

Original Article

Feedback Seeking and Teaching Standards Capabilities of Public Secondary Technology and Livelihood Education Teachers

Noveliza Manang¹, Josephine Baguio^{1,*}

Received: 03 May 2026; Revised: 29 May 2026;
Accepted: 05 June 2026; Published: 07 June 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.66074/N4P8W1C5>

Abstract

This study examined the relationship between feedback-seeking behavior and teaching standards capabilities among public secondary Technology and Livelihood Education teachers in Cluster 13, Division of Davao City. A quantitative descriptive-correlational design was used with 120 teachers selected from an accessible population of 200. Data were collected through adapted standardized questionnaires that measured effort in feedback-seeking, risk in feedback-seeking, value of feedback about performance behaviors, and seven domains of teaching standards capabilities. The instruments obtained Cronbach's alpha values of 0.920 for feedback-seeking behavior and 0.902 for teaching standards capabilities. Means, standard deviations, Pearson product-moment correlation, and multiple linear regression were used for data analysis. Results showed that feedback-seeking behavior was very high overall ($M = 4.22$, $SD = 0.87$), with value of feedback about performance behaviors as the highest domain ($M = 4.27$, $SD = 0.87$). Teaching standards capabilities were also very high overall ($M = 4.26$, $SD = 0.84$), with learning environment as the highest domain ($M = 4.30$, $SD = 0.85$). Feedback-seeking behavior had a moderate and significant positive relationship with teaching standards capabilities ($r = 0.64$, $R \text{ squared} = 0.41$, $p = 0.000$). Regression results showed that all feedback-seeking domains significantly influenced teaching standards capabilities ($R = 0.65$, $R \text{ squared} = 0.422$, $F = 67.19$, $p = 0.000$), with value of feedback about performance behaviors as the strongest predictor. The

¹ Graduate School,
Rizal Memorial
Colleges, Inc., Davao,
Philippines
* josephinebbaguio@
outlook.com

findings support the role of a supportive feedback culture in standards-based teacher development.

Keywords: capability, feedback-seeking, pedagogy, standards, teachers

1. Introduction

Feedback has become a central concern in contemporary teacher development because it links professional self-knowledge with the continuous refinement of classroom practice. In teaching, feedback is not only a set of comments delivered after observation or evaluation. It is a professional information process through which teachers clarify the quality of their work, compare their practice with standards, and decide which instructional behaviors require adjustment. Feedback can support teaching only when it is understood, valued, and acted upon; thus, recent scholarship treats feedback literacy as a capability shared by teachers, school leaders, and learners rather than as a one-way message from evaluator to recipient (Boud & Dawson, 2023; Carless & Winstone, 2023; Molloy et al., 2020).

Feedback-seeking behavior extends this view because it positions teachers as active agents in their own professional growth. Classic feedback-seeking theory describes individuals as purposeful users of information who request, monitor, and interpret feedback to reduce uncertainty and improve performance (Ashford & Cummings, 1983). Later meta-analytic evidence shows that feedback-seeking is associated with learning orientation, supportive relationships, and better performance-related outcomes, while its frequency can decrease when people anticipate social cost or negative judgment (Anseel et al., 2015). In school contexts, this means that teachers who deliberately ask colleagues, school heads, mentors, or learners for feedback can gain more immediate information about lesson clarity, learner engagement, classroom management, assessment practices, and professional relationships.

For public secondary Technology and Livelihood Education teachers, the need for feedback is particularly salient. TLE instruction requires teachers to connect conceptual knowledge with applied, skill-based, and competency-oriented tasks. The K to 12 TLE curriculum places emphasis on practical learning, work readiness, entrepreneurship-related competencies, and performance-based outputs that require teachers to plan safe activities, demonstrate procedures, guide learners with varied abilities, and assess products or performances with clarity (Department of Education, 2016). These expectations make teacher feedback-seeking especially relevant because classroom practice in TLE often involves visible performances, learner outputs, laboratory or workshop conditions, and community-linked learning experiences.

Teaching standards capabilities provide the professional frame within which these expectations can be assessed. In the Philippines, the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers sets nationally adopted domains that include content knowledge and pedagogy, the learning environment, diversity of learners, curriculum

and planning, assessment and reporting, community linkages and professional engagement, and personal growth and professional development (Department of Education, 2017). These domains describe professional practice as a combination of knowledge, pedagogical judgment, ethical conduct, learner responsiveness, assessment literacy, collaboration, and commitment to development. The framework is therefore useful for examining whether feedback-seeking behavior relates to teachers' self-reported capability across multiple dimensions of professional teaching.

International evidence also supports the need to view teaching quality as a developmental and institutional concern. The OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey reports that teacher learning, professional collaboration, and constructive feedback remain important factors in teacher work and school improvement (OECD, 2019). Research on teacher professional development similarly emphasizes that effective teacher learning requires clear goals, insight into current practice, opportunities for rehearsal, and support to transfer new techniques to classroom routines (Kraft et al., 2018; Sims et al., 2025). Feedback-seeking can serve as a bridge between formal professional development and everyday classroom improvement because it allows teachers to identify specific gaps and obtain context-sensitive guidance.

At the same time, feedback-seeking is not always easy. Teachers may perceive feedback requests as signs of weakness, lack of expertise, or vulnerability before colleagues and administrators. Research on feedback processes shows that the social and emotional conditions surrounding feedback affect whether recipients can use feedback productively (Gnepp et al., 2020; Jeffs et al., 2023). Leadership also matters because learning-oriented leaders can make feedback seeking feel useful and safe rather than punitive (Crans et al., 2022). In the school setting, risk is therefore not a minor issue. A teacher may know that feedback has value yet still hesitate if the school climate does not protect professional dignity.

Teaching standards capabilities also depend on the quality of the learning environment, the capacity to respond to learner diversity, and the teacher's ability to integrate pedagogy, assessment, and professional values. The science of learning and development highlights the need for supportive, culturally responsive, and relationship-centered classrooms (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020). Studies on social-emotional learning and digital competence further show that teachers require both interpersonal and technological competencies to create inclusive and relevant learning experiences (Falloon, 2020; Ferreira et al., 2020). These capabilities are not fixed traits. They are strengthened through reflection, feedback, practice, and sustained professional motivation (Pekrun, 2021).

Despite the importance of feedback-seeking and teaching standards, localized empirical evidence in public secondary TLE remains limited. Much of the available literature discusses feedback, teacher standards, or professional development as separate concerns. Less attention has been given to whether TLE teachers who exert effort to obtain feedback, perceive feedback-seeking risk, and value performance feedback also report stronger capability across the PPST domains. This study

addressed that gap by examining the relationship between feedback-seeking behavior and teaching standards capabilities among public secondary TLE teachers in Cluster 13, Division of Davao City. Specifically, it determined the level of feedback-seeking behavior, assessed the level of teaching standards capabilities, tested the relationship between the two variables, and identified which feedback-seeking domains significantly influenced teaching standards capabilities.

2. Methodology

The study used a quantitative descriptive-correlational design to examine feedback-seeking behavior and teaching standards capabilities among public secondary Technology and Livelihood Education teachers in Cluster 13, Division of Davao City during school year 2025-2026. This design was appropriate because the study described the levels of the two constructs and tested the degree of association and predictive influence among their domains without manipulating school conditions, teacher assignments, or professional development exposure. The independent variable was feedback-seeking behavior, measured through effort in feedback-seeking, risk in feedback-seeking, and value of feedback about performance behaviors. The dependent variable was teaching standards capabilities, measured through content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment, diversity of learners, curriculum and planning, assessment and reporting, community linkages and professional engagement, and personal growth and professional development.

The respondents were 120 public secondary TLE teachers drawn from an accessible population of 200 teachers in the cluster. The sample consisted of 34 teachers from F. Bustamante National High School, 27 from Mahayag National High School, 28 from Dr. Santiago Dakudao Sr. National High School, 22 from Buhisan National High School, and 9 from Victor Bernal Integrated School. Purposive sampling was used because the study required respondents who were currently teaching TLE, were employed in public secondary schools in the identified cluster, and had at least three years of teaching experience in the subject area. Teachers from private schools, teachers assigned to other subject areas, teachers outside the selected division or cluster, those with less than three years of TLE teaching experience, those on temporary leave, and those under administrative action at the time of data collection were not included.

Data were gathered through an adapted standardized questionnaire divided into two major parts. The first part measured feedback-seeking behavior across the three domains of effort, risk, and value of feedback about performance behaviors, using a five-point Likert scale from 1, strongly disagree, to 5, strongly agree. The second part measured teaching standards capabilities using items aligned with the seven PPST domains adopted in the Philippine teacher standards framework (Department of Education, 2017). The TLE context of the items was retained because the study focused on teachers whose instructional work includes skill demonstration, practical

tasks, learner performance, curriculum alignment, and community-linked learning in accordance with the K to 12 TLE curriculum (Department of Education, 2016).

The instruments passed expert validation and reliability checking before the main survey. Three experts reviewed the questionnaire for content relevance, clarity of language, alignment with the research objectives, and suitability for public secondary TLE teachers. After revision based on expert comments, a pilot test was conducted with 30 public secondary TLE teachers who were not part of the final respondents. The feedback-seeking behavior scale obtained a Cronbach's alpha of 0.920, while the teaching standards capabilities scale obtained a Cronbach's alpha of 0.902. These coefficients showed strong internal consistency for the two measures and supported their use in the main data collection.

Before the survey, the researcher secured institutional and school-level approvals, including ethics clearance, endorsement from the graduate school, permission from the Schools Division Superintendent, and approval from the school heads of the participating schools. Respondents were informed about the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, and their right to withdraw without penalty. The researcher obtained informed consent and protected anonymity by avoiding personally identifying information in the dataset. Completed responses were treated confidentially and were used only for the purposes of the study.

The data were encoded, checked for completeness, and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Means and standard deviations summarized the levels of feedback-seeking behavior and teaching standards capabilities, with interpretation based on the scale ranges of 4.20 to 5.00 for Very high, 3.40 to 4.19 for High, 2.60 to 3.39 for Moderate, 1.80 to 2.59 for Low, and 1.00 to 1.79 for Very low. Pearson product-moment correlation was used to test the relationship between feedback-seeking behavior and teaching standards capabilities. Multiple linear regression was used to identify which feedback-seeking domains significantly influenced teaching standards capabilities. All inferential tests were evaluated at the 0.05 level of significance.

3. Results

The feedback-seeking summary showed an overall mean of 4.22 and SD of 0.87, described as Very high (Table 1). Among the three domains, value of feedback about performance behaviors obtained the highest mean of 4.27, followed by effort in feedback-seeking with 4.26 and risk in feedback-seeking with 4.12.

Table 1. Summary of the level of feedback-seeking behavior.

Domain	SD	Mean	Descriptive Level
Effort in Feedback-Seeking	0.88	4.26	Very high
Risk in Feedback-Seeking	0.86	4.12	High
Value of Feedback about Performance Behaviors	0.87	4.27	Very high
Overall	0.87	4.22	Very high

The teaching standards capabilities summary showed an overall mean of 4.26 and SD of 0.84, described as Very high (Table 2). Among the seven domains, learning environment obtained the highest mean of 4.30, followed by curriculum and planning with 4.28, diversity of learners with 4.27, assessment and reporting with 4.26, personal growth and professional development with 4.25, content knowledge and pedagogy with 4.22, and community linkages and professional engagement with 4.21.

Table 2. Summary of the level of teaching standards capabilities.

Domain	SD	Mean	Descriptive Level
Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	0.87	4.22	Very high
Learning Environment	0.85	4.30	Very high
Diversity of Learners	0.86	4.27	Very high
Curriculum and Planning	0.85	4.28	Very high
Assessment and Reporting	0.84	4.26	Very high
Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	0.81	4.21	Very high
Personal Growth and Professional Development	0.83	4.25	Very high
Overall	0.84	4.26	Very high

Table 3 presents the relationship between feedback-seeking behavior and teaching standards capabilities. Feedback-seeking behavior had a mean of 4.22 and SD of 0.87, while teaching standards capabilities had a mean of 4.26 and SD of 0.84. The correlation coefficient was 0.64, with R squared of 0.41 and p-value of 0.000. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 3. Correlation results.

Variables	r	p-value
Feedback Seeking Behavior	0.64	0.000
Teaching Standards Capabilities		

Table 4 presents the regression results. The model equation was Teaching Standards Capabilities = 2.75 + 0.72(Effort) + 0.69(Risk) + 0.74(Value). The model statistics were R = 0.65, R squared = 0.422, F = 67.19, and p-value = 0.000. The value of feedback about performance behaviors had the highest standardized beta coefficient of 0.63, followed by effort in feedback-seeking at 0.61 and risk in feedback-seeking at 0.59.

Table 4. Regression results.

Predictor	B	SE	Beta	t	P-value
Constant	2.75	0.78		4.82	0.000
Effort in Feedback-Seeking	0.72	0.70	0.61	4.21	0.000
Risk in Feedback-Seeking	0.69	0.67	0.59	4.10	0.000
Value of Feedback about Performance Behaviors	0.74	0.73	0.63	4.33	0.000

4. Discussion

The findings show that public secondary TLE teachers reported a very high overall level of feedback-seeking behavior, with the strongest mean found in the value of feedback about performance behaviors. This pattern is consistent with feedback-seeking theory, which explains that people are more likely to seek feedback when they perceive it as useful for goal attainment and performance improvement (Ashford & Cummings, 1983; Anseel et al., 2015). In the context of TLE, feedback has practical value because teachers must manage demonstrations, learner outputs, workshop safety, competency-based assessment, and varied instructional materials. The very high mean for value suggests that teachers recognized feedback not as a mere compliance requirement but as information that can improve instruction and support career growth, a view aligned with feedback literacy research that treats feedback as a process of sense-making, action, and refinement (Alipio, 2020; Boud & Dawson, 2023; Carless & Winstone, 2023; Molloy et al., 2020).

The high, rather than very high, rating for risk in feedback-seeking deserves particular attention. Although the domain mean remained positive, it was the lowest among the three feedback-seeking domains. This result indicates that the social cost of feedback still forms part of the professional experience of teachers. Anseel et al. (2015) showed that feedback-seeking behavior is shaped by the perceived balance between value and cost, while Gnepp et al. (2020) argued that feedback is more motivating when it is framed toward future improvement rather than personal deficiency. In schools, teachers may be willing to ask for feedback, but the process can still involve image concerns, anxiety about evaluation, or uncertainty about how colleagues and school heads will interpret the request. Crans et al. (2022) therefore

becomes relevant because learning-oriented leadership can reduce the social risk of feedback seeking and make feedback requests a normal part of professional work.

The very high level of teaching standards capabilities indicates that teachers perceived themselves as capable across the PPST domains. The highest domain, learning environment, reflects a strong self-reported capacity to provide safe, fair, respectful, participatory, and well-managed classrooms. This is important because teaching standards are not limited to subject mastery; they require teachers to create conditions where learners can participate, practice skills, take intellectual risks, and receive support. The PPST explicitly frames the learning environment as a core domain of professional teaching (Department of Education, 2017), while the broader science of learning emphasizes that belonging, safety, and relationships influence learner engagement and development (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020; Ferreira et al., 2020). For TLE, a safe and structured learning environment is especially significant because lessons often involve tools, materials, demonstrations, and performance tasks.

The strong results for curriculum and planning, diversity of learners, and assessment and reporting also reflect important elements of TLE teaching. The K to 12 TLE curriculum requires teachers to align learning competencies with applied tasks, performance products, and learner readiness (Department of Education, 2016). Thus, teachers need both planning capability and flexible pedagogy. The high scores in diversity of learners align with the PPST expectation that teachers adapt instruction to learner differences (Department of Education, 2017). They also resonate with research that shows effective classrooms combine academic challenge with attention to learner context, social-emotional needs, and equitable access to learning opportunities (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020; Ferreira et al., 2020). Assessment and reporting likewise connect with feedback literacy because the teacher's ability to provide clear learner feedback depends on competence in assessment design and interpretation (Boud & Dawson, 2023; Wisniewski et al., 2020).

Community linkages and professional engagement obtained the lowest mean among the teaching standards domains, although it remained very high. This relative position suggests a possible area for strategic development. TLE has natural links with households, local livelihood practices, community resources, and work-oriented learning; therefore, stronger community engagement can enrich practical instruction and learner motivation. The PPST includes community linkages because teachers do not work in isolation from families, local contexts, and professional communities (Department of Education, 2017). OECD (2019) similarly emphasized that collaboration and professional networks are part of teacher growth. In this study, the comparatively lower community linkage score may indicate that teachers are capable but may still need more structured opportunities to involve parents, local resource persons, industry partners, and community stakeholders in TLE-related activities.

The significant positive relationship between feedback-seeking behavior and teaching standards capabilities provides empirical support for the view that professional capability develops through active information use. The correlation coefficient of 0.64, with R squared of 0.41, shows that feedback-seeking behavior

accounted for a substantial proportion of variance in teaching standards capabilities. This relationship is theoretically coherent because feedback-seeking helps teachers compare actual practice with expected standards, recognize instructional gaps, and identify specific changes. Hattie and Timperley (2007) described feedback as powerful when it clarifies where learners or professionals are going, how they are going, and what actions come next; in the same way, teacher feedback-seeking can help convert standards into observable teaching behaviors. However, the correlational design does not establish causation. It supports association and predictive linkage within the sampled context, not a definitive causal claim.

The regression findings further showed that all three feedback-seeking domains significantly influenced teaching standards capabilities, with value of feedback about performance behaviors as the strongest predictor. This result highlights that feedback systems may not be effective if teachers do not perceive feedback as useful, specific, and actionable. Carless and Winstone (2023) argued that feedback work depends on teacher and learner capacity to design and use feedback processes, while Boud and Dawson (2023) emphasized that feedback-literate teachers can create conditions for uptake. In this study, the value domain likely functioned as the motivational foundation for feedback-seeking because teachers who see feedback as relevant to performance are more likely to request, process, and apply it. Effort also mattered because improvement requires deliberate action, while risk mattered because teachers can act on feedback only when the school climate makes such action professionally safe (Crans et al., 2022; Jeffs et al., 2023).

The findings have practical implications for professional development and school leadership. Programs for TLE teachers should not treat feedback as a one-time post-observation comment but as a continuing professional cycle that includes pre-observation goal setting, peer observation, coaching dialogue, implementation, and follow-up. Evidence from teacher coaching shows that focused, practice-connected support can improve instruction and learner outcomes (Kraft et al., 2018), while recent theory on effective professional development emphasizes insight, motivation, techniques, practice, and supportive embedding in school routines (Sims et al., 2025). For the teachers in this study, school heads can strengthen feedback-seeking by making feedback requests routine, non-punitive, and connected to PPST domains. Feedback logs, mentoring pairs, lesson study groups, and TLE-specific peer demonstrations can also reduce risk and increase the practical value of feedback.

The results should be read with methodological caution. The study used self-report measures, purposive sampling, and a cross-sectional design; therefore, the findings reflect perceived behavior and capability at one point in time among the selected teachers. Self-report can capture professional perceptions, but it cannot fully substitute for classroom observation, learner performance evidence, or longitudinal professional development data. Future research can extend this work through mixed-method designs, observation-based ratings, school head assessments, learner outcome indicators, and comparative samples from other divisions or subject areas. Even with these cautions, the study offers context-specific evidence that feedback-seeking

behavior is meaningfully associated with teachers' standards-based capability in public secondary TLE.

5. Conclusion

This study concludes that public secondary TLE teachers in Cluster 13, Division of Davao City demonstrated a very high level of feedback-seeking behavior and a very high level of teaching standards capabilities. Teachers reported particularly strong appreciation of feedback about performance behaviors and strong capability in the learning environment domain. These results point to a professional group that recognizes feedback as useful and views itself as capable across the major domains of teaching practice.

The significant positive relationship between feedback-seeking behavior and teaching standards capabilities indicates that teachers who seek, value, and manage feedback more actively also tend to report stronger standards-based capability. The regression results further show that effort, risk, and value all significantly influenced teaching standards capabilities, with value of feedback about performance behaviors as the strongest predictor. The findings support the argument that feedback-seeking is not merely an interpersonal habit but a professional development behavior linked with teachers' capacity to meet established teaching standards.

For practice, school leaders should build a feedback culture that makes feedback frequent, specific, respectful, and connected to the PPST domains. TLE departments may benefit from structured peer observation, coaching cycles, feedback conferences, demonstration-based mentoring, and follow-up sessions where teachers can convert feedback into instructional revisions. Because risk in feedback-seeking had the lowest feedback-seeking mean, schools should also ensure that feedback is developmental rather than punitive and that teachers can request feedback without fear of negative judgment.

For research, future studies should examine the relationship between feedback-seeking and teaching standards capabilities using longitudinal designs, observation-based measures, and learner outcome data. Wider samples across other clusters, divisions, and learning areas may also clarify whether the pattern observed in this study is specific to public secondary TLE or reflects a broader teacher development trend.

Acknowledgment

Sincere appreciation is given to all peer reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions, which helped the author to improve the quality of the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Alipio, M. (2020). *A Structural Model of Organizational Commitment among Higher Education Economics Educators* (No. 99421). University Library of Munich, Germany. <https://mpr.aub.uni-muenchen.de/id/eprint/99421>
- Anseel, F., Beatty, A. S., Shen, W., Lievens, F., & Sackett, P. R. (2015). How are we doing after 30 years? A meta-analytic review of the antecedents and outcomes of feedback-seeking behavior. *Journal of Management, 41*(1), 318-348. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313484521>
- Ashford, S. J., & Cummings, L. L. (1983). Feedback as an individual resource: Personal strategies of creating information. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 32*(3), 370-398. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(83\)90156-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(83)90156-3)
- Boud, D., & Dawson, P. (2023). What feedback literate teachers do: An empirically-derived competency framework. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 48*(2), 158-171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1910928>
- Carless, D., & Winstone, N. (2023). Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy. *Teaching in Higher Education, 28*(1), 150-163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1782372>
- Crans, S., Aksentieva, P., Beausaert, S., & Segers, M. (2022). Learning leadership and feedback seeking behavior: Leadership that spurs feedback seeking. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, Article 890861. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.890861>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science, 24*(2), 97-140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791>
- Department of Education. (2016). K to 12 Edukasyong Pantahanan at Pangkabuhayan and Technology and Livelihood Education curriculum guide. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/EPP-CG.pdf>
- Department of Education. (2017). DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2017/08/11/do-42-s-2017-national-adoption-and-implementation-of-the-philippine-professional-standards-for-teachers/>
- Falloon, G. (2020). From digital literacy to digital competence: The teacher digital competency framework. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 68*(5), 2449-2472. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09767-4>
- Ferreira, M., Martinsone, B., & Talic, S. (2020). Promoting sustainable social emotional learning at school through relationship-centered learning environment, teaching methods and formative assessment. *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability, 22*(1), 21-36. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jtes-2020-0003>
-

- Gnepp, J., Klayman, J., Williamson, I. O., & Barlas, S. (2020). The future of feedback: Motivating performance improvement through future-focused feedback. *PLOS ONE*, *15*(6), Article e0234444. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234444>
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 81-112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Jefferies, C., Maes, J. D., Bravard, S., & McRae, L. (2023). Feedback for teaching development: Moving from a fixed to growth mindset. *Professional Development in Education*, *49*(5), 842-855. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2021.1876149>
- Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). 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>
- Molloy, E., Boud, D., & Henderson, M. (2020). Developing a learning-centred framework for feedback literacy. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *45*(4), 527-540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1667955>
- OECD. (2019). TALIS 2018 results (Volume I): Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/1d0bc92a-en>
- Pekrun, R. (2021). Teachers need more than knowledge: Why motivation, emotion, and self-regulation are indispensable. *Educational Psychologist*, *56*(4), 283-297. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2021.1991356>
- Sims, S., Fletcher-Wood, H., O'Mara-Eves, A., Cottingham, S., Stansfield, C., Goodrich, J., Van Herwegen, J., & Anders, J. (2025). Effective teacher professional development: New theory and a meta-analytic test. *Review of Educational Research*, *95*(2), 213-254. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543231217480>
- Wisniewski, B., Zierer, K., & Hattie, J. (2020). The power of feedback revisited: A meta-analysis of educational feedback research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, Article 3087. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03087>
-

Author Contributions: Manang, N., Baguio, J.; Study design, method conception, data collection, data analysis and manuscript writing