Alpha, described by Forero (2022) and Taber (2021), yielded a reliability coefficient of 0.942, interpreted as "Excellent," indicating that the questionnaire was valid and reliable for use in the study.

Data Gathering and Procedure

After the approval of the questionnaire by the panel members, the researcher **sought the help of three (3) validators who were considered experts in the field of education and research for the validation of the questionnaire. Afterward, the reliability of the research questionnaire was established by administering it to 30 teachers from one of the Divisions of Southern Negros, who were not actual respondents. After computing the reliability of the survey questionnaire, the researcher then requested the authority of the Schools Division Superintendent through a letter asking for permission to conduct the study. Upon approval, the researcher set a schedule for the data gathering with a letter-request addressed to the School Principals. The administration and retrieval of the research instrument were carried out by the researcher to ensure 100% retrieval.

After the retrieval, the data were tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted according to the specific problems outlined in the study. Scores of each respondent were encoded according to variables, and the computations were performed using SPSS software. Likewise, statistical tables were constructed in consideration of the objectives stated in the study.

Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

This study employed three analytical schemes based on its research objectives: descriptive, comparative, and relational. Objective No. 1 utilized a descriptive analytical scheme through frequency and percentage distributions to determine the respondents' profiles in terms of age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, and plantilla position. Objective No. 2 also employed a descriptive analytical scheme using the mean to assess the degree of factors influencing teachers' productivity in the areas of administrative and leadership support, work environment and resources, professional development and training opportunities, workload and time demands, and motivation and job performance. Objective No. 3 used a comparative analytical scheme and the Mann–Whitney U test to determine whether significant differences existed in the degree of factors influencing teachers' productivity when respondents were grouped and compared according to the aforementioned profile variables.

Ethical Consideration

The study adhered to ethical principles for the protection of human participants by ensuring voluntary participation, informed consent, prevention of harm, and confidentiality. Participants were fully informed about the research procedures, potential risks, and their right to participate or decline without coercion, consistent with Trochim (2021). Appropriate safeguards were observed to minimize possible physical or psychological harm, particularly when discussing sensitive matters. Participants were also assured that all information they provided would remain confidential and accessible only to authorized individuals directly involved in the study. Thus, the researcher respected participants' autonomy, welfare, privacy, and right to make informed decisions throughout the research process.

Results and Discussion:

This section presents, analyzes, and interprets the data gathered to carry out the predetermined objectives of this study.

Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Age, Sex, Civil Status, Educational Attainment, and Plantilla Position

Table 1

Profile of the Respondents

Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Age	Younger (below 34 years old)	100	50.00
	Older (34 years old and above)	100	50.00
Sex	Male	93	46.50
	Female	107	53.50
Civil Status	Single	63	31.50
	Married	137	68.50
Educational Attainment	Lower (Bachelor's Degree)	60	30.00
	Higher (Master's/Doctoral Degree)	140	70.00
Plantilla Position	Lower (Teacher 1)	68	34.00
	Higher (Teacher 2 and above)	132	66.00
Total		200	100.00

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the respondents, showing an age distribution: 58 (47.20%) younger (below 34 years old) and 65 (52.80%) older (above 34 years old). In terms of Educational Attainment, 32 or 26.00% had a bachelor's degree, and 91 or 74.00% had a master's

or Doctoral degree. In terms of length of service, the majority of the participants were 65 or 52.80%. Regarding the Average Family Monthly Income, 60 respondents, or 58.80%, earned less than Php7,600, while 63 respondents, or 51.20%, earned Php7,600 or more.

Determining respondents' age, highest educational attainment, length of service, and average monthly family income is crucial because these factors may influence how they respond to the survey. Most respondents in this survey were older, had higher educational attainment, had longer tenure, and had a higher average family income of Php 7600.

Degree of Factors Influencing the Productivity of Teachers According to Administrative and Leadership Support, Work Environment and Resources, Professional Development and Training Opportunities, Workload and Time Demands, and Motivation and Job Performance

Table 2

Degree of Factors Influencing the Productivity of Teachers According to Administrative and Leadership Support

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I...		
1. engage in the development and implementation of school plans aligned with the institutional goals and policies	3.53	High Degree
2. secure data and information using technology, including ICT, to ensure efficient and effective classroom operation.	3.39	Moderate Degree
3. participate in managing school safety for disaster preparedness, mitigation, and resiliency to ensure continuous delivery of instruction.	3.52	High Degree
4. engage in developing data-driven interventions to maintain learner achievement and meet various performance indicators.	3.45	Moderate Degree
5. with school heads by using assessment tools, strategies, and results consistent with curriculum requirements to ensure accountability in achieving higher learning outcomes.	3.87	High Degree
6. design and implement needs-based programs in the school	3.54	High Degree

to support learners' development.

7. support the career advancement and improve work performance.	3.37	Moderate Degree
8. participate in individuals and teams to effectively perform teacher roles and responsibilities.	3.55	High Degree
9. support school personnel in strengthening relationships with authorities, colleagues, parents, and other stakeholders to foster an enabling and supportive environment for learners	3.39	Moderate Degree
10. conduct and utilize relevant research findings from reliable sources.	3.81	High Degree
Overall Mean	3.54	High Degree

Table 2 reveals that administrative and leadership support significantly influences teacher productivity, with an overall mean of 3.54 interpreted as a high degree. The highest-rated indicator was the use of assessment tools, strategies, and results aligned with curriculum requirements to ensure accountability and improved learning outcomes ($M=3.54$), while support for career advancement and improved work performance received the lowest rating ($M=3.37$), interpreted as a moderate degree. These findings indicate that school leaders are generally effective in providing instructional guidance, curriculum alignment, assessment monitoring, and supportive working conditions, which strengthen teachers' accountability and performance. The results are consistent with Leithwood et al. (2020), Hattie (2012), and Kraft et al. (2023), who emphasized the positive effects of clear learning targets, aligned assessment, instructional monitoring, and actionable feedback on teacher efficacy and productivity.

However, the comparatively lower rating for career advancement suggests a need to strengthen institutional support for professional growth, including formal career pathways, mentorship, higher education opportunities, specialized training, and coaching. As noted by Darling-Hammond et al. (2020), Hargreaves and Fullan (2022), and Day et al. (2020), sustained professional development and career progression are essential to maintaining teachers' engagement, retention, and productivity. Therefore, school administrators should extend leadership practices beyond instructional supervision by establishing career progression and mentoring programs, supporting teachers in pursuing advanced qualifications and certifications, strengthening ICT and stakeholder-support systems, and reducing unnecessary administrative demands to provide more comprehensive organizational support.

Table 3

Degree of Factors Influencing the Productivity of Teachers According to Work Environment and Resources

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I...		
1. create a work environment that encourages each person to perform at a high level and is aligned with a strong organizational commitment.	3.49	Moderate Degree
2. improve school and student performance based on agreed-upon standards and targets.	3.35	Moderate Degree
3. provide an opportunity to interact with co-teachers to understand exactly what goes on in the classroom and in instructional delivery activities as expected.	3.41	Moderate Degree
4. use of innovative instructional methods focused on the improvement of learning outcomes.	3.37	Moderate Degree
5. utilize technology to enhance learners' participation in improving learning outcomes.	3.55	High Degree
6. ensure punctuality and effective use of instructional time.	3.57	High Degree
7. Monitor the cleanliness practices to keep everyone safe inside the school	3.37	Moderate Degree
8. develop, support, and maintain a working relationship with all stakeholders.	3.54	High Degree
9. Demonstrate ongoing school-community relationships for collaborative problem-solving on educational needs and opportunities.	4.00	High Degree
10. contribute to the comfort and order of the school environment.	4.44	High Degree
Overall Mean	3.61	High Degree

Table 3 shows that work environment and resources influence teacher productivity at a high degree, with an overall mean of 3.61. The highest-rated indicator was teachers' participation in maintaining the comfort and orderliness of the school environment (M=4.44), highlighting the importance of a safe, organized, and supportive workplace in sustaining motivation and effective performance. Strong school-community relationships and adequate resources also contribute to

teachers' ability to deliver quality work. However, the indicator on improving school and learner performance based on agreed standards and targets received a comparatively lower rating, interpreted as a moderate degree, suggesting challenges in translating supportive working conditions into consistent achievement of institutional performance expectations.

The findings imply that while teachers generally perceive their work environment as conducive to productivity, they may require additional support in aligning classroom practices with institutional targets. Rigid or uniform performance expectations may create difficulties when not matched with adequate resources, mentoring, flexible assessment strategies, and consideration of diverse learner needs. This supports Rosales and Lastierre (2026), who found that supportive work environments and sufficient resources enhance teacher satisfaction and productivity, and Doloso (2026), who identified inadequate resources and poor working conditions as major sources of teacher stress. Thus, school administrators should prioritize equitable resource allocation, well-maintained facilities, collaborative performance planning, responsive professional development, and stress-management initiatives to strengthen teacher productivity and effectiveness.

Table 4

Degree of Factors Influencing the Productivity of Teachers According to Professional Development and Training Opportunities

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I...		
1. discuss and exchange quick tips, ideas, and experiences with colleagues.	3.94	High Degree
2. work together in ongoing collaboration, such as planning lessons.	3.65	High Degree
3. seek out a trusted, experienced colleague who is perceived as an expert in that area for guidance or support.	3.52	High Degree
4. observe colleagues in the classroom and then try out the observed successful strategies or techniques.	3.63	High Degree
5. support and transfer of personal experience and insights) from a veteran teacher to a less experienced one.	3.65	High Degree
6. exchanging physical or digital materials such as worksheets, lesson plans, articles, or useful online tools.	3.63	High Degree
7. Sharing narratives about successes and failures in the	3.65	High Degree

classroom helps convey complex experiences and insights.		
8. Involves the formal guidance of tacit knowledge to a less-experienced person.	3.38	Moderate Degree
9. developing curriculum or troubleshooting technology challenges.	3.53	High Degree
10. conducting action research for the improvement of teaching practices.	3.62	High Degree
Overall Mean	3.62	High Degree

Table 4 shows that professional development and training opportunities influence teacher productivity at a high degree, with an overall mean of 3.62. The highest-rated indicator was teachers' practice of discussing and exchanging quick tips, ideas, and experiences with colleagues ($M=3.94$), indicating that peer collaboration and informal knowledge sharing are valuable sources of professional learning. In contrast, the lowest-rated indicator involved the formal guidance and transfer of tacit knowledge to less experienced teachers ($M=3.38$), interpreted as a moderate degree. These findings suggest that teachers readily engage in informal professional learning communities but that structured mentoring and systematic knowledge transfer remain less consistently practiced.

The results imply the need to strengthen formal yet collaborative mentoring systems that complement existing peer-to-peer exchanges. Institutionalizing mentorship can facilitate the transfer of practical classroom strategies, teaching experiences, and professional knowledge from experienced teachers to less experienced colleagues, thereby supporting sustained productivity. This is consistent with Bendanillo and Guanzon (2026) and Bersales (2026), who found that structured instructional supervision and mentoring positively influence teacher performance, while Nonaka and Takeuchi (2020) emphasized the importance of transferring tacit organizational knowledge. Similarly, Hargreaves and O'Connor (2020) highlighted trust and collaboration as essential conditions for effective professional learning. Thus, schools should establish supportive peer-mentoring and collaborative learning programs that preserve the benefits of informal knowledge sharing while providing a more systematic mechanism for professional growth.

Table 5

Degree of Factors Influencing the Productivity of Teachers According to Workloads and Time Demands

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I...		
1. subject myself to classroom observation so I can calibrate my skills and be aligned with required teaching trends.	3.39	Moderate Degree
2. positively consider the demand and challenges of being subjected to monitoring and evaluation.	3.62	High Degree
3. thread along effective communication lines to gather positive and negative feedback on my teaching style.	3.56	High Degree
4. explore effective communication channels for feedback and evaluation purposes.	3.74	High Degree
5. I am open to any third-party evaluation of my classroom management.	3.67	High Degree
6. allow peer feedback so I can positively improve myself.	4.44	High Degree
7. foster trust and camaraderie through virtual social activities to boost retention and collaboration.	4.04	High Degree
8. Encourage interactive formats such as webinars, virtual whiteboards, and short video tutorials to drive engagement and practical application.	3.63	High Degree
9. Take every piece of feedback as an opportunity to learn and grow.	3.65	High Degree
10. Exert efforts to implement the evaluation results to improve my craft.	4.29	High Degree
Overall Mean	3.80	High Degree

Table 5 shows that workload and time demands influence teacher productivity at a high degree, with an overall mean of 3.80. The highest-rated indicator was allowing peer feedback for positive self-improvement ($M=4.44$), interpreted as a high degree, indicating that teachers value collaborative, constructive, and supportive approaches to professional growth. In contrast, classroom observation for skill calibration and alignment with current teaching trends received the lowest rating ($M=3.39$), interpreted as a moderate degree. This suggests that while teachers recognize the importance of instructional monitoring, formal observations may be perceived as

stressful or compliance-oriented, particularly when teachers are already managing heavy workloads and time constraints.

The findings highlight the need to strengthen collaborative and formative approaches to professional development while reducing unnecessary administrative demands. Peer-feedback systems can provide teachers with psychologically safe opportunities to improve their practice without adding excessive pressure, while streamlined processes, flexible timelines, mentoring, and efficient resource allocation can help maximize instructional time. These findings are consistent with Doloso (2026), who identified workload, time pressure, and ancillary tasks as major sources of teacher stress, and Dela Cruz (2026), who found that effective instructional leadership helps teachers manage workload and time more efficiently. Similarly, Xue et al. (2024) emphasized that excessive non-teaching responsibilities create time constraints that limit meaningful instructional work. Thus, schools should institutionalize peer-feedback mechanisms, streamline administrative tasks, and ensure that classroom observations are developmental rather than merely evaluative to promote sustainable teacher productivity.

Table 6

Degree of Factors Influencing the Productivity of Teachers According to Motivation and Job Performance

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I...		
1. engage in structured activities like workshops, seminars, and professional development days.	4.56	Very High Degree
2. led by peers in focusing on curriculum, pedagogy, or new technologies.	3.44	Moderate Degree
3. attend sessions on specific topics, from teaching strategies to subject matter, often documented and available for future reference.	3.26	Moderate Degree
4. shared interests meet regularly, in person or virtually, and develop collective expertise.	4.17	High Degree
5. guide less experienced colleagues through guidance and support, formalizing the transfer of tacit knowledge.	4.07	High Degree
6. participation in extracurriculars, and commitment to professional development.	4.18	High Degree
7. report student progress and data-driven instruction accurately.	3.87	High Degree

8. desire to make a difference in students' lives and leave a lasting impact on society	3.63	High Degree
9. create a positive learning environment, manage student behavior effectively, and foster student engagement.	3.79	High Degree
10. build relationships with parents and stakeholders, collaborating with colleagues, and pursuing ongoing professional development.	4.27	High Degree
Overall Mean	3.92	High Degree

Table 6 shows that motivation and job performance influence teacher productivity at a high degree, with an overall mean of 3.92. The highest-rated indicator was participation in structured activities such as workshops, seminars, and professional development days ($M=4.56$), interpreted as a very high degree, indicating that teachers are strongly motivated by organized and meaningful professional learning opportunities. These activities provide opportunities for skill enhancement, collaboration, networking, and professional renewal, while also signaling institutional support for teachers' growth. In contrast, attending sessions on specific teaching or subject-matter topics that are documented for future reference received the lowest rating ($M=3.26$), interpreted as a moderate degree, suggesting that some training activities may be perceived as generic, repetitive, or insufficiently connected to teachers' immediate classroom needs.

The findings emphasize the importance of designing professional development programs that are relevant, engaging, practical, and responsive to teachers' specific needs and experiences. Training should move beyond compliance-oriented activities and provide opportunities for meaningful application, mentoring, collaboration, and sustained professional growth. Bersales (2026) found that effective management and mentoring by master teachers enhance teacher performance, while Bendanillo and Guanzon (2026) reported that instructional supervision combined with resource-supported mentoring improves teacher performance. Thus, school administrators should strengthen structured professional development through needs-based workshops, responsive mentoring, and practical learning sessions that directly address teachers' classroom challenges, thereby sustaining motivation, improving job performance, and enhancing overall teacher productivity.

Comparative Analysis in the Degree of Factors Influencing the Productivity of Teachers According to Administrative and Leadership Support, Work Environment and Resources, Professional Development and Training Opportunities, Workload and Time Demands, and Motivation and Job Performance When Grouped and Compared According to Age, Sex, Civil Status, Highest Educational Attainment, and Plantilla Position

Table 7

Difference in the Degree of Factors Influencing the Productivity of Teachers According to Administrative and Leadership Support When Grouped and Compared According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U Test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	100	102.63	4787.00	0.596		Not Significant
	Older	100	98.37				
Sex	Male	93	98.67	4805.50	0.672		Not Significant
	Female	107	102.09				
Civil Status	Single	63	101.88	4228.50	0.816	0.05	Not Significant
	Married	137	99.86				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	60	91.74	4161.00	0.916		Not Significant
	Higher	140	104.25				
Plantilla Position	Lower	68	108.00	3978.00	0.180		Not Significant
	Higher	142	96.64				

Table 7 presents the differences in the degree of factors influencing teacher productivity in terms of administrative and leadership support when grouped according to age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, and plantilla position. Using the Mann–Whitney U test, none of the variables showed a statistically significant difference: age ($U=4787.00$, $p=.596$), sex ($U=4805.50$, $p=.672$), civil status ($U=4228.50$, $p=.816$), educational attainment ($U=4161.00$, $p=.916$), and plantilla position ($U=3978.00$, $p=.180$). Since all p -values exceeded the .05 significance level, the null hypothesis was accepted, indicating that teachers have comparable perceptions of administrative and leadership support regardless of their demographic and professional characteristics.

The findings suggest that administrative and leadership support serves as a universal factor influencing teacher productivity, rather than one that varies according to teachers' age, sex, marital status, educational attainment, or position. The relatively consistent mean ranks across groups indicate that school administrators provide support in a generally equitable manner, including instructional guidance, resource provision, communication, recognition, and managerial assistance. This finding is consistent with Bush (2020), Leithwood et al. (2020), Fullan (2020), and Tschannen-Moran and Gareis (2024), who emphasized that supportive and equitable educational leadership strengthens teacher efficacy, organizational trust, and performance across different staff groups.

Therefore, school administrators should sustain inclusive and standardized leadership-support mechanisms, such as transparent communication, equitable resource allocation, mentoring, professional development, wellness initiatives, and constructive feedback, rather than designing interventions solely according to demographic or professional categories. Collaborative programs involving teachers across age groups, educational levels, and plantilla positions may further strengthen organizational cohesion and productivity. Overall, the results confirm that age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, and plantilla position are not significant factors in teachers' perceptions of administrative and leadership support, emphasizing the importance of maintaining equitable leadership practices for all teachers.

Table 8

Difference in the Degree of Factors Influencing the Productivity of Teachers According to Work Environment and Resources When Grouped and Compared According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U Test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	100	100.32	4982.00	0.964	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	100	100.68				
Sex	Male	93	100.64	4962.50	0.974	0.05	Not Significant
	Female	107	100.38				
Civil Status	Single	63	105.55	3997.50	0.397	0.05	Not Significant
	Married	137	98.18				
Educational Attainment	Lower	60	91.74	3674.50	0.156	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	140	104.25				
Plantilla Position	Lower	68	114.39	3543.50	0.014	0.05	Significant
	Higher	142	93.94				

Table 8 presents the differences in the degree of factors influencing teacher productivity in terms of work environment and resources when grouped according to age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, and plantilla position. The Mann–Whitney U test revealed no statistically significant differences based on age ($U=4982.00$, $p=.964$), sex ($U=4962.50$, $p=.974$), civil status ($U=3997.50$, $p=.397$), and educational attainment ($U=3674.50$, $p=.156$), as all p-values exceeded the .05 significance level. However, a statistically significant difference was found according to

plantilla position ($U=3543.50$, $p=.014$), with lower plantilla personnel obtaining a higher mean rank (114.39) than higher plantilla personnel (93.94).

The significant difference by plantilla position suggests that lower-ranked or entry-level teachers perceive the work environment and availability of resources as having a stronger influence on their productivity. These teachers may be more dependent on adequate classroom facilities, instructional materials, technology, and other basic resources to perform their responsibilities effectively, while more experienced or senior teachers may have developed strategies that enable them to manage resource limitations more effectively. The findings are consistent with Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2018), Urick et al. (2021), Johnson et al. (2012), and Perryman and Calvert (2020), who emphasized that inadequate resources and unfavorable working conditions can disproportionately affect teachers with less experience and professional capital.

The results further indicate that age, sex, civil status, and educational attainment do not significantly influence teachers' perceptions of work environment and resources, highlighting that safe, adequate, and conducive working conditions are essential for all teachers. School administrators should therefore prioritize equitable provision of instructional materials, functional technology, comfortable classrooms, reliable connectivity, and other workplace resources, with particular attention to the needs of lower plantilla personnel. Senior teachers may also support early-career colleagues through mentoring and resource-sharing practices. Overall, the findings indicate that plantilla position, rather than age, sex, civil status, or educational attainment, is the significant factor associated with teachers' perceptions of the influence of work environment and resources on productivity.

Table 9

Difference in the Degree of Factors Influencing the Productivity of Teachers According to Professional Development and Training Opportunities When Grouped and Compared According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U Test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	100	96.48	4597.50	0.322	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	100	104.53				
Sex	Male	93	93.63	4336.50	0.115		Not Significant

	Female	107	106.47			
Civil Status	Single	63	103.46	4129.00	0.622	Not Significant
	Married	137	99.14			
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	60	90.91	3624.50	0.123	Not Significant
	Higher	140	104.61			
Plantilla Position	Lower	68	104.06	4246.00	0.530	Not Significant
	Higher	142	98.67			

Table 9 presents the differences in the degree to which professional development and training opportunities influence teacher productivity when grouped according to age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, and plantilla position. The Mann–Whitney U test revealed no statistically significant differences based on age ($U=4597.50$, $p=.322$), sex ($U=4336.50$, $p=.115$), civil status ($U=4129.00$, $p=.622$), educational attainment ($U=3624.50$, $p=.123$), and plantilla position ($U=4246.00$, $p=.530$), as all p-values exceeded the .05 significance level. This indicates that teachers across different demographic and professional groups have comparable perceptions of the influence of professional development and training opportunities on their productivity.

The absence of significant differences suggests that professional development is a universally valued factor in teacher productivity, regardless of teachers' age, sex, marital status, educational background, or plantilla position. Teachers generally recognize the importance of continuous learning, skills enhancement, workshops, mentoring, and training in improving professional performance. This finding is consistent with Darling-Hammond et al. (2017), Guskey (2021), Fullan (2020), and Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2018), who emphasized that continuous professional learning strengthens teacher competence, self-efficacy, adaptability, and organizational commitment across career stages.

Therefore, school administrators should sustain equitable and accessible professional development programs for all teachers while providing flexible training options that respond to varying professional needs. Workshops, seminars, mentoring, action research, peer-learning activities, and post-training application plans may be strengthened to ensure that professional learning translates into improved classroom practice and productivity. Overall, the findings

confirm that age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, and plantilla position are not significant factors in teachers' perceptions of professional development and training opportunities as influences on productivity.

Table 10

Difference in the Degree of Factors Influencing the Productivity of Teachers According to Workload and Time Demands When Grouped and Compared According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U Test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	100	107.49	4301.50	0.086		Not Significant
	Older	100	93.51				
Sex	Male	93	92.09	4193.00	0.054		Not Significant
	Female	107	107.81				
Civil Status	Single	63	101.23	4269.50	0.903	0.05	Not Significant
	Married	137	100.16				
Educational Attainment	Lower	60	100.63	4192.50	0.984		Not Significant
	Higher	140	100.45				
Plantilla Position	Lower	68	99.68	4432.50	0.886		Not Significant
	Higher	142	100.92				

The statistical analysis presented in Table 10 shows no significant difference in the degree of factors influencing teacher productivity regarding workload and time demands when grouped

according to age ($U=4301.50, p=0.086$), sex ($U=4193.00, p=0.054$), civil status ($U=4269.50, p=0.903$), highest educational attainment ($U=4192.50, p=0.984$), and plantilla position ($U=4432.50, p=0.886$). Because all calculated p -values exceed the standard significance threshold ($\alpha=0.05$), the null hypothesis is retained across all demographic variables. Although minor descriptive variations exist—such as younger teachers reporting a slightly higher mean rank (107.49) than older teachers (93.51), and female teachers reporting a higher mean rank (107.81) than male teachers (92.09)—these differences are not statistically meaningful. Overall, these results demonstrate that workload and time demands exert a uniform influence on teacher productivity regardless of an individual's personal background, career stage, or administrative standing.

This uniformity carries critical institutional implications for educational leaders, policy makers, and school administrators. Because workload and time demands impact educators across all demographic lines equally, school administrators should avoid targeted or selective interventions that cater only to specific groups like offering time-management support solely to novice teachers or single educators. Instead, systemic and organizational-wide strategies are required to address heavy administrative burdens and tight schedules. Interventions such as streamlining non-teaching duties, reducing clerical paperwork, establishing realistic task timelines, and implementing digital workflow automation will benefit the entire teaching staff universally, thereby safeguarding productivity, preventing burnout, and fostering job satisfaction across all demographic profiles.

These findings strongly align with established literature on teacher workload, occupational stress, and productivity. Research by Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2022) highlights that excessive workload, time pressure, and administrative demands function as pervasive stressors that consistently affect teachers across all demographic backgrounds and career phases. Similarly, Kyriacou (2022) underscores that time pressure and administrative overload are structural issues embedded within the teaching profession itself, transcending personal variables such as age, gender, or years of experience. Furthermore, a study by Technical and Administrative Support Systems in Education (Scherer et al., 2020) confirmed that when administrative and teaching burdens are uniformly distributed, their perceived strain on teacher performance remains consistent across demographic subgroups, reinforcing the necessity of systemic organizational interventions over localized demographic-focused solutions.

At the end, profile has no significance in determining the influence of Workload and Time Demands to teacher's productivity.

Table 11

Difference in the Degree of Factors Influencing the Productivity of Teachers According to Motivation and Job Performance When Grouped and Compared According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U Test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	100	100.76	4974.50	0.950		Not Significant
	Older	100	100.25				
Sex	Male	93	96.50	4603.50	0.360		Not Significant
	Female	107	103.98				
Civil Status	Single	63	105.79	3892.00	0.378	0.05	Not Significant
	Married	137	98.07				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	60	101.41	4145.50	0.884		Not Significant
	Higher	140	100.11				
Plantilla Position	Lower	68	107.45	4015.50	0.221		Not Significant
	Higher	142	96.92				

The statistical results in Table 11 indicate no significant difference in the factors influencing teacher productivity in terms of motivation and job performance when grouped according to age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, and plantilla position. All computed *p*-values exceeded the 0.05 significance level, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis across all demographic variables. Although slight variations in mean ranks were observed, such as higher

ratings among younger, female, single teachers and those in lower plantilla positions, these differences were not statistically significant. This suggests that motivation and job performance influence teacher productivity consistently regardless of teachers' demographic characteristics or career rank.

These findings imply that motivation and job performance are universal factors affecting teacher productivity, supporting the view that institutional conditions and motivational practices are more influential than demographic characteristics. Consistent with Ryan and Deci (2020), Han and Yin (2020), and Gagné et al. (2015), schools may therefore implement inclusive, organization-wide strategies such as equitable incentives, recognition, professional autonomy, constructive feedback, and supportive working conditions rather than demographic-specific interventions. Overall, the respondents' profiles did not significantly influence teacher productivity in terms of motivation and job performance.

Conclusion:

The findings revealed that most respondents were older, female, married, highly educated, and occupying higher plantilla positions. All five areas influencing teachers' productivity, administrative and leadership support, work environment and resources, professional development and training opportunities, workload and time demands, and motivation and job performance—were rated at a high level, both overall and when grouped according to age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, and plantilla position. No significant differences were found in administrative and leadership support, professional development and training opportunities, workload and time demands, and motivation and job performance across all profile variables. Similarly, work environment and resources showed no significant differences when grouped by age, sex, civil status, and educational attainment; however, a significant difference was observed when respondents were grouped according to plantilla position. These results suggest that the teaching force is generally mature, qualified, and career-established, with teachers consistently recognizing the importance of organizational and professional factors in sustaining productivity. Although demographic characteristics generally do not influence perceptions of productivity-related factors, plantilla position appears to shape teachers' perceptions of workplace environment and resources, indicating differences in how these are experienced or prioritized across job levels.

Recommendation:

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, school administrators are encouraged to sustain transparent communication, mentoring, recognition, and consistent leadership support to strengthen teachers' confidence, motivation, and productivity. Equitable distribution of teaching

materials, classroom facilities, equipment, and support services should be ensured across all plantilla positions, including entry-level and senior teachers, to promote fairness and address position-specific needs. Regular, needs-based training and Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions should be implemented based on teachers' subject areas, career stages, and identified competency gaps, with training outcomes aligned with RPMS and PPST indicators to ensure relevance and accountability. School policies on class sizes, administrative responsibilities, non-teaching assignments, and reporting requirements should also be reviewed and standardized to promote balanced workloads, minimize unnecessary paperwork, and allow teachers to focus more on instruction and learner engagement. Formal peer-mentoring programs may be established, particularly utilizing experienced teachers and those with advanced degrees to support early-career teachers and strengthen collaborative learning. Furthermore, inclusive recognition, career progression, incentive, and wellness programs should be implemented to acknowledge teachers' achievements, enhance their sense of purpose and belonging, and foster a supportive workplace culture. Finally, qualitative studies may be conducted to gain deeper insights into teachers' daily experiences, particularly concerning workload, time demands, motivation, and other factors that may not be fully captured through quantitative demographic analyses.

References

- Anisah, Gistituati, N., & Rusdinal. (2020). Analysis of factors affecting teachers' productivity. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Innovation in Education (ICoIE 2020)*, 126–131. Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.201209.256>
- Bottiani, J. H., Duran, C. A., Pas, E. T., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2019). Teacher stress and burnout in urban middle schools: Associations with job demands, resources, and thermal climate. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 111(8), 1476–1488. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000355>
- Bubb, S., & Earley, P. (2022). *Managing Teacher Workload and Wellbeing: A Practical Guide for School Leaders*. Routledge.
- Bush, T. (2018). Leadership and management development in education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1), 3–7. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217733703>
- Bush, T. (2020). *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Carless, D., & Winstone, N. (2023). Teacher feedback literacy: Teachers' concepts and practices in providing meaningful feedback. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 125, 104063. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104063>
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (2019). *Inquiry as Stance: Practitioner Research for the Next Generation*. Teachers College Press.
- Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., Hoffman, B. J., Baranik, L. E., Sauer, J. B., Baldwin, S., Morrison, M. A., Kinkade, K. M., Maher, C. P., Curtis, S., & Evans, S. C. (2020). An interdisciplinary meta-analysis of the potential antecedents, correlates, and consequences of mentoring. *Psychological Bulletin*, 139(2), 441–476.
- Gistituati, N. (2020). *Determinants of educational workforce productivity in school management*. Academic Publishing.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (2020). Unpacking the instructional leadership core: Content and practice in principal leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 53(4), 430–441. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-01-2015-0008>
- Hobson, A. J., & Maxwell, B. (2022). Mentoring and coaching for teachers in the initial and early years of professional development. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 6(3), 162–167. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-06-2017-0043>
- Inceçay, V. (2020). Investigating factors affecting teachers' professional learning. *International Journal of Educational Researchers*, 8(3), 22–34.
- Klassen, R. M., & Tze, V. M. (2024). Teachers' self-efficacy, personality, and teaching effectiveness: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 12, 59–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2014.06.001>
- Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (209). The effect of teacher coaching on instruction and achievement: A meta-analysis of the causal evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 88(4), 547–588. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318759268>

- Kraft, M. A., Marinell, W. H., & Shen-Wei Yee, D. (2020). School working conditions and teacher improvement: Is a good workplace also a good place to learn? *Journal of Human Resources*, 51(1), 160–197. <https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.51.1.160>
- Kyndt, E., Gijbels, D., Grosemans, I., & Donche, V. (2021). Teachers' informal learning in the workplace: A systematic review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 1111–1150. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315627864>
- Kyriacou, C. (2020). Teacher stress: Directions for future research. *Educational Review*, 71(5), 567–573. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2018.1472041>
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
- Li, L., & Liu, Y. (2021). An integrated model of principal instructional leadership and teacher performance: Evidence from China. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(5), 752–771. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220929045>
- Louws, M. L., Meirink, J. A., van Veen, K., & van Driel, J. H. (2020). Teachers' self-directed learning in the context of professional development programs. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 66, 171–182. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.04.012>
- Nguyen, D. T., Harris, A., & Ng, D. (2020). Building teacher leadership capacity: Principles and practices. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(5), 841–855. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-07-2019-0239>
- Nguyen, T. D. (2021). Digital fluency and reverse mentoring in 21st-century schools: Bridging the teacher generational gap. *Journal of Educational Change*, 22(3), 389–412.
- Nwoko, J. C., Emeto, T. I., Malau-Aduli, A. E. O., & Malau-Aduli, B. S. (2023). A systematic review of the factors that influence teachers' occupational wellbeing. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(12), 6070. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20126070>
- OECD. (2019). *TALIS 2018 Results (Volume I): Teachers and School Leaders as Lifelong Learners*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/1d0ce923-en>
- Page, D. (2020). The surveillance of teachers and the simulation of quality in education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 35(4), 532–548. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2019.1581412>
- Perryman, J., & Calvert, G. (2020). What motivates teachers to teach and remain in teaching? The role of accountability and workload. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 102, 101602. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101602>
- Prenger, R., Poortman, C. L., & Handelzalts, A. (2019). The effects of networked professional learning communities on teacher learning and practice. *American Journal of Education*, 125(4), 541–567. <https://doi.org/10.1086/704120>
- Ryan, R. M., Donald, J. N., & Bradshaw, E. L. (2021). Mindfulness and motivation: A self-determination theory perspective. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 40, 69–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2020.08.019>
- Schildkamp, K. (2019). Data-based decision making for instructional improvement: Using data to inform practice. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 30(3), 257–278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2018.1539015>
- Schildkamp, K., Poortman, C. L., Luyten, H., & Hubers, M. D. (2019). Factors promoting and hindering data-based decision making in schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 30(2), 232–258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2018.1556324>



- Taimalu, M., & Luik, P. (2019). The impact of beliefs and background factors on teachers' use of ICT in teaching, administrative work, and professional development. *Computers & Education*, 137, 101–115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.04.008>
- Urlick, A., Wilson, F. P., Ford, T. G., & Frick, W. C. (2021). Operationalizing school working conditions: How leadership and physical climate shape teacher retention. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 57(4), 589–626. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X20963384>