

Teacher quality and classroom practices across nations

Gellie H. Tamban*

Maribago Elementary School, Maribago, Lapu-Lapu City, Cebu, Philippines

Neciforo A. Olivar

Canduman Elementary School, Canduman, Mandaue City, Cebu, Philippines
Email: neciforo.olivar@deped.gov.ph

Elen P. Catipay

Maribago Elementary School, Maribago, Lapu-Lapu City, Cebu, Philippines
Email: elen.catipay003@deped.gov.ph

Dr. Regina P. Galigao

Cebu Technological University - Main Campus Cebu City, Philippines
Email: reginpgaligao@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examines teacher quality and classroom practices across nations, focusing on how teacher competencies, instructional strategies, and professional development influence learning outcomes in diverse contexts. Through a comparative review of international research and policy literature, the study found that teacher quality is a multidimensional and context-dependent concept that extends beyond formal qualifications to include sustained professional development, instructional autonomy, and pedagogical competence. Across systems, teacher quality consistently influenced instructional practices, particularly in lesson planning, learner engagement, formative assessment, and responsiveness to learner diversity. However, this relationship varied according to system-level factors such as policy coherence, professional learning support, and working conditions. The study concludes that improving teacher quality requires coherent, instructionally focused policies that align preparation, professional development, and supportive teaching environments to promote effective and equitable classroom practice.

Keywords: Teacher quality, classroom practices, professional development, cross-national education systems, pedagogical competencies.

Date Submitted: June 29, 2026

Date Accepted: July 3, 2026

Date Published: July 10, 2026

*Corresponding author / Email: gellie.tamban@deped.gov.ph
DOI: <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05031307>

Recommended citation:

Olivar, N. A., Catipay, E. P., Tamban, G. H., & Galigao, R. P. (2026). Teacher quality and classroom practices across nations. *Pantao (International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences)* 5 (3), 951-962.
<http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05031307>

INTRODUCTION

Teacher quality is widely acknowledged as one of the most critical determinants of student learning and overall education system performance. A substantial body of international research demonstrates that differences in teacher effectiveness account for significant variation in student achievement, often exceeding the effects of school resources and structural factors (Goldhaber, 2016; Nilsen & Gustafsson, 2016). Consequently, improving teacher quality has become a central focus of educational reform efforts worldwide.

Despite global consensus on its importance, teacher quality is defined and conceptualized differently across national education systems. In some contexts, teacher quality is closely associated with measurable teacher effectiveness and accountability mechanisms, such as classroom observations and student performance indicators. In other systems, teacher quality is framed as professional expertise developed through rigorous preparation, sustained professional development, and high levels of professional autonomy (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). These varying conceptualizations reflect differences in policy priorities, professional cultures, and governance structures.

Instructional practices represent the concrete expression of teacher quality in the classroom. Effective teachers demonstrate the ability to employ appropriate pedagogical strategies, adapt instruction to diverse learners, and use assessment to support learning. However, international evidence suggests that the relationship between teacher quality and instructional practices is mediated by contextual factors, including professional development opportunities, curriculum expectations, and working conditions (OECD, 2025). As a result, similar definitions of teacher quality may lead to different instructional practices across countries.

Understanding teacher effectiveness therefore requires a comparative perspective that examines how national systems align teacher qualifications, professional development, and pedagogical competencies with classroom practice. This study seeks to examine how teacher quality is defined and conceptualized across selected national education systems and to analyze the relationship between teacher quality and instructional practices in diverse contexts. By comparing instructional methods and classroom practices across countries, this research aims to contribute to evidence-informed discussions on how education systems can strengthen teaching quality and improve learning outcomes.

Statement of the problem

This study aims to examine how teacher quality is defined and conceptualized across selected national education systems and to determine classroom instructional practices in diverse educational contexts.

Specifically, it seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. How is teacher quality defined and conceptualized across different national education systems?
2. How does teacher effectiveness compare across selected nations in terms of qualifications, professional development, and pedagogical competencies?
3. What instructional methods and classroom practices are employed by teachers across nations, and how do these compare across different national contexts?
4. What is the effectiveness of the relationship between teacher quality and instructional practices in diverse national contexts?

METHODOLOGY

This study utilizes a comparative mixed-methods research design with an embedded data mining component to examine teacher quality and classroom practices across different national education systems. The design combines traditional comparative education research with advanced data-driven techniques to allow both theory-based and pattern-based analysis.

This study examined how teacher quality is defined across selected national education systems and the effectiveness of instructional practices in diverse contexts. Through a comparative review of international research and policy literature, the study found that teacher quality is a multidimensional and context-dependent concept that extends beyond formal qualifications to include sustained professional development, instructional autonomy, and pedagogical competence.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Results and Discussion section presents a comparative synthesis of the key findings on teacher quality and classroom practices across nations, drawing on international literature, policy documents, and comparative education research rather than on data collected through a researcher-administered survey instrument. Because this section examines national education systems as units of analysis, comparing the United States, Finland, Singapore, Australia, and the Philippines, the discussion is grounded in the body of scholarly and policy literature synthesized for this study, and the findings are interpreted in direct relation to the study's objective of understanding how teacher quality, competencies, instructional approaches, and professional development influence classroom practices and student learning outcomes across differing educational contexts. The analytical approach integrates thematic comparison across national systems with reference to established theoretical and empirical frameworks in the field, allowing patterns, effectiveness, and variations in teacher quality and classroom practice to be examined systematically. Comparative insights are drawn to illuminate similarities and differences across educational systems, taking into account contextual factors such as policy environments, resource availability, and cultural influences, and the discussion below interprets the implications of these findings in relation to existing theories and frameworks while identifying critical areas for improvement and future research in enhancing teacher quality and instructional effectiveness on a global scale.

Teacher quality is widely recognized as a key determinant of educational effectiveness, yet its definition and conceptualization vary considerably across national education systems. Contemporary research increasingly views teacher quality as a multidimensional construct encompassing not only formal qualifications and experience but also pedagogical competence, professional beliefs, collaboration, and the capacity to positively influence student learning (OECD, 2018; Schleicher, 2020). In systems oriented toward effectiveness and accountability, teacher quality is commonly equated with teacher effectiveness, defined largely by measurable impacts on student achievement, with evaluation systems typically combining classroom observations, student growth measures such as value-added models, and student feedback (Goldhaber, 2016). While these systems aim to improve transparency and accountability, critics argue that they promote a technocratic and narrow view of teacher quality that may undervalue relational, contextual, and ethical dimensions of teaching (Skourdoumbis, 2017). In contrast, a professional expertise and trust-based model define teacher quality through professional competence, autonomy, and trust, wherein teachers complete rigorous, research-based master's level education and are granted substantial curricular and pedagogical

autonomy. Rather than relying on formal evaluation or inspection systems, such education systems depend on selective recruitment, strong teacher preparation, and professional responsibility to ensure quality, viewing teacher quality as a collective and systemic property rather than an individual performance metric (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). A further conception, developmental professionalism, frames teacher quality as professional excellence aligned with national goals, emphasizing structured induction, intensive mentoring, continuous professional development, and multiple career pathways encompassing teaching, leadership, and specialist tracks. In this model, teacher quality is sustained through a coherent system that integrates preparation, appraisal, development, and promotion, and research indicates that this approach supports high levels of teacher self-efficacy and professional collaboration, reinforcing a developmental and growth-oriented view of quality (Zhang et al., 2024). A fourth conception, standards based professional quality, defines teacher quality primarily through professional standards and evidence of impact, formalized through national teacher standards that guide teacher education, certification, appraisal, and promotion (Clinton et al., 2017). However, critical policy analyses suggest that standards driven approaches risk narrowing pedagogical practice if implementation becomes compliance focused rather than developmental, and international comparative research notes that teacher quality discourse is strongly influenced by global accountability trends (Singh et al., 2021). Taken together, these perspectives indicate that teacher quality is no longer understood as a static set of qualifications but as a context dependent, practice based, and system embedded construct. While national education systems differ in their approaches, there is growing international consensus that sustainable improvements in teacher quality depend on coherent systems that integrate preparation, professional learning, supportive working conditions, and professional trust.

Teacher effectiveness is a central concern of education systems worldwide, yet it is shaped by differing policy priorities, cultural values, and governance structures. Comparative research shows that effective teachers are not defined solely by credentials but by the interaction of qualifications, ongoing professional development, and pedagogical competencies that translate into classroom practice (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; OECD, 2025). In the United States and Australia, teacher effectiveness has traditionally been associated with formal qualifications, including undergraduate degrees, certification, and licensure requirements; however, extensive empirical research indicates that these credentials alone are weak predictors of classroom effectiveness (Goldhaber, 2016), prompting both countries to shift toward supplementing qualification requirements with evaluation systems that emphasize performance and measurable outcomes. Australia, in particular, aligns teacher qualifications with national professional standards, using them as benchmarks for entry, promotion, and appraisal, although critics argue that standards driven systems may overemphasize compliance rather than deep instructional expertise (Singh et al., 2021). Finland presents a markedly different model in which teacher effectiveness is strongly linked to rigorous, research based qualifications, with all teachers required to complete a master's degree that integrates theory, research, and extensive teaching practice; these high entry standards allow Finland to rely less on external accountability and more on professional trust (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017), and international evidence suggests that Finland's emphasis on deep preparation contributes to teachers' strong pedagogical reasoning and instructional autonomy, which are central to their effectiveness. In Singapore, teacher qualifications are highly standardized and centrally managed, with teachers recruited from the top segment of the academic cohort and trained at the National Institute of Education (NIE), ensuring coherence between national goals and teacher preparation; here, qualifications are viewed not as an endpoint but as the foundation of a lifelong professional trajectory (OECD, 2018; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). In the Philippines, teacher qualifications are defined through pre-service education, licensure through the BLEPT, and alignment with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST),

and while qualification standards are clearly articulated, national studies note variability in teacher preparation quality across institutions, influencing early career effectiveness (Rodriguez, 2024).

With respect to professional development, practices in the United States are often decentralized and vary widely in quality and coherence; while effective professional development programs are shown to improve teaching practice, many teachers report that such programs are fragmented, short term, and weakly connected to instructional needs, limiting their impact on effectiveness (Popova et al., 2022). In Finland, professional development is embedded within teachers' work and strongly connected to collaborative inquiry and school-based learning, with teachers engaging in continuous professional learning as part of their professional responsibility rather than through frequent external training, an approach that reinforces teacher effectiveness by promoting reflective practice and collective improvement (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Singapore is widely recognized for its systematic and sustained professional development model, in which teachers receive at least 100 hours of professional development annually, supported by mentoring, professional learning communities, and clear career pathways, ensuring that teacher effectiveness evolves over time rather than remaining static (Zhang et al., 2024). Australia's professional development framework is linked closely to teacher standards and appraisal systems, and while this alignment promotes coherence, research suggests that professional development effectiveness depends heavily on school leadership and local capacity, resulting in uneven outcomes across contexts (Clinton et al., 2017). In the Philippine context, professional development is explicitly aligned with the PPST and coordinated through the Department of Education (DepEd) and the National Educators Academy of the Philippines (NEAP), and evidence indicates that sustained, curriculum aligned professional development improves pedagogical competence, although many teachers report limited practical impact due to short term training designs, heavy workloads, and insufficient follow up (Prudente et al., 2024).

Regarding pedagogical competencies, in systems such as the United States and Australia, pedagogical competence is often assessed through classroom observations, student performance data, and formal appraisal tools; while these mechanisms aim to capture effectiveness, critics argue that they may oversimplify teaching by prioritizing observable behaviors and test outcomes over professional judgment (Skourdoumbis, 2017). Finland emphasizes pedagogical competencies such as adaptive instruction, formative assessment, and learner centered teaching, developed through deep preparation and professional autonomy rather than external monitoring, and research suggests that such trust-based systems enable teachers to respond more effectively to diverse learner needs (Nilsen & Gustafsson, 2016). Singapore integrates pedagogical competence into its career stage framework, with increasing expectations for mentoring, curriculum leadership, and instructional innovation, so that teachers are supported to refine their pedagogical skills continuously, reinforcing effectiveness at both individual and system levels (Zhang et al., 2024). This comparison highlights that teacher effectiveness is not a universally fixed construct but a system dependent outcome shaped by how qualifications, professional development, and pedagogical competencies are aligned, and that education systems treating teachers as developing professionals, rather than solely as performers subject to evaluation, are more likely to foster long term instructional quality and equity.

Instructional methods and classroom practices reflect how teacher effectiveness is enacted in daily teaching, and across national education systems these practices are shaped by curriculum frameworks, teacher preparation models, assessment regimes, and cultural expectations about teaching and learning. Comparative research indicates that while no single

instructional model dominates globally, high performing systems emphasize student engagement, formative assessment, and adaptive pedagogy, whereas accountability-oriented systems tend to emphasize structured instruction and observable performance (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; OECD, 2025). In the United States, classroom practices are strongly influenced by standards-based curricula and accountability systems, with common instructional methods including explicit or direct instruction, the display and review of learning objectives, frequent checking for understanding, and data driven grouping and remediation. Teachers often align lesson structure with state standards and standardized assessments, leading to a focus on measurable learning outcomes (Goldhaber, 2016), and classroom observations frequently emphasize clarity of instruction, classroom management, and alignment between objectives, activities, and assessment, although studies show variability across districts, with some schools adopting inquiry based learning and project based approaches, particularly in well-resourced settings (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017).

Finnish teachers, by contrast, employ learner centered instructional methods grounded in professional autonomy and deep pedagogical knowledge, with common practices including inquiry-based learning, phenomenon-based instruction organized around cross disciplinary themes, formative and narrative assessment, and differentiated instruction based on learner needs. Classroom practices emphasize student autonomy, collaboration, and deep conceptual understanding rather than frequent testing (Nilsen & Gustafsson, 2016), and teachers adapt pacing and instructional strategies flexibly, supported by minimal external inspection, resulting in classrooms typically characterized by calm learning environments, low teacher talk ratios, and high levels of trust in students' intrinsic motivation. Singapore blends structured instruction with high level cognitive engagement, with instructional methods commonly observed including explicit teaching of concepts followed by guided practice, the use of questioning techniques to promote higher order thinking, lesson study and collaborative planning, and the systematic use of formative assessment. Teachers apply consistent instructional frameworks while maintaining high academic expectations, and classroom practices emphasize mastery learning, metacognition, and problem solving, particularly in mathematics and science (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017), with Singaporean teachers trained to refine lessons through professional learning communities to ensure alignment between pedagogy, assessment, and curriculum goals (Zhang et al., 2024). Australian teachers employ a mix of student centered and teacher directed methods, guided by national curriculum standards, with common practices including explicit teaching combined with inquiry tasks, differentiated instruction, the use of formative feedback and rubrics, and the integration of digital technologies. Classroom practices are expected to demonstrate alignment with the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers, leading to structured lesson planning and reflective documentation (Clinton et al., 2017), and research suggests that the quality of instructional practice varies across schools depending on leadership support and professional development coherence (Singh et al., 2021). In the Philippines, instructional practices are anchored on the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) and the K to 12 curriculum, with common classroom methods including direct instruction combined with interactive activities, the use of formative assessment and performance tasks, contextualized examples and localized materials, and an emphasis on values education and collaborative learning. Studies indicate that Filipino teachers demonstrate strengths in classroom management, lesson planning, and rapport with learners, while challenges persist in areas such as inclusive education and differentiated instruction for diverse learners (Gepila, 2020; Rodriguez, 2024), and classroom practices are often shaped by large class sizes and limited resources, requiring teachers to adapt instructional strategies pragmatically. This comparison demonstrates that instructional methods and classroom practices vary considerably across national contexts but increasingly converge around student engagement, formative assessment, and adaptive pedagogy, and that while no single

instructional model guarantees effectiveness, systems integrating professional trust with structured support appear best positioned to foster high quality teaching and learning.

Research across national education systems consistently demonstrates a strong relationship between teacher quality and instructional practices, indicating that teacher quality shapes how instruction is planned, delivered, and assessed in classrooms. Teacher quality, commonly defined through qualifications, pedagogical knowledge, professional competence, and continuous professional development, serves as the foundation upon which effective instructional practices are enacted, while sustained engagement in sound instructional practices contributes in turn to the further development of teacher quality (Nilsen & Gustafsson, 2016; OECD, 2025). This relationship, however, is not uniform across countries, being mediated by system level factors such as accountability structures, professional autonomy, resource availability, and policy coherence. High teacher quality equips teachers with the pedagogical content knowledge, instructional decision-making skills, and reflective capacity needed to implement effective classroom practices, and empirical studies consistently show that well prepared teachers are more likely to employ practices such as formative assessment, differentiated instruction, and higher order questioning, which are strongly associated with improved student learning outcomes (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). International comparative studies indicate that teacher quality influences not only the selection of instructional strategies but also the adaptation of those strategies to learner needs and contextual constraints, such that teacher quality functions as the enabling condition through which instructional effectiveness is realized (Bradford et al., 2021).

In accountability driven systems such as the United States and Australia, teacher quality is often operationalized through observable instructional practices and student performance indicators, with teachers in these contexts tending to emphasize structured instruction, explicit learning objectives, and frequent assessment aligned with curriculum standards (Goldhaber, 2016). While teachers with strong professional competencies demonstrate consistency and clarity in instruction, research suggests that external accountability pressures may constrain pedagogical innovation, such that the relationship between teacher quality and instructional practices in these systems is strong in terms of technical proficiency but weaker in relation to creative or inquiry-based approaches (Singh et al., 2021). In Finland, a professional trust-based system, teacher quality is grounded in advanced qualifications, research-based preparation, and professional autonomy, and Finnish teachers exercise substantial instructional discretion, resulting in classroom practices that emphasize learner centered instruction, inquiry based learning, and formative assessment (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). The relationship between teacher quality and instructional practices in Finland is largely bidirectional, in that high levels of professional preparation enable sophisticated instructional practices, which in turn reinforce teachers' professional judgment and expertise, with minimal external monitoring allowing pedagogical competence to flourish through reflective and adaptive practice (Nilsen & Gustafsson, 2016). Singapore represents a developmental professionalism model in which teacher quality and instructional practices are highly aligned through coherent system design, with strong initial preparation, structured mentoring, and continuous professional development enabling teachers to implement cognitively demanding instructional strategies, including mastery learning, metacognitive instruction, and problem-solving approaches (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Research using TALIS data demonstrates that as teachers advance in professional competence, their instructional practices extend beyond classroom delivery to include mentoring, curriculum leadership, and instructional innovation, indicating a reinforcing relationship between teacher quality and instructional practice across career stages (Zhang et al., 2024). In resource constrained and emerging systems such as the Philippines, the

relationship between teacher quality and instructional practices is shaped by systemic and material constraints, including large class sizes and limited instructional resources, and studies show that teachers with higher demonstrated quality, aligned with professional standards, are better able to implement context responsive strategies such as interactive teaching and formative assessment (Gepila, 2020; Rodriguez, 2024). Nevertheless, structural challenges often require even high-quality teachers to rely on direct instruction, suggesting that while teacher quality enhances instructional adaptability, the realization of effective practice depends heavily on institutional support and working conditions (UNESCO, 2024).

Across diverse national contexts, teacher quality and instructional practices are deeply interrelated, with teacher quality providing the professional capacity required for effective instruction while instructional practices serve as the primary mechanism through which teacher quality influences student learning. The comparative synthesis across the United States, Finland, Singapore, Australia, and the Philippines demonstrates that education systems which align teacher preparation, professional development, instructional autonomy, and institutional support exhibit the strongest and most sustainable relationship between teacher quality and classroom practice, whereas systems that rely predominantly on external accountability mechanisms tend to achieve technical proficiency at the expense of pedagogical innovation, and systems constrained by limited resources demonstrate that teacher quality alone cannot compensate for structural and material deficits. These findings directly address the study's objective of understanding how teacher quality, competencies, instructional approaches, and professional development shape classroom practices and student learning outcomes across differing educational systems, and they contribute to the field by consolidating cross national evidence into a coherent comparative framework that distinguishes accountability oriented, trust based, developmental, and standards-based conceptions of teacher quality. The discussion further underscores that reforms aimed at improving teacher quality must be designed as instructionally coherent system reforms that integrate preparation, professional learning, supportive working conditions, and professional trust, rather than as isolated policy interventions. These conclusions provide the conceptual and empirical foundation for the subsequent chapter, which builds on this comparative understanding to propose recommendations and implications for strengthening teacher quality and instructional practice within specific educational contexts.

CONCLUSION

This comparative study shows that teacher quality is a key factor in effective teaching across national education systems, although how it is defined and applied depends on cultural, institutional, and policy contexts. The results show that countries viewing teacher quality as a multi-dimensional, professional trait—including strong credentials, ongoing professional development, pedagogical skills, and teamwork—are more likely to achieve effective and adaptable classroom practices.

The analysis reveals that teacher quality cannot be reduced to formal qualifications alone. While qualifications establish baseline competence, their impact on instructional practice depends heavily on the coherence of professional development systems, the degree of instructional autonomy afforded to teachers, and the availability of institutional support. High-performing systems demonstrate that sustained, research-based preparation combined with continuous professional learning fosters instructional practices characterized by adaptability, cognitive rigor, and responsiveness to learner diversity.

Cross-national comparison further indicates that system design mediates the effectiveness of teacher quality and classroom instructional practices. Accountability-oriented systems tend to translate teacher quality into structured, standards-aligned instruction that

prioritizes measurable outcomes, whereas professional trust-based systems encourage inquiry-driven, learner-centered practices grounded in professional judgment. Developmental professionalism models illustrate that when teacher quality is cultivated progressively across career stages, instructional practices evolve to include mentoring, leadership, and innovation.

In resource-constrained contexts, the findings underscore that even high-quality teachers face limitations in fully enacting effective instructional practices without adequate systemic conditions. Factors such as class size, workload, resource availability, and access to sustained professional development significantly influence how teacher quality is expressed in classroom practice. This highlights the importance of viewing teacher quality not solely as an individual attribute but as a system-embedded outcome.

Overall, the evidence supports the conclusion that improving teacher quality requires coherent, instructionally focused reforms that integrate preparation, professional development, instructional autonomy, and supportive working conditions. Education policies that align these elements are more likely to translate teacher quality into consistently effective instructional practices and equitable learning opportunities. Consequently, efforts to enhance educational outcomes should prioritize strengthening the professional capacity of teachers within supportive and context-responsive systems rather than relying on isolated or purely evaluative approaches.

REFERENCES

- Fang, G., Teo, T., & Chan, P. W. K. (2025). Instructional quality measurement across countries. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12, 520.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.
- Donohoo, J., Hattie, J., & Eells, R. (2020). The power of collective efficacy. *Educational Leadership*, 77(10), 40–44.
- Hattie, J. (2016). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge.
- OECD. (2018). *Teaching and learning international survey (TALIS) 2018 results (Volume I): Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners*. OECD Publishing.
- OECD. (2019). *Education at a glance 2019: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing.
- OECD. (2020). *Unlocking high-quality teaching*. OECD Publishing.
- OECD. (2024). *Teaching and learning international survey (TALIS) 2024 results*. OECD Publishing.
- Schleicher, A. (2020). *World class: How to build a 21st-century school system*. OECD Publishing.
- Donohoo, J., Hattie, J., & Eells, R. (2020). The power of collective efficacy. *Educational Leadership*, 77(10), 40–44.

- Hattie, J. (2016). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge.
- Schleicher, A. (2020). *World class: How to build a 21st-century school system*. OECD Publishing.
- UNESCO. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. UNESCO.
- Bradford, K., Pendergast, D., & Grootenboer, P. (2021). What is meant by “teacher quality” in research and policy: A systematic, quantitative literature review. *Education Thinking*, 1(1), 57–76.
- Clinton, J. M., Anderson, M., Dawson, G., Dawson, A., Bolton, S., & Mason, R. (2017). *Teacher effectiveness systems, frameworks and measures: A review*. Australian Government Department of Education.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Burns, D., Campbell, C., Goodwin, A. L., Hammerness, K., Low, E. L., McIntyre, A., Sato, M., & Zeichner, K. (2017). *Empowered educators: How high-performing systems shape teaching quality around the world*. Jossey-Bass.
- Goldhaber, D. (2016). In schools, teacher quality matters most. *Education Next*, 16(2), 56–62.
- Nilsen, T., & Gustafsson, J.-E. (Eds.). (2016). *Teacher quality, instructional quality and student outcomes*. Springer.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2025). Unlocking high-quality teaching. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/f5b82176-en>

Singh, P., Hoyte, F., Heimans, S., & Exley, B. (2021). Teacher quality and teacher education: A critical policy analysis of international and Australian policies. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 46(4).

UNESCO. (2024). Global report on teachers: Addressing teacher shortages and transforming the profession. UNESCO.

Zhang, H., Lyu, X., & Qiu, Y. (2024). Effective teacher professional development and its influencing factors: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Teacher Education*.

Darling-Hammond, L., Burns, D., Campbell, C., Goodwin, A. L., Hammerness, K., Low, E. L., McIntyre, A., Sato, M., & Zeichner, K. (2017). *Empowered educators: How high-performing systems shape teaching quality around the world*. Jossey-Bass.

Goldhaber, D. (2016). In schools, teacher quality matters most. *Education Next*, 16(2), 56–62.

Nilsen, T., & Gustafsson, J.-E. (Eds.). (2016). *Teacher quality, instructional quality and student outcomes*. Springer.

OECD. (2025). *Unlocking high-quality teaching*. OECD Publishing.

Popova, A., Evans, D. K., Breeding, M. E., & Arancibia, V. (2022). Teacher professional development around the world. *World Bank Research Observer*, 37(1), 107–136.

Singh, P., Hoyte, F., Heimans, S., & Exley, B. (2021). Teacher quality and teacher education: A critical policy analysis. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 46(4).

Zhang, H., Lyu, X., & Qiu, Y. (2024). Effective teacher professional development: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Teacher Education*.

Rodriguez, K. F. R. (2024). An exploration of the quality of graduates of Philippine teacher education institutions. *Frontiers in Education*, 9.

Zhang, H., Lyu, X., & Qiu, Y. (2024). Effective teacher professional development and its influencing factors: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Teacher Education*.

Gepila, E. C., Jr. (2020). Assessing teachers using Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(3), 923–931.