



TEACHERS' DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS TOWARDS EFFICIENT DELIVERY OF INSTRUCTIONS

RICHARD A. PUEBLO

Cotabato Foundation College of Science and technology (CFCST)

ABSTRACT

This study explored the influence of teachers' disciplinary actions on the efficient delivery of instructions using descriptive correlational design. The study involved 261 respondents of secondary high schools of 3rd Congressional District of Cotabato Province specifically Matalam High School, Mlang National High School and Tulunan National High School. The results revealed that teachers' most common disciplinary actions were recommending students for counseling and contacting parents. Preventative discipline was often implemented, followed by supportive discipline, while corrective discipline was least implemented. Teachers were found to be highly efficient in delivering instructions in terms of purpose, student engagement, curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, and classroom environment and culture.

The study found significant correlations between teachers' disciplinary actions and some variables involving the delivery of instructions. The findings suggest that teachers' disciplinary actions play a crucial role in the efficient delivery of instructions. The study also found that preventative discipline significantly influenced the delivery of instruction except in terms of pedagogy and classroom environment and culture. Supportive discipline influenced the delivery of instructions except in relation to curriculum and assessment. However, corrective discipline had no significant influence on the delivery of instruction. The study's findings have implications for teachers, administrators, and policymakers in promoting effective teaching and learning practices.

INTRODUCTION

Discipline and deliver of instruction are two different elements. But both are necessary in realizing the learning process. The researcher seeks to see the complementarity of discipline and levels of delivery of instructions to ensure efficacy and efficiency. The results will suggest reconstruction and adjustment on curriculum target, mode of delivery, and discipline guidelines to ensure quality and equal chances of learning for students.

Learners' discipline is essential for effective teaching and learning. It can enhance students' engagement, facilitate positive learning, prevent disruptive problems, and provide overall academic success (Semali & Vumilia, 2016). Without discipline, schools will not provide the best possible education. Good disciplinary measures and procedures must be any school (Simuforosa & Rosemary, 2014; Sailor, 2010; Thornberg, 2008; Onyechi, Okere, & Trivellor, 2007).

Today, the issue on school discipline seems to be unresolved it continues to creep in Philippine educational system where many teachers had been reported due to their initiatives to push on students' discipline. Undeniably, there is a great emphasis on learner's rights as a safeguard to abuse. The school will only have to supplement whatever is learned at home. It will enhance values to make them better citizens (Perez, 2023).

Nowadays, school discipline are becoming worst, due to factors such as environment, mass media, family among others (Perez, 2014).

Due to DepEd Order No. 40, s. 2012., known as "The Child Protection Policy", Quinto and Santos (2021) postulated that students misbehaving in the classroom were one of the main issues in schools. Students are difficult to manage. Teachers refrained from enforcing discipline.

Millapre (2014) cited in Catipo (2023) revealed that one of the most difficult issues facing the Philippine educational system right now is the combination of unruly student behavior and disciplinary actions taken by teachers.

Furthermore, few studies (Stanley, 2014; Simuforosa & Rosemary, 2014) have explored the relationship between learners' discipline and how well the child is doing in school. Due to lack of specificity and consensus in the current literature, unconfirmed assumptions about the benefits of learners' discipline are widespread—hence, the need to examine these assumptions in the present studies (Semali & Vumilia, 2016). The aforementioned reasons encouraged the researcher to conduct the study due to its urgency. The proposed intervention plan will lead to exploring opportunities on teachers' disciplinary actions towards efficient delivery of instructions and clear policy on disciplining the students.

Research Questions

This study aims to explore the influence of teachers' disciplinary actions towards efficient delivery of instructions.

It specifically intends to answer the following questions:

1. What are the various forms of teachers' disciplinary actions?
2. What is the level of teachers' disciplinary actions based on the following dimensions: preventative; supportive; and corrective?
3. What is the level of teachers' efficiency in the delivery of instructions in terms of the following: purpose; student engagement; curriculum and

- pedagogy: assessment; and classroom environment and culture?
4. Is there a significant relationship between teachers' disciplinary actions and delivery of instructions?
 5. What is the influence of teachers' disciplinary actions towards efficient delivery of instructions?

METHODOLOGY

This chapter covers presentation of the research design, locale of the study, respondents of the study, sampling procedure, research instrument, data gathering procedure and statistical tools utilized in this study.

Research Design

The researcher specifically used descriptive-correlational approach to describe the correlation between teachers' disciplinary action and the efficiency of the delivery of instruction. Descriptive-correlational research design attempted to describe the variables and measures the extent of the relationships that occur between and among the variables (Aprecia, Barrera, Cuares, Cuison, Lazaro, Pat-I & Sayson, 2022).

Survey questionnaire was administered to 261 teachers of Secondary Public Schools in the 3rd Congressional District of North Cotabato. This phase generated numerical data or information that was translated and converted into numbers. It had focus more in counting and classifying features and constructing statistical models and figures to explain what was observed (Quantitative & Qualitative Research, 2018). After retrieving the questionnaire, the data was analyzed using statistical tools.

Research Participants

The respondents in this study were the teachers from the big secondary public school ranging school teachers from 100 and above of three (3) municipalities; Matalam, Mlang, and Tulunan of the 3rd Congressional District of Cotabato. There were 261 teachers as number of identified respondents as determined and distributed fairly and accurately through the use of Raosoft online calculator a sample size calculator used in survey research to determine the number of respondents needed to achieve a desired level of accuracy to represent the population size.

Big Secondary Public Schools	Teachers Population	Respondents	Percentage
Municipality of Matalam Matalam High School (Poblacion)	140	86	33%
Municipality of Mlang Mlang National High School	166	102	39%
Municipality of Tulunan Tulunan National High School	123	73	28%
Total	429	261	100%

Research Instrument

In this study, a three-part Checklist which adapted, modified, and patterned from various reputable sources was used with the following parts:

Part I is for the forms of teachers' disciplinary action wherein the respondents checked the forms of discipline they had applied in disciplining their students (patterned from Behavior Checklist, Your Therapy Source, 2022).

Part II, which were the types of discipline such as preventative, supportive, and corrective (adapted and modified from Nyonesa et. al., 2016).

Part III Comprised of variable on the efficiency in the delivery of instruction. It had five variables such as purpose, student engagement, curriculum and pedagogy, assessment and classroom environment and culture (adapted from the study of Isaeva et. al., 2024).

The validation was ensured through pilot-testing at 5% Chronbach alpha. The purpose of pilot-testing was to delete irrelevant and double barrel items to ensure validity of the results.

Data Analysis

The statistical tools such as frequency method, percentage mean, weighted mean and Pearson r and regression were used. **Frequency method and percentage** were used to determine the forms of teachers' disciplinary action. **Frequency and mean** were solved to determine dimensions of discipline such as preventative, supportive and corrective that the teachers implemented. As well as to determine the level of teachers' efficiency in terms of purpose, student engagement, curriculum and pedagogy, assessment and classroom environment and culture. **Pearson r and regression** were used to determine the significant relationship between the level of teachers' disciplinary action and the delivery of instructions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter provides the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of the results of the study. The corresponding discussion is presented according to the order of the problem posed at the beginning of the study.

Form of Teachers' Disciplinary Actions

The first research problem focused on determining the forms of teachers' disciplinary actions with 68.2% as the highest and .4% as the lowest. This 68.2 (178 responses) signifies that mostly of the teachers prefer to recommend the students for counselling sessions and 31.4% (82 responses) of the teachers contact the parents through letter, mobile number and messenger. Only .4% (1 teacher) send student to go home for a week or even a month.

The results imply that teachers do not directly apply disciplinary actions in accordance to their will as to their actions they prefer the guidance counselors/advocates and parents to meddle in this concern. On the other hand, sending students home for a week or even a month is not a commonly used approach.

The results gained support from the study of Khamala, Amunga, and Ashioya (2025), reveals that guidance and counseling in public secondary schools positively influenced students' discipline.

Moreover, parental involvement is necessary in the implementation of students' discipline conducted by Lekganyane (2011).

Table 1 Forms of Teachers Disciplinary Actions

Statements	Frequency	Percentage
1. Recommend the students for counselling sessions	178	68.2%
2. Send student to go home for a week or even a month	1	.4%
3. Contact the parents through letter, mobile number and messenger	82	31.4%
Total	261	100%

Levels of Teacher's Disciplinary Actions

The second research problem focused on the level of teachers' disciplinary actions based on the following dimensions in terms of preventative, supportive and corrective.

Preventative Discipline

Table 2.1 shows the teachers implementation of disciplinary actions in terms of preventative discipline with the weighted mean of 3.93 indicates that teachers generally implement preventative discipline measures, fall within the "Implemented" category (81-90% level). This suggests that teachers have a good foundation in preventive measures, creating a conducive learning environment. This indicates that teachers prioritize building positive relationships, promoting good behavior, and ensuring students are well-guided in their academic and personal lives. Teachers are proactive in promoting good behavior and academic engagement.

The findings preventative aspect of discipline involves establishment of expectations, guidelines and rules for behavior change during the first schooling days of a pupil. The ultimate goal of preventive disciplining style is to provide proactive interventions to potential disruptive behaviors by clearly explaining to students what good behaviors are (Nyongesa et. al., 2016). In addition, preventative approaches used to prevent undesirable behaviors and promote positive behavioral choices in the classroom. Many teachers are not proactive or prevention oriented, which logically results in an increase in behavior problems in their classrooms (The University of Kansas, 2025).

Supportive Discipline

Table 2.2 shows the teachers' implementation of disciplinary action in terms of supportive discipline. The results suggest that teachers generally implement supportive discipline strategies, with a total mean score of 3.71, this means that teachers are often implemented supportive discipline at 81%-90%. Ensuring students' attendance and praising improved behavior are highly implemented practices. These findings can inform teacher training and professional development programs to enhance supportive discipline practices.

The results were supported that praise and affirmation rewards for good behavior and working together with students to set classroom rules and penalties are all examples of positive disciplinary techniques (Escobal et. al., 2023). Additionally, supportive discipline provides a student with suggestions and options for correcting behavior before a consequence is necessary such as verbal warning, suggestions for correcting behavior, reminders, redirection and nonverbal communication (Nyongesa et. al., 2016).

Corrective Discipline

Table 2.3 reveals the teachers' implementation of disciplinary actions in terms of corrective discipline with the weighted mean 1.80 and described as least implemented. This indicates that teachers rarely implemented corrective discipline at 60% and below. The results indicate that teachers generally do not implement corrective discipline. The only item that falls under "Implemented" is being prompt when dealing with indiscipline cases. All other items, including punitive measures like caning, suspension, and denial of privileges, are either less implemented or least implemented. This suggests that teachers may be moving away from punitive approaches to discipline and towards preventative and supportive approaches. The low implementation of punitive measures may be due to various factors, including changes in educational policies, teacher training, or societal attitudes towards discipline. These findings have implications for teacher training and school policies on discipline.

In support with the results, punishment is used as a tool to inculcate discipline either be positive or negative. Physical or corporal punishment includes caning, physical labor. As part of enforcing the conventions on children's rights, several countries have abolished corporal punishment in schools,

although controversial is still common in some schools (Bodo, 2020). In corrective discipline school rules require students to face for noncompliance which defines consequences for *misbehavior*. School authorities administer either serious verbal reprimands or additional homework or *situational-specific disciplinary measures*. Teachers strive to show students the cost of their decisions while implementing methods which lead them toward better conduct (Sharma, 2025).

Table 2 – Levels of Teachers’ Disciplinary Actions based on the following dimensions

Disciplinary Actions	Weighted Mean	Description
2.1. Preventative Discipline	3.93	Implemented
2.2. Supportive Discipline	3.71	Implemented
2.3. Corrective Discipline	1.80	Least Implemented

Level	Mean	Description	Percentage
5	4.21 – 5.00	Highly Implemented	91%-100%
4	3.41 – 4.20	Implemented	81%-90%
3	2.61 – 3.40	Moderately Implemented	71%-80%
2	1.81 – 2.60	Less Implemented	61%-70%
1	1.00 – 1.80	Least Implemented	60% and below

Level of Teachers’ Efficiency in the Delivery of Instructions

The entire variables address by the third research question were with weighted mean within the bracket of 4.21-5.00 which described as highly implemented. The numerical values proved that teachers manifest expertise and efficiency in delivering instructions. This implied that 91%-100% of the teachers were equipped with content, methods, strategies, and skills to deliver learnings in terms of purpose, student engagement, curriculum and pedagogy, assessment, and classroom environment and culture.

In support with findings, effective delivery of content knowledge by providing students with a meaningful and relevant lesson helps students to conceptualize new topics (Marcum, 2016). Teacher involvement in the process of curriculum development is important to align content of curriculum with students needs in the classroom (Alsubaie, 2016). The instructors need to put into practice their experiences in facilitating student learning and leading to enrichment of the overall system of education (Persaud, 2019). The ability to construct effective test items is of utmost importance in evaluating student learning and shaping instructional strategies (Mpuangnan, 2024).

Table 3 - Level of Teacher’s Efficiency in the Delivery of Instruction based on the following dimensions

Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Description
3.1. Purpose	4.52	Highly Efficient
3.2. Student Engagement	4.47	Highly Efficient
3.3.1. Curriculum	4.53	Highly Efficient
3.3.2. Pedagogy	4.39	Highly Efficient
3.4. Assessment	4.55	Highly Efficient
3.5. Classroom Environment & Culture	4.49	Highly Efficient

Level	Mean	Description	Percentage
5	4.21 – 5.00	Highly Efficient	91%-100%
4	3.41 – 4.20	Efficient	81%-90%
3	2.61 – 3.40	Slightly Efficient	71%-80%
2	1.81 – 2.60	Fairly Efficient	61%-70%
1	1.00 – 1.80	Poorly Efficient	60% and below

Correlation between Teachers’ Disciplinary Actions and Delivery of Instructions

Table 4 presents the correlation matrix showing the relationship of the teachers’ disciplinary actions and efficiency of the delivery of Instructions. It reveals the relationship between teachers’ disciplinary actions (preventative, supportive, and corrective discipline) and the efficiency of delivery of instructions in various aspects (purpose, student engagement, curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, and classroom environment and culture). In preventative discipline it shows highly significant positive correlations with purpose ($r = 0.327, p < 0.01$), student engagement ($r = 0.252, p < 0.01$), and pedagogy ($r = 0.169, p < 0.01$). There is a significant positive correlation with curriculum ($r = 0.145, p < 0.05$) and assessment ($r = 0.146, p < 0.05$). There is no significant with classroom environment & culture ($r = 0.097, p = 0.117$). In supportive discipline, it shows there is highly significant positive correlations with purpose ($r = 0.442, p < 0.01$), student engagement ($r = 0.292, p < 0.01$), and curriculum ($r = 0.206, p < 0.01$). Moreover, there is significant positive

correlation with classroom environment & culture ($r = 0.126$, $p < 0.05$). There is no significant correlations with pedagogy ($r = 0.093$, $p = 0.136$) and assessment ($r = 0.051$, $p = 0.414$). In corrective discipline shows that there is significant positive correlation with curriculum ($r = 0.130$, $p < 0.05$). There is no significant correlations with purpose ($r = 0.095$, $p = 0.125$), student engagement ($r = 0.067$, $p = 0.284$), pedagogy ($r = -0.030$, $p = 0.632$), assessment ($r = 0.061$, $p = 0.324$), and classroom environment & culture ($r = 0.037$, $p = 0.547$). This implies that preventative and supportive discipline are positively correlated with various aspects of efficient delivery of instructions. Preventative discipline is strongly related to purpose and student engagement, while supportive discipline is strongly related to purpose, student engagement, and curriculum. Corrective discipline has a relatively weaker relationship with efficient delivery of instructions, with only a significant correlation with curriculum. The results imply that teachers' disciplinary actions play a crucial role in shaping the effectiveness of instructional delivery. This implies the necessity for teachers' training and professional development programs, highlighting the importance of preventative and supportive discipline in promoting efficient instructional delivery.

In support with the findings, classroom management requires an orchestration of effective, proactive preventive, practical corrective, and positive supportive techniques. This approach helps teachers motivate students. When these components are integrated, effective teaching, management, and discipline complement each other to facilitate learning. Distracting misbehaviors interrupt the lesson, stop the momentum, and get the focus away from important matters and annoy the teachers at the same time (Kyle and Rogien, 2004). However, corporal punishment is used to correct behavior. But widely rejected in the school setting even considered illegal in 15 countries worldwide. Teachers were seen as substitute parents, and were given liberties as such, punishments of children's bad behavior most frequently took the form of smacks with a paddle or cane (Ryan and Kallio, 2021).

Table 4. Correlation Matrix showing the Relationship of the Teachers' Disciplinary Actions and Efficiency of the Delivery of Instructions

TEACHERS' DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS	EFFICIENT DELIVERY OF INSTRUCTION					
	Purpose	Student Engagement	Curriculum	Pedagogy	Assessment	Classroom Environment and Culture
Preventative Discipline	.327**	.252**	.145*	.169**	.146*	.097
	.000	.000	.019	.006	.019	.117
Supportive Discipline	.442**	.292**	.206**	.093	.051	.126*
	.000	.000	.001	.136	.414	.042
Corrective Discipline	.095	.067	.130*	-.030	.061	.037
	.125	.284	.036	.632	.324	.547

** Highly Significant

*Significant at 5%

Influence Between Teachers' Disciplinary Actions and Efficiency of the Delivery of Instructions

The regression analysis reveals the influence of teachers' disciplinary actions (preventative, supportive, and corrective discipline) on the efficiency of delivery of instructions in various aspects (purpose, student engagement, curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, and classroom environment & culture). In preventative discipline, it posits no significant relationship between teachers' disciplinary actions and student outcomes. Therefore, H_0 is rejected. The highly significant F-values for purpose ($F = 26.518$, $p < 0.01$) and student engagement ($F = 20.327$, $p < 0.01$) suggest a strong relationship, indicating that these disciplinary actions have a substantial impact on student outcomes. Similarly, assessment ($F = 4.226$, $p < 0.01$) also shows a significant relationship. In contrast, while curriculum ($F = 8.903$), pedagogy ($F = 3.578$, $p < 0.05$), and classroom environment and culture ($F = 3.804$, $p < 0.05$) also demonstrate significant relationships, their relatively lower F-values suggest a smaller impact compared to purpose and student engagement. Given these results, therefore H_0 is rejected indicating that teachers' disciplinary actions are indeed significant predictors of student outcomes, with purpose and student engagement being the strongest predictors. This highlights the importance of effective disciplinary strategies in educational settings, particularly those that promote purpose and engagement.

In supportive discipline, it reveals the impact on various aspects of teaching reveals mixed results. For Purpose, Supportive Discipline shows a significant positive relationship ($\beta = .132$, $t = 5.412$, $p < .01$), indicating that supportive disciplinary actions strongly predict a sense of purpose among students. Therefore, H_0 is rejected. Similarly, for student engagement, it shown that there is significant relationship ($\beta = .112$, $t = 3.496$, $p < .01$). Therefore, H_0 is rejected. However, for Curriculum, the relationship is weaker ($\beta = .050$, $t = 1.848$, $p = .066$). Therefore, H_0 is rejected. For pedagogy and classroom environment and culture, it does not demonstrate significant predictive power ($p = .518$ and $p = .745$, respectively) as well as or assessment, the relationship is also not significant ($p = .104$). Therefore, H_0 is accepted, due to the lack of significant relationships.

Moreover, in corrective discipline various teaching aspects reveals no significant relationships. For all variables—Purpose ($\beta = -.010$, $t = -.267$, $p = .789$), Student Engagement ($\beta = -.002$, $t = -.045$, $p = .964$), Curriculum ($\beta = .069$, $t = 1.626$, $p = .105$), Pedagogy ($\beta = .069$, $t = .435$, $p = .664$), Assessment ($\beta = .069$, $t = 1.249$, $p = .213$), and Classroom Environment & Culture ($\beta = .019$, $t = .438$, $p = .662$)—the p-values are above conventional significance levels. Given these results, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected for any of the variables, indicating that corrective Discipline does not significantly predict or relate to these teaching aspects. This suggests that the use of corrective disciplinary actions may not have a substantial impact on promoting purpose, engagement, curriculum implementation, pedagogy, assessment, or classroom environment & culture. The lack of significance across all variables implies that other factors might be more influential in shaping these outcomes. This finding could have implications for how disciplinary actions are approached in educational settings.

In support with the findings, school discipline used to correct the misbehavior of the learners through the rules and strategies employed by schools to manage student behaviors and support their developmental needs. The quality of the teacher-student relationship is of primary concern. Effective teachers strive to develop a positive relationship with every student in their classrooms and seek to promote positive relationships and a sense of community

among the students themselves (Friaes et. al., 2023). It is said that when positive discipline policies and practices use a race-equity lens and are fairly implemented, these efforts can not only create safe and inclusive learning environments but also support students' holistic development (Wriston & Duchesneau, 2023).

Table 5. Matrix showing the Influence of the Teachers' Disciplinary Actions towards Efficiency of the Delivery of Instructions

Teachers' Disciplinary Actions	Purpose				Student Engagement				Curriculum				Pedagogy				Assessment				Classroom Environment & Culture			
	Coef. B	Std. Error	t-value	P-value	Coef. B	Std. Error	t-value	P-value	Coef. B	Std. Error	t-value	P-value	Coef. B	Std. Error	t-value	P-value	Coef. B	Std. Error	t-value	P-value	Coef. B	Std. Error	t-value	P-value
Preventative Discipline	0.129	0.033	3.924**	0	0.206	0.043	4.788**	0	0.105	0.036	2.882**	0.004	0.131	0.043	2.579**	0.01	0.131	0.047	2.773**	0.006	0.064	0.036	1.768	0.078
Supportive Discipline	0.132	0.024	5.412**	0	0.112	0.032	3.496**	0.001	0.05	0.027	1.848	0.066	0.011	0.032	0.648	0.518	0.011	0.035	0.325	0.745	0.044	0.027	1.633	0.104
Corrective Discipline	-0.01	0.038	-0.267	0.789	-0.002	0.05	-0.045	0.964	0.069	0.042	1.626	0.105	0.069	0.05	0.435	0.664	0.069	0.055	1.249	0.213	0.019	0.042	0.438	0.662
	F = 26.518**				F = 20.327**				F = 8.903				F = 3.578*				F = 4.226**				F = 3.804*			
	R ² = 0.236				R ² = 0.192				R ² = 0.094				R ² = 0.040				R ² = 0.047				R ² = 0.043			

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This chapter deals with the summary, conclusion and recommendation in accordance to the results and discussion from data and information gathered.

Summary

As to the findings of the study, results revealed that teachers' disciplinary actions primarily take in three forms. The most common approach is recommending students for counseling sessions, which accounts for 68.2% of responses, highlighting the role of counseling in addressing student behavior. Another significant approach is contacting parents through letters, mobile numbers and messengers, making up 31.4% of responses. In contrast, sending students home for a week or even a month is a rarely used method, accounting for only 0.4% of responses. In addition, teachers' disciplinary actions are categorized into three dimensions such as preventative, supportive and corrective. In preventative discipline, teachers generally implemented measures with a weighted mean of 3.93, prioritizing positive relationships, promoting good behavior, and creating a conducive learning environment. For supportive discipline, teachers implement strategies with a total mean score of 3.71, highly implemented the practices like ensuring attendance and praising improved behavior. In contrast, corrective discipline is rarely implemented, with a weighted mean of 1.80, and punitive measures like caning, suspension, and denial of privileges being least implemented. It clearly shows that teachers prioritize proactive and supportive measures over punitive ones, indicating a shift towards creating a positive and guiding learning environment.

In consonance with the teachers' disciplinary actions, it is necessary to determine the level of teachers' efficiency in the delivery of instructions in terms of purpose, students' engagement, curriculum and pedagogy, assessment and classroom environment and culture. The results shown that teachers possessed efficiency in the delivery of instruction in relation to purpose obtained the weighted mean 4.52 and described as highly efficient, students' engagement with 4.47 weighted mean and described as highly efficient, curriculum with 4.53 weighted mean and described as highly efficient, pedagogy with 4.39 weighted mean and described as highly efficient, assessment with 4.55 weighted mean and described as highly efficient garnered the highest mean, classroom environment and culture with 4.49 weighted mean and described as highly efficient. The results indicate that the variables are statistically tied. It signifies that, teachers have the expertise.

Moreover, teachers' disciplinary actions had shown correlation with some of the variables involving the delivery of instructions. The results shown that preventative discipline has significant relationship between the delivery of instruction in terms of purpose, student engagement curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. It has no significant relationship between the delivery of instruction in terms of classroom environment and culture. Meanwhile, supportive discipline has significant relationship between the delivery of instruction in terms purpose, students' engagement, curriculum and classroom environment and culture. There is no significant relationship between the delivery of instruction in term of pedagogy and assessment. Moreover, corrective discipline has significant relationship between the delivery of instruction in terms of curriculum. It has no significant relationship with the delivery of instruction in terms of purpose, student engagement, pedagogy, assessment and classroom environment and culture.

Furthermore, teachers' disciplinary actions influenced the delivery of instruction in terms of purpose, student engagement, curriculum, pedagogy, assessment and classroom environment and culture. Preventative discipline influenced the purpose (t-value=3.924; p-value=0.000 ≤ 0.001), student engagement (t-value=4.788; p-value=0.000 ≤ 0.001), curriculum (t-value=2.882; p-value=0.004 ≤ 0.010) and assessment (t-value=2.773; p-value=0.006 ≤ 0.050). Meanwhile, pedagogy (t-value=2.579; p-value=0.010 ≤ 0.050) and classroom environment and culture (t-value=1.768; p-value=0.078 ≤ 0.050) had no influenced the disciplinary action. Supportive discipline shown influenced of the delivery of instruction in relation to purpose (t-value=5.412; p-value=0.000 ≤ 0.001), student engagement (t-value=3.496; p-value=0.001 = 0.001) and classroom environment and culture (t-value=1.633; p-value=0.004 ≤ 0.005). While, curriculum (t-value=1.848; p-value=0.066 ≤ 0.001 or 0.05) implies marginal significance but the relationship is not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. In addition, pedagogy (t-value=.648; p-value=.518 ≤ 0.005) and assessment (t-value=3.25; p-value=.745 ≤ 0.005) shown had no influenced with the delivery of instruction. Also, corrective discipline evidently had no influenced with purpose (t-value=.267; p-

value=0.789 \leq 0.000), student engagement (t-value=-.045; p-value=.964 \leq 0.000), curriculum (t-value=1.626; p-value=.105, is greater than the significance level (0.005), which indicates that the result is not statistically significant, pedagogy (t-value=.435; p-value=.664 \leq 0.005), assessment (t-value=1.249; p-value=.213 \leq 0.005) and classroom environment and culture (t-value=.438; p-value=.662 \leq 0.005).

Conclusion

The results of this study made the researcher find an accurate and valid support to the following notions:

In light of these findings, it is evident that teachers' disciplinary actions play a crucial role in promoting efficient instruction delivery and improving student outcomes. The study reveals that teachers prioritize supportive and collaborative approaches, such as counseling sessions and parental involvement, over punitive measures. Preventative and supportive discipline strategies are implemented to foster positive relationships, promote good behavior, and encourage attendance, while corrective discipline is rarely used. Based on the hypothesis testing results, the H_0 is rejected for preventative discipline in relation to purpose, student engagement, curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment, indicating significant correlations. However, the H_0 is accept, for classroom environment and culture, indicating no significant correlation. For supportive discipline, the H_0 is rejected for purpose, student engagement, curriculum, and classroom environment and culture, indicating significant correlations, while accepting, the H_0 for pedagogy and assessment due to lack of significant correlations. For corrective discipline, the H_0 is rejected only for curriculum, indicating a significant correlation, while accepting H_0 for purpose, student engagement, pedagogy, assessment, and classroom environment and culture due to lack of significant correlations. These findings highlight the importance of teachers' disciplinary actions in promoting efficient instruction delivery and improving student outcomes. In regression analysis, teachers' disciplinary actions significantly influenced the efficiency of instruction delivery, but the nature of this influenced varies across different types of discipline. Preventative discipline strongly predicts student outcomes, particularly purpose and student engagement, while supportive discipline shows mixed results, significantly predicting purpose and student engagement but not, other aspects. In contrast, corrective discipline does not significantly predict or relate to any teaching aspects.

Recommendation

Based on the results and conclusion, researcher made the following recommendations:

1. Regular training should be provided for teachers to understand the characteristics and needs of the current generation of students, enabling them to implement effective approaches. Preventative measures like counselling and parental contact must be given an emphasis, discouraged corrective discipline, and create a supportive classroom environment to promote efficient instruction delivery.
2. Counseling is a time-consuming endeavor. Department of Education (DepEd) key officials should take this challenge into consideration. The researcher recommends that they conduct a thorough examination of teachers' workloads and routines, rather than emphasizing paperwork. Students require attention and support, but this need is often overlooked due to the pressure to complete paperwork promptly.
3. The researcher proposes to establish a clear school rules and regulations, as well as classroom policies, that are contextual and relevant to the current situation with rigorous approval process involving PTA, School heads, stakeholders, local government units (such as DSWD), and the Department of Education. Both teachers and students understand their roles, responsibilities, and boundaries.
4. To ensure the reliability of results, further research should be conducted on a larger scale to inform unified rules and regulations and review the existing DepEd Child Protection Policy. In the teaching and learning context, it's essential to balance students' care with respect for teachers' rights, as well as abide with the laws mandated in Philippines Constitution. It is really urgent to produce well-trained and well-discipline citizens of the country, and empowering students.
5. Develop and implement intervention plans to enhance teachers' disciplinary actions and instructional delivery with detailed documentation of actions throughout the year. Regular evaluation of the interventions will ensure reliable and valid results. Assessment will help identify areas for improvement and inform future adjustments. By monitoring progress, educators can refine their strategies to better support student success.

REFERENCES

1. Alsubaie, M. (2016). Curriculum Development: Teacher Involvement in Curriculum Development. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1095725.pdf>
2. Aprecia, N. A. B., Barrera, G. A., Cuares, K. R. A., Cuison, M. J. L., Lazaro, M. K. D., Pat-i, K. K. M. A., Sayson, Y. J. H. (2022). Descriptive Correlational Study on the Physical Environment and Perceived Academic Performance of STEM Online Learners. Notre Dame of Marbel University - Integrated Basic Education Department, Senior High School. https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/conf_shsrescon/2022/paper_cli/3/
3. Behavior Checklist for Students. (2022). Your Therapy Source. <https://www.yourtherapysource.com › blog1 › 2022/04/15>
4. Bodo, S. (2020). The education pendulum: the role of discipline in learner performance and quality of life. <https://www.adeanet.org/en/blogs/education-pendulum-role-discipline-learner-performance-quality-life>
5. Escobal, Arboleda, Jarina and Caluza, 2023. Philippine Public School Values Education Teachers' Experiences In Classroom Positive Discipline: A Phenomenological Inquiry. <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Las-Johansen-Caluz/publication>
6. Friaes, W., Nana, A., Alo, I., Tajo, W., and Pescuela, J. (2023). School Discipline: Its Impact as Perceived by the Basic Education Learners. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication>

7. Khamala, J.W., Amunga, J. and Ashioya, I. (2025) Influence of Guidance and Counseling on Students' Discipline in Public Secondary Schools in Bungoma South. *Open Access Library Journal*, 12, 1-18. doi: 10.4236/oalib.1112629.
8. Kyle, P., & Rogien, L. (2004). Classroom management: Corrective strategies. In A. Canter, L. Paige, M. Roth, I. Romero, & S. Carroll (Eds.), *Helping children at home and school II: Handouts for families and educators*. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists. ISBN: 0-932-955-82-7.
9. Lekganyane, S.A. (2011). *Managing Learner Misconduct in Ntoane Village Secondary Schools*. (University of South Africa). <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/43167556.pdf>
10. Millapre, M. (2014). Classroom Management Practices of Teachers. https://www.academia.edu/29381209/Classroom_Management_Practices_of_Teachers
11. Mpuangnan, K. & Roboji, Z. (2024). Transforming educational leadership in higher education with innovative administrative strategies. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies* 5 (2):27-56. <https://philarchive.org/rec/MPUTEL>
12. Nyongesa, D., Chong, H., and Yegon, B. (2016). Teachers' Disciplining Styles Influence on Pupils' Behaviour Modification in Primary Schools in Kimilili Sub-county, Kenya
13. Okeke, C.C. 2024. Teachers' learning thoughts on verbal discipline practices after professional conversations. Paper published for the South African International Conference on Education proceedings, 367-377. Available at https://aa-rf.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/saiced2020-proceedings_1.pdf [Accessed 13 August 2023].
14. Onyechi, K. C., Okere, A., & Trivellor, U. (2007). Deviant behavior as correlate of academic achievement among secondary school adolescents. Implication of service delivery in the education sector. Issues and strategies. London: B. G. Mworugy.
15. Perez, A. (2023). Discipline in Education. <https://www.philstar.com/the-freeman/opinion/2023/10/17/2304365/discipline-education>
16. Perez, P.P. (2014). School Discipline in Philippine Schools: The Problematic System <https://edupeter2000.wordpress.com/2014/05/29/school-discipline-in-philippine-schools-the-problematic-system>
17. Preventative Approaches.(2025) University of Kansas. https://specialconnections.ku.edu/behavior_plans/classroom_and_group_support/teacher_tools/preventative_approaches
18. Quantitative & Qualitative Research. (2018). International Journal of Research. <https://www.google.com/search?q=Quantitative+and++qualitative+research+2018>
19. Quinto, L. & Santos, E. (2021). Child protection practices and classroom discipline in elementary schools. *Globus Journal of Progressive Education* A Refereed Research Journal.
20. Raosoft Sample Size Calculator Inc. <http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize>.
21. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2016). Facilitating and hindering motivation, learning, and well-being in schools: Research and observations from self-determination theory. In *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 96–119). Routledge
22. Ryan, E. BA, & Kallio, K A. M.Ed. (2021). School Discipline. <https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/education/school-discipline>
23. Sailor, D. (2010). *Discipline and punishment*. New York: Ally Bacon Prentice Hall.
24. Sharma,J. (2025). Classroom Discipline: Strategies, Importance, and Effective Techniques. <https://www.21kschool.com/ae/blog/classroom-discipline>
25. Semali, L. M. & Vumilia, P.L. (2016). Challenges Facing Teachers' Attempts to Enhance Learners' Discipline in Tanzania's Secondary Schools. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1158247.pdf> <https://www.academia.edu/2017015>
26. Simuforosa, M., & Rosemary, N. (2014). Learner indiscipline ins schools. *Review of Arts and Humanities*, 3(2), 79-88
27. Stanley, E. (2014). Discipline and academic performance. *International Journal of Academic Research in progressive Education and Development*, 3(1), 81-194.
28. Thornberg, R. (2008). School children's reasoning about school rules. *Research papers in education*, 23(1), 37-52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02671520701651029>
29. Wriston, B., & Duchesneau, N. (2023). How School Discipline Impacts Students' Social, Emotional, and Academic Development (SEAD). Education Trust. <https://www.google.com/search?q=Wriston+%26+Duchesneau%2C+2023+students+development>