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Abstract

According to the recent findings in education reform in the Philippines, this has been characterized by increased standards and higher expectations for teacher performance. Today, teachers in general are being asked to improve their educational practices including methods, pedagogy, content knowledge, and research capability. The success or failure of the students’ performance is basically dependent on the kind of instruction students receive from their respective teachers (Punongbayan, 2015). The researcher utilized the descriptive correlational method of research. According to Nieswiadomy (2008), a correlational research design is used to describe the statistical association between two or more variables. The interest is examining the teachers’ research capability, emotional intelligence, and instructional supervision as determinants of teachers’ performance in Augustinian Higher Educational Institution. A validated semi-structured questionnaire was used as a primary data gathering tool. Documentary analysis was also used extensively in determining the factors influencing teachers’ performance of Augustinian HEI’s. The respondents of the study were the teachers and Heads of Augustinian Schools in the School Year 2018-2019. This study focused on identifying the determinants of teachers’ performance in Augustinian higher education institutions (HEI’s). Teachers’ performance were assessed in terms research productivity, emotional intelligence and instructional supervision. Results of the regression revealed that of the three provisions: research productivity, emotional intelligence and instructional supervision contribute a significant effects in the teachers performance.

Introduction:

According to the recent findings in education reform in the Philippines, this has been characterized by increased standards and higher expectations for teacher performance. Today, teachers in general are being asked to improve their educational practices including methods, pedagogy, content knowledge, and research capability. The success or failure of the students’ performance is basically dependent on the kind of instruction students receive from their respective teachers (Punongbayan, 2015). In the same manner teachers’ performance is also one of the factors that influence the performance of the learners in order to enhance students’ interest in the learning process.
School has a big role to play in order for students’ to become responsive to their task because in the 21st Century education demands higher preparation of learners in the basic education to be equipped with the necessary knowledge, skills, values and attitudes. School administrators, especially the deans, principals and curriculum developers are prompted to enhance the skills of the teachers that can affect the students’ performance. Anderson in his studies entitled, “Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings.” says, that successful leaders, have an indirect, yet powerful influences, on the quality of educational provision and the performance of students (Louis, 2010). There are factors that we need to consider that influence students’ and teachers’ performance. The issue on how emotional intelligence influenced students’ performance and dealing with their teachers and other people are important factors that we need to consider at present. Various social media sites are also factors that can affect their emotions as learners and individuals. In the succeeding years of implementation of the new curriculum, consideration of Emotional Intelligence as a discrete entity has been indicated that higher Emotional Intelligence ratings significantly predict positive life outcomes (Brackett, 2006) and that Emotional Intelligence competencies can be developed with the potential to improve future life outcomes (Nelis, 2009).

Supervision is complex, demanding, and continuous. As one goal is reached, a new goal is created. Effective supervisors use a problem-solving approach that encourages teachers to become self-reflective and choose their own paths with respects to professional development and ultimately, with improved teaching abilities. As the supervisory process is incorporated, both teachers and administrator emphasize a collaborative effort. While it is true that there is little agreement among scholars active in instructional supervision, it is generally accepted that supervision is essential for the improvement of instruction in a school. As Jonasson (as cited by Basa, 2005) suggests, “if we wish to promote student learning in schools, we must invest time, money and energies into the training and development of teachers by which teachers and principals work together for mutual professional development”. This can be done by instituting a supervision program which utilizes a process. Glickman (2005) points out that supervision can enhance teacher belief in a cause beyond oneself, promote teachers’ sense of efficacy, make teachers aware of how they complement each other in striving for common goals, and stimulate teachers to plan common purpose and actions, and challenge teachers to think abstractly about their work. Thus, supervision is the process by which some persons or group of people is responsible for providing a link between individual needs of each teacher and organizational goals so that individuals within the school can work in harmony toward their vision of what the school should be.

On the other hand, teachers’ research capability is also an intervening factor that has influenced over students’ performance. Research activities assist students in interpreting the research of others (Reis-Jorge, 2005), allow students to take ownership of their learning (Todd, 2004), and may lead to a deeper interest in, and understanding of, subject material (Turner, 2008). Research activities have also been shown to enhance undergraduate students’ motivation for postgraduate study (Lopatto, 2004). Finally, researchers have noted links between undergraduate research engagement and improvements in student self-efficacy (Zambo & Zambo, 2007). Notwithstanding these benefits, research engagement can cause students considerable anxiety. Common concerns include time limitations (Jantarakantee, 2012), difficulties in defining the research problem (Ersoy & Çengelci, 2008), and inadequate support from academic staff. Studies also point to the anxiety and negative expectations that many students experience when required to learn and perform statistical analysis, with many students believing that there is no way they can overcome their lack of mathematical ability (McGrath, 2014) and uncertainty about gathering and analyzing data (Shaw, 2008).

The author envisions that this research will promote an interesting study on factors influencing teachers’ performance in view of the 21st Century education. Furthermore, people in the academe has to upgrade their skills in teaching and learning process to compete and suit the needs of students 21st postmodern learners. A number of descriptions of classroom environments or quality teaching have been put forth in the educational and developmental literatures listing factors likely to be related to student learning. Hamre and Pianta (Hamre & Pianta, 2010) developed an assessment approach that organizes features of teacher-student interactions into three major domains: emotional supports, classroom organization, and instructional supports.

This study has a great role to contribute in the body of knowledge concerning teachers’ performance in order to comply the demands of standardization and excellence especially for Colleges and Universities seeking for an autonomous status.
**Theoretical/Conceptual Framework**

The study is anchored on the ‘theory of motivation’ which states that motivation is the process of arousing and maintaining goal directed behavior. Motivation is the key in the establishment and further development of quality in higher education. (Lertputtarak, 2008) The study further asserts that the teachers’ performance is influenced by teachers’ research capability, emotional intelligence of teachers and teachers’ instructional supervision.

Motivation theory can be classified in two main ways; content theories and process theories. Content theories mainly emphasize the basic human needs and drive that cause humans to perform or cease behaviors. Within the work environment, content theories focus on the needs, motives, or desires that cause faculty members to produce desired outcomes, as well as their relationships to the incentives or rewards that affect on personal performance. Meanwhile, process theories are concerned with how behavior originates and operate in the work environment in order to achieve desired outcomes. (Lertputtarak, 2008).

As a study that hopes to contribute in improving the research productivity of Augustinian Higher Education Institutions, this research anchors its conceptual model on the framework of the National Higher Research Agenda in Higher Education (NHERA, 2008-2015). NHERA shall serve as a guide for CHED to manage all related researches in higher education as well as serve as guidepost for the whole higher education community. It envisions that higher education shall have generated, discovered and extended knowledge useful to education, business, industry and others and shall have developed a research culture supportive of sustained development and globally economic growth of the country. Indeed, the vision of NHERA seeks to bring out improvement in instruction and extension work in the pursuit of knowledge useful for survival in the next century. (NHERA, 2011)

Figure 1 presents the conceptual model of the study that was utilized in identifying the determinants of teachers’ performance in Augustinian higher education institutions (HEI’s).

The research productivity was assessed in terms of scientific research, publications, citations, and patents.

The Emotional Intelligence was determined in terms of self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, social-awareness, and social skills.

The Instructional Supervision was assessed in terms of planning for preparation for instruction, teaching strategies, facilitating learning, classroom management, use of instructional materials, and assessment of learning.

The teachers’ performance was evaluated using teachers’ characteristics and classroom rules.

The arrow from the independent variables going to the dependent variable shows that the IVs have an effect on the DV. Thus, assuming that the IVs, Research Productivity, Emotional Intelligence and Instructional Supervision are possible determinants of the DV which is the Teachers’ Performance.

---

**Research Productivity**
- Scientific Research
- Publications
- Citations
- Patents

**Instructional Supervision**
- Planning for Preparation for Instruction
- Teaching Strategies
- Facilitating Learning
- Classroom Management

**Emotional Intelligence**
- Self-Awareness
- Self-Regulation
- Motivation
- Social Awareness

---

**Teachers’ Performance**
- Teachers Characteristics
- Classroom Rules

---

**Figure 1:- Conceptual Model of the Study**
Statement of the Problem
The major concern of the study is to identify the determinants of teachers’ performance in Augustinian HEI’s. Specifically, this study sought to answer the following:

How may the faculty research productivity of the Augustinian HEI’s for the past five years be described in terms of the number of
1. Scientific research;
2. Publications;
3. Citations; and
4. Patents?

How may the Emotional Intelligence profile of the teachers be described in terms of
1. Self-Awareness;
2. Self-Regulation;
3. Motivation;
4. Social Awareness, and
5. Social Skills?

To what extent do the teachers implement the following instructional supervision domain
1. Planning for Preparation for Instruction;
2. Teaching Strategies;
3. Facilitating Learning;
4. Classroom Management;
5. Use of Instructional Materials, and
6. Assessment of Learning?

How may the teachers’ level of performance be described in terms of
1. Teachers Characteristics;
2. Classroom Rules;

Does the level of teachers’ research productivity exerts significant effect on teachers’ performance?
Does the level of Teachers Emotional Intelligence exerts significant effect on teachers’ performance?
Does the level of teachers’ instructional supervision exerts significant effect on teachers’ performance?
What management implications may be drawn from the findings of the study?

Hypotheses of the Study
The following hypotheses were tested at .05 level of significance
The teachers’ level of research productivity does not significantly affect the teachers’ performance.
The teachers’ level of Emotional Intelligence does not significantly affect the teachers’ performance.
The teachers’ of level Instructional Supervision does not significantly affect the teachers’ performance.

Methodology of the Study
This chapter presents the research methodology, research instrument, respondents of the study, data gathering procedure, and statistical treatment of data.

Method and Techniques Used
The researcher utilized the descriptive correlational method of research. According to Nieswiadomy (2008), a correlational research design is used to describe the statistical association between two or more variables. The interest is examining the teachers’ research capability, emotional intelligence, and instructional supervision as determinants of teachers’ performance in Augustinian Higher Educational Institution.

A validated semi-structured questionnaire was used as a primary data gathering tool. Documentary analysis was also used extensively in determining the factors influencing teachers’ performance of Augustinian HEI’s.
Respondents of the Study
The respondents of the study were the teachers and Heads of Augustinian Schools in the School Year 2018-2019. The respondents were purposively selected based on the following inclusion criteria: (1) Full-time faculty member; (2) teaching in the college level; and (3) have at least three years of service in the institution.

It may be gleaned from the data in Table 1 that a total of 120 teachers and 8 heads were made part of the study. Teachers were coming from School A (10, 8.3%), School B (29, 24.17%), School C (10, 8.33%), School D (8, 6.67%), School E (10, 8.33%), School F (8, 6.67%), School G (10, 8.33%), and School H (35, 29.17%)

Table 1: Respondents of the Study.

| Augustinian Schools | Teachers Frequency | Teachers Percentage | Heads Frequency |
|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| A                   | 10                 | 8.33                | 1               |
| B                   | 29                 | 24.17               | 1               |
| C                   | 10                 | 8.33                | 1               |
| D                   | 8                  | 6.67                | 1               |
| E                   | 10                 | 8.33                | 1               |
| F                   | 8                  | 6.67                | 1               |
| G                   | 10                 | 8.33                | 1               |
| F                   | 35                 | 29.17               | 1               |
| Total               | 120                | 100                 | 8               |

Instrument of the Study
Research productivity was assessed in terms of scientific research, publications, citations and patents. Documentary analysis was conducted to appraise the teachers research productivity.

Emotional Intelligence
The researcher used the Emotional Intelligence Scale developed and standardized by Singh (2004) based on Goleman’s Model of Emotional Intelligence competencies. It is composed of 60 items under five categories: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, social awareness and social skills. This instrument will be accomplished by the teachers.

Instructional Supervision
The researcher used a reliable instrument to measure the teacher Instructional Supervision with the following variables: planning and preparation for instruction; teaching strategies; facilitating learning; classroom management; communication skills; use of instructional materials; and assessment of learning. A four-point Likert scale was used as follows 4 very satisfactory; 3 means satisfactory; 2 means fair; and 1 means poor. The instrument has a cronbach’s alpha of 0.86.

Teachers Performance
The researcher utilized survey rating scale and questionnaire in obtaining the needed information on the extent of based teachers behaviors, holding high performance and innovative practices in school. A five-point Likert scale was used as follows 5 outstanding; 4 means very good; 3 means good; 2 means fair, and 1 means poor. The instrument has a cronbach’s alpha of 0.86.
Data Gathering Procedure
The mode of data gathering was the questionnaire method. Each of the respondents was given a structured set of questions. In gathering the data, the researcher carried out the following procedure:

A letter was sent to the university Presidents of the eight Augustinian higher education institutions in Luzon.

With the approval of the Presidents, the researcher distributed the questionnaire to the respondents personally and thru courier.

The researcher collected the questionnaires from the respondents and checked whether all the questions were answered.

The data collected were tabulated and processed using Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS). In order to analyze and interpret the data gathered, the following statistical measures were used:

Data Processing and Statistical Treatment
The data collected were tabulated and processed using Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS). In order to analyze and interpret the data gathered, the following statistical measures were used:

The extent of faculty research productivity in the Augustinian HEI’s was quantified using frequency counts and percentage procedures.

The teachers’ emotional intelligence and teachers performance of Augustinian HEI’s was analyzed using the following scales:

| Scale | Range     | Interpretation | Teachers Performance |
|-------|-----------|----------------|----------------------|
| 5     | 4.5 – 5.00| Very High      | Outstanding          |
| 4     | 3.5 – 4.49| High           | Very Good            |
| 3     | 2.5 – 3.49| Moderately High| Good                 |
| 2     | 1.5 – 2.49| Low            | Fair                 |
| 1     | 1.0 – 1.49| Very Low       | Poor                 |

The teachers’ instructional supervision of Augustinian HEI’s was analyzed using the following scale.

| Scale | Range     | Interpretation |
|-------|-----------|----------------|
| 4     | 3.5 – 4.00| Very Satisfactory |
| 3     | 2.5 – 3.49| Satisfactory    |
| 2     | 1.5 – 2.49| Fair           |
| 1     | 1.0 – 1.49| Poor           |

The effects of research productivity, emotional intelligence and instructional supervision were quantified using correlation and regression analysis.

Summary of Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations:-
This chapter presents the summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations with regards to the teachers’ research productivity, emotional intelligence, and instructional supervision as determinants of teachers’ performance in Augustinians HEI’s.

This study made use of descriptive correlational method of research that utilized standard questionnaire as a primary data-gathering tool, substantiated by extensive documentary analysis. The respondents of the study were 120 faculty members and 8 school heads.

The following null hypothesis was subjected for testing at 0.05 level of significance.

The teachers’ level of research productivity does not significantly affect the teachers’ performance.
The teachers’ level of Emotional Intelligence does not significantly affect the teachers’ performance.

The teachers’ level of Instructional Supervision does not significantly affect the teachers’ performance.

The results were processed using the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) and the data were presented using appropriate tables and texts. The results were analyzed and interpreted using statistical tests such as regression analysis in determining the factors affecting teachers’ performance Augustinian Higher Education Institution. Using the aforementioned procedures, the findings of the study may be summarized as follows;

**Summary of Findings**

**Problem 1**

Research Productivity of Faculty Members of Augustinian HES’s for the Past Five Years

There were four Augustinian HEI’s whose faculty members are productive in research. Top producer of researches was School H with a total of 26 researchers, 59 of which are scientific papers, 45 are accepted for publications and 10 citations. This was followed by School C with a total of 47 researches, 25 of which were scientific papers and 22 were recognized for publications. Following closely was School A with a total of 37 research outputs, 20 were scientific papers and 17 researchers were published. Meanwhile, School D recorded 25 researches of the full time faculty members. About 11 research papers were produced by the faculty members of School B where five were scientific papers and six were published and 8 research papers by School F.

Moreover, it may be noted on the same table that the faculty members of the two Augustinian HEI’s School E and School G have not yet started any research endeavors.

Furthermore, the number of active researchers in the Augustinian HEI’s is not sufficient as evidenced by the limited number of active researchers which accounts to 61 out of 120 or 50.83 percent. There were 6 out of 10 or 60 percent of the full time faculty members who were actively doing research for both School A and School C. About 6 out of 10 or 60 percent of the full time faculty members in School F who were actively engaged in writing scientific papers. Also, School B have 12 out of 29 or 41.38 percent active researchers while School H have 26 out of 35 or 74.29 percent active researchers.

**Problem 2**

How may the Emotional Intelligence profile of the teachers be described in terms of:

2.1 **Self-Awareness;** The teachers emotional intelligence in terms of self-awareness has high degree of self-awareness as evidenced by a 4.46 overall mean.

2.2 **Self-Regulation;** The teachers emotional intelligence in terms of self-regulation possesses a high level of self-regulation, having obtained a 4.43 overall mean.

2.3 **Motivation;** The teachers emotional intelligence in terms of motivation showed that they are strongly motivated as depicted by the total mean average of 4.16 overall mean.

2.4 **Social Awareness;** Teachers’ emotional intelligence in terms of social awareness received a mean of 4.21 discloses that the teachers strongly agreed with most statements.

2.5 **Social Skills;** In general, the teachers responded agreed in terms of social skills by the mean result of 4.32.

**Problem 3**

To what extent do the teachers implement the following instructional supervision domain:

3.1 **Planning for Preparation for Instruction;** The teachers answered a very satisfactory rating to all of the statements of Instructional Supervision Practices in terms of Planning and Preparation for Instruction with an overall mean of 3.87.

3.2 **Teaching Strategies;** Teachers are consistent in using the indicators as their teaching strategies with an overall mean of 3.81.

3.3 **Facilitating Learning;** Teachers are always consistent in implementing different practices to facilitate learning with an overall mean of 3.76.

3.4 **Classroom Management;** The “Instructional Supervision Practices in terms of Classroom Management” obtained an overall average of 3.86 which means that the teachers always manage the class.
3.5 **Use of Instructional Materials:** The “Instructional Supervision Practices in terms of Use of Instructional Materials” obtained an overall average of 3.76 which means that the teachers always use of instructional materials.

3.6 **Assessment of Learning:** The “Instructional Supervision Practices in terms of Assessment of Learning” obtained an overall average of 3.63 which means that the teachers always assess students’ learning.

**Problem 4**

To what extent do the teachers implement the following instructional supervision domain:

4.1 **Teachers Characteristics:** The classroom management practices in terms of teachers characteristics have a “Very good” rating of classroom management practices as evidenced by a 4.45 overall mean.

4.2 **Classroom Rules:** With regards to classroom management in terms of classroom rules, the teachers received a “Very good” score with an overall mean of 4.33.

**Problem 5**

Research Productivity on Teachers’ Performance

Results of the regression revealed that of the three provisions in promoting research productivity: scientific papers, publications, produced B coefficients of .736 and .709 respectively with associated probability less than the significance level set at .05. The findings indicate that for every unit increase in scientific papers could generate a .461 and .501 increases in publications of faculty members in Augustinian HEI’s. The obtained Beta coefficients of .461 (scientific papers) and .501 (publications) indicate that the two factors contribute almost the same significant effects in the faculty research productivity. The factors “citations” and patents also contribute to research productivity but not to a significant extent.

**Problem 6**

Emotional Intelligence on Teachers’ Performance

Data in Table 17 showed the results of the analysis of regression. The five indicators affecting teachers’ performance: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, social awareness, and social skills produced B coefficients of 1.041, .721, .2393, -1.959, and -1.754 respectively with associated probability less than the significance level set at .05. The findings indicate that for every unit increase in self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, social awareness, and social skills could generate a 7.745, 5.929, 9.724, -6.234 and -5.466 increases in performance of faculty members in Augustinian HEI’s. The obtained Beta coefficients of 7.745 (self-awareness), 5.929 (self-regulation), 9.724 (motivation), -6.234 (social awareness), and -5.466 (social skills) indicate that the five factors contribute a significant effects in the teachers performance.

**Problem 7**

Teachers’ Instructional Supervision on Teachers’ Performance

Results of the regression revealed that of the six planning and preparation for instruction teaching strategies, facilitating learning, classroom management, use of instructional materials, and assessment of learning, produced B coefficients of .261, .488, -.665, 1.424, -.2.859 and 0.61 respectively with associated probability less than the significance level set at .05. The findings indicate that for every unit increase in planning and preparation for instruction, teaching strategies, facilitating learning, classroom management, use of instructional materials, and assessment of learning could generate a 1.037, .458, -.480, .316, -1.169 and .025 increases in instructional supervision of faculty members in Augustinian HEI’s. The obtained Beta coefficients of 1.037 (planning and preparation for instruction), .458 (teaching strategies), -.480 (facilitating learning), .316 (classroom management), -1.169 (use of instructional materials) and .025 (assessment of learning) indicate that all factors contribute almost the same significant effects in teachers’ instructional supervision.

**Problem 8**

Management implications may be drawn from the study. Based on the results of the study, the following pedagogical implications were derived:

The research capacity of the faculty members should be enhanced to improve their teaching performance with the help and support of the school administration.
The school must provide funds if possible for the teachers for the purpose of practicing and improving their research capacity.

The department heads should support the teachers in developing their classroom management and in improving teaching effectiveness through educational reforms.

Teaching is a high pressure profession. The school should be an organization that maintains a healthy work place to make teachers focused and to optimize their productivity.

Conclusions:-
Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:
1. The number of active researchers in the Augustinian HEI’s is not sufficient as evidenced by the limited number of active researchers.
2. The faculty members of Augustinian HEI’s own a high level of emotional intelligence (EI). Among the five elements of EI, self-awareness received the highest overall mean.
3. It is the department head’s responsibility to work with teachers to foster an intrinsic desire to improve their instructional performance by appropriating strategies that will motivate teachers to improve their performance.
4. Teacher’s performance of Augustinian HEI’s described as very high in terms of the following key results area, teacher characteristics and classrooms rules.
5. Teachers’ performance in Augustinian HEI’s is significantly influenced by the teachers’ research capability, emotional intelligence and instructional supervision.
6. The implications drawn from the findings of the study are important insights that can be considered in further upgrading and continuously promotes excellent teachers performance.

Recommendations:-
In view of the conclusions drawn, the following recommendations are proposed.
1. That Augustinian higher education institutions may develop an attainable research agenda, good culture of research, appropriate budget for research, functional research units and services, linkages and networks, provision of research benefits and incentives, research committee, and venue for publications are the essential elements of supportive research environment may be considered by the Augustinian HEIs in order to motivate faculty members to become research productive.
2. Since the result of the Emotional Intelligence survey shows that the faculty members of Augustinian HEI’s have high EI and significantly affect Teachers’ Performance, it is highly recommended that the school administration continuously motivates teachers towards positive attitude.
3. It is recommended that regular instructional supervision should be organize to maintain better job performance of faculty members of Augustinian HEI’s.
4. The Augustinians HEI’s must consider “teacher personality” and “teacher health” to guarantee that they will be able to deliver excellent teachers performance.
5. It is highly recommended that the management of Augustinian Higher Education Institutions to continuously further enhance their teachers’ research capability, emotional intelligence and instructional supervision to maintain outstanding performance and good quality education.
6. That the implications drawn from this study be considered to further enhance the teaching and learning environment of Augustinian Higher Educational Institutions.

References:-
1. Acosta Sherlyne & Clemena, Rose Marie. (2009). Developing Research Culture in Philippine Higher Education Institutions: Perspective of University Faculty retrieved on January 2010 from http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/files/54062/1187006385Rose_Marie_Clemena.pdf/Rose_Marie_Clemena.pdf
2. Abdollahi, A., Nezhad Hosseini, S. M. E., Motalebi, S. A., & Talib, M. (2013). Examining the association between emotional intelligence with depression among the Iranian boy students. Asian Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities 2(3), 53–61.
4. Ainley, M. (2012). Students’ interest and engagement in classroom activities. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), Handbook of research on student engagement (pp. 283–302). New York, NY: Springer.

5. AITSL. (2011). National professional standards for teachers. Melbourne, VIC: Author. Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., & Furlong, M. J. (2008). Student engagement with school: Critical conceptual and methodological issues of the construct. Psychology in the Schools, 45, 369–386. doi:10.1002/pits.20303

6. Alumran, J. I. A., & Punamaki, R.-L. (2008). Relationship between gender, age, academic achievement, emotional intelligence, and coping styles in Bahraini adolescents. Individual Differences Research 6(2), 104–119.

7. Berry, Rita (2008) ASSESSMENT for LEARNING; HONG KONG: HONG KONG UNIVERSITY PRESS.

8. Happelear, J. (2017). SELF-AWARENESS AND SELF-REGULATION: CORE SKILLS IN EFFECTIVE LEADERS.

9. The Business Journals. Retrieved from HTTPS://WWW.BIZJOURNAL.COM/BIZJOURNALS/HOW-TO/GROWTH-STRATEGIES/2017/02/SELF-AWARENESS-AND-Self-Regulation-CORE-SKILLS-IN.HTML.

10. Chingos, M. M., & Peterson, P. E. (2011). It’s easier to pick a good teacher than to train one: Familiar and new results on the correlates of teacher effectiveness. Economics of Education Review, 30, 449–465.

12. Corpuz, Brenda B. and Gloria Salandnan (2003) PRINCIPLES OF TEACHING I LORIMAR PUBLISHING, INC. QUEZON CITY. Creating a Differentiated MATHEMATICS CLASSROOM

13. Ersoy, A. F., & Çengelci, T. (2008). The research experience of social studies pre-service teachers: A qualitative study. Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 8(2), 541–554.

16. Esmai, C. (2018). Great leadership starts with self-awareness. Forbes. Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/ellevarr/2018/02/15/self-awareness-being-more-of-what-makes-you-great/#32e5a2ef40dd.

17. Esmaeilii, N., & Jamkhaneh, E. B. (2013). The relationship between emotional Intelligence and mental health in humanism college students at IAU, Quemshah Branch, Iran. Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research 3(2), 68–76.

18. Elíasdóttir, Á. B. (2011). What are you wanting up here? Professional consultation of school leaders to teachers. Unpublished master’s thesis, University of Iceland.

19. Glassick, Charles (2000). Boyer’s Expanded Definitions of Scholarship retrieved on January 2012 from http://www.academicpeds.com.org.

20. Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2010). Supervision and instructional leadership (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

21. Gohm, C. L., Corser, G. C., & Dalsky, D. J. (2005). Emotional intelligence under stress: Useful, unnecessary, or irrelevant. Personality and Individual Differences 39(6), 1017–1028.

22. Gupta, G., & Kumar, S. (2010). Mental health in relation to emotional intelligence and self efficacy among college students. Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology 36(1), 61–67.

23. Hamre, B. K., Pianta, R. C., Burchinal, M., & Downer, J. T. (2010). A course on supporting early language and literacy development through effective teacher-child interactions: Effects on teacher beliefs, knowledge and practice. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness, Washington, DC.

24. Harris, D. N., & Sass, T. (2011). Teacher training, teacher quality and student achievement. Journal of Public Economics, 95, 798–812.

25. Jantarakantee, E., Roadrangka, V., & Clarke, A. (2012). Pre-service science teachers’ understandings of classroom research and the problems in conducting classroom research projects. US-China Education Review, A1, 112–120.

26. Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings. St. Paul: The University of Minnesota.

27. Lopatto, D. (2004). Survey of undergraduate research experiences (SURE): First findings. Cell Biology Education, 3, 270–277. http://dx.doi.org/10.1187/cbe.04–07-0045

28. Lerpputarak, Sarunya (2008). An Investigation of Factors Related to Research Productivity in a Public University in Thailand: A Case Study retrieved on January 2012 from http://vuir.vu.edu.au/1459/1/Lerpputarak.pdf

29. Levin, B., Cooper, A., Arjomand, S., & Thompson, K. 2011. “Can Simple Interventions Increase Research Use in Secondary Schools?” Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 1–29.
32. Lizeretti, N. P., & Extremera, N. N. (2011). Emotional Intelligence and clinical symptoms in outpatients with generalized anxiety disorder (GAD). Psychiatric Quarterly 82(3), 253–260.
33. Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings. St. Paul: The University of Minnesota.
34. Mashburn, A. J., Downer, J. T., Rivers, S. E., Brackett, M. A., & Martinez, A. (2013). Improving the power of an experimental study of a social and emotional learning program: Application of generalizability theory to the measurement of classroom-level outcomes. Prevention Science.
35. Margol, E. (2015). The why and what of motivation. Retrieved from https://trainingindustry.com/articles/leadership/the-why-and-what-of-motivation/
36. Marshall, B., and M. Jane Drummond. 2006. “How Teachers Engage with Assessment for Learning: Lessons from the Classroom.” Research Papers in Education 21 (2): 133–149
37. Marston, D., M. Pickart, A. Reschly, D. Heistad, P. Muyskens, and G. Tindal. 2007. “Early Literacy Measures for Improving Student Reading Achievement: Translating Research into Practice.” Exceptionality 15 (2): 97–117.
38. McGrath, A. L. (2014). Content, affective, and behavioral challenges to learning: students’ experiences learning statistics. International Journal For The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 8(2), 1–21. doi:10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2015.1.5
39. Montes-Berges, B., & Augusto, J. M. (2007). Exploring the relationship between perceived emotional intelligence, coping, social support and mental health in nursing students. Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing 14(2), 163–171.
40. Nasir, M., & Masrur, R. (2010). An exploration of emotional intelligence of the students of IIUI in relation to gender, age and academic achievement. Bulletin of Education and Research 32(1), 37–51.
41. Patrick, C.L. (2011). Student evaluations of teaching: Effects of the Big Five personality traits, grades and the validity hypothesis. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 36(2), 239–249. doi:10.1080/02602930903308258
42. Punongbayan, Estelito J. and Bauyon, Simeona M. Instructional Performance of Teacher Education. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research. Vol. 3 No.5, 135–143 December 2015 Part I P-ISSN 2300-7756 E-ISSN 2350-8442
43. Reis-Jorge, J. M. (2007). Teachers’ conceptions of teacher-research and self-perceptions as enquiring practitioners – A longitudinal case study. Teaching and Teacher Education, 23(4), 402–417. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.12.007
44. Riggio, R.R. & Reichard, R.J. (2008) "The emotional and social intelligences of effective leadership: An emotional and social skill approach", Journal of Managerial Psychology, Vol. 23 Issue: 2, pp.169-185, https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940810850080
45. Rocca, S.J. (2013). Comparison of factors influencing the college choice of matriculant and non-matriculant students into a college of agriculture. NACTA Journ. 57(2): 72-78.
46. Shaw, K., Holbrook, A., Scevak, J., & Bourke, S. (2008). The response of pre-service teachers to a compulsory research project. The Australian Educational Researcher, 35(3), 89–109. doi:10.1007/BF03246291
47. Sellie-Dosunmu, M. (2016). Using emotional intelligence in the workplace. Alexandria, Virginia: Association For Talent.
48. Todd, M., Bannister, P., & Clegg, S. (2004). Independent inquiry and the undergraduate dissertation: Perceptions and experiences of final-year social science students. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 29(3)335–355. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0260293042000188285
49. Turner, N., Wuetherick, B., & Healey, M. (2008). International perspectives on student awareness, experiences and perceptions of research: Implications for academic developers in implementing research-based teaching and learning. International Journal for Academic Development, 13(3), 199–211. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13601440802242333
50. Wiliam, D., C. Lee, C. Harrison, and P. Black. 2004. “Teachers Developing Assessment for Learning: Impact on Student Achievement.” Assessment in Education 11 (1): 49–65.
51. Williams, H., Huggins C., Bartlett, J. and Kotrlik, J. (2007) Factors Associated with Research Productivity of Agricultural Education Faculty. Journal of agricultural education. Vol. 43 number 3
52. Yukl, G. A. (2012). Leadership in organizations (8th ed.). Harlow, UK: Pearson.
53. Zambo, D., & Zambo, R. (2007). Action research in an undergraduate teacher education program: What promises does it hold? Action in Teacher Education, 28(4), 62–74. http://dx.doi.org/10. 1080/01626620.2007.10463430.