



# American Journal of Education and Technology (AJET)

ISSN: 2832-9481 (ONLINE)

VOLUME 4 ISSUE 2 (2025)



PUBLISHED BY  
E-PALLI PUBLISHERS, DELAWARE, USA

## Instructional Supervision of Master Teachers: Its Critical Role in Advancing Teachers' and Learners' Performance

Manuel III B. Reyes<sup>1\*</sup>, Jane C. Oropa<sup>2</sup>

### Article Information

**Received:** January 13, 2025

**Accepted:** February 17, 2025

**Published:** March 20, 2025

### Keywords

*Academic Achievement,  
Instructional Supervision, Master  
Teachers, Professional Development,  
Teacher Performance*

### ABSTRACT

This study examined the role of master teachers in improving the performance of proficient teachers and learners, focusing on instructional supervision across Key Result Areas (KRAs) during the school year 2024-2025. Utilizing a quantitative descriptive-correlational design, data were gathered from 95 master teachers and 75 school heads across public elementary schools in the second district of Surigao del Sur. The study also assessed elementary teachers' Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) ratings and learners' academic performance through Mean Percentage Scores (MPS). Results indicated that instructional supervision was highly manifested across all KRAs, with an overall mean score of 4.449. The highest-rated domain was Professional Engagement, Personal Growth, and Professional Development ( $M=4.515$ ), highlighting educators' commitment to continuous learning. However, correlation analysis revealed no significant relationship ( $p>0.05$ ) between teachers' performance and learners' academic performance. This finding suggests that while instructional supervision is well-practiced, it does not directly influence measurable improvements in teacher performance or student learning outcomes. Other factors, such as teacher motivation, instructional strategies, and student engagement, may have a more substantial impact. Meanwhile, one-way ANOVA results showed significant differences ( $p<0.05$ ) in instructional supervision levels based on school type pointing to variations in support and professional development opportunities. These findings highlight the need to reassess the effectiveness of current instructional supervision practices and explore complementary strategies that better support teacher effectiveness and student success. Future applications of this study include refining school-based professional development models and informing DepEd policies on teacher evaluation and supervision to ensure a more holistic approach to improving educational outcomes.

### INTRODUCTION

Improving the effectiveness of teachers and students in the educational system depends on supervision by school leaders, including master teachers. This involves various approaches designed to guide teachers in enhancing their teaching skills while ensuring that instruction aligns with academic standards. Master teachers play a key role in monitoring instruction, promoting academic success, and improving both student learning and teacher performance. In response, the Department of Education (DepEd) issued DepEd Order No. 42, Series of 2017, mandating the use of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) to assess teachers' performance.

Several studies support the impact of instructional supervision on teaching effectiveness and student performance. Dingal (2023) found that master teachers significantly influence instructional methods and overall teaching quality, though their supervisory abilities have only a moderate effect on student achievement. Bautista and Alvarado (2022) emphasized that constructive feedback mechanisms foster teacher professional growth and improve classroom practices. Additionally, Ali and Smith (2021) argued that cooperative and collaborative supervisory methods are more effective than authoritarian approaches in motivating teachers. Saro *et al.* (2022a)

further highlighted that school leaders' guidance plays a crucial role in shaping teachers' competencies and improving student outcomes.

In the Caraga Region, DepEd provides training programs for master teachers to enhance their supervisory skills, including workshops on the Result Performance Management System (RPMS-PPST). However, issues persist, particularly regarding classroom observations, technical assistance, and the integration of technology in supervision. In Surigao del Sur, many elementary schools face resource shortages, and master teachers struggle with the use of advanced tools to support teachers. While Learning Action Cells (LAC) are in place, division-level activities often disrupt these initiatives, making it difficult for master teachers to fully apply their training.

Given these challenges, this study aimed to examine the critical role of master teachers in instructional supervision and its impact on both proficient teachers and student performance. More so, by focusing on elementary schools in the second district of Surigao del Sur, the study explored how master teachers provide supervision, the strategies they employ to enhance teaching effectiveness, and the extent to which their guidance influences classroom instruction. The study also sought to assess how instructional supervision

<sup>1</sup> North Eastern Mindanao State University, Rosario, Tandag City, Surigao del Sur, Philippines

<sup>2</sup> College of Teacher Education, North Eastern Mindanao State University, Rosario, Tandag City, Surigao del Sur, Philippines

\* Corresponding author's e-mail: [manuelreyes001@deped.gov.ph](mailto:manuelreyes001@deped.gov.ph)

contributes to professional development, fosters a collaborative teaching environment, and also enhances student learning outcomes. The findings provide valuable insights into improving instructional supervision practices and reinforcing teacher support systems within the educational framework, ensuring that master teachers are equipped with the necessary skills and resources to effectively mentor and guide proficient teachers in their respective schools.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The performance of master teachers, both as classroom instructors and facilitators, has been the subject of extensive research in educational literature. Scholars have explored various dimensions of this topic, including classroom observation, teachers' self-perceptions, and factors influencing teaching effectiveness. The role of master teachers extends beyond traditional classroom instruction, encompassing instructional supervision, professional development, and mentoring of fellow educators. Research indicates that their performance significantly impacts overall teaching quality, student learning outcomes, and institutional effectiveness (Munir *et al.*, 2022; Chi, 2021). These studies highlight the intricate relationship between master teachers' effectiveness and the broader educational landscape, emphasizing the need for robust instructional supervision mechanisms that foster continuous growth and improvement.

One of the critical aspects of instructional supervision is the accuracy and fairness of teacher evaluations. Chi (2021) found that factors such as race and gender congruence between teachers and evaluators influence performance assessments, potentially leading to biases. To address these concerns, research suggests implementing diverse evaluation teams and refining observation tools to ensure objectivity (Burke & Krey, 2020). Moreover, Alshehri (2019) emphasized that classroom observation serves as a valuable professional development tool, enabling teachers to engage in reflective practices that lead to instructional enhancement. Lynch (2024) further argued that observation protocols must be continuously refined to align with evolving educational standards, ensuring that quality teaching practices are recognized and reinforced.

Teachers' perceptions of classroom observation and evaluation processes significantly influence their engagement and effectiveness. Lasagabaster and Sierra (2020) explored the cognitive and emotional responses of teachers toward classroom observations, revealing a spectrum of attitudes ranging from enthusiasm for professional growth to apprehension about judgmental assessments. The study by Zhang (2023) found that teacher resilience and well-being play a crucial role in fostering positive attitudes toward evaluations, particularly in language instruction settings. These findings suggest that for instructional supervision to be effective, it must be designed in a way that acknowledges teachers' psychological responses and provides constructive,

non-threatening feedback mechanisms that promote professional development.

The shift to virtual learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic necessitated adaptations in instructional supervision. Jerry (2022) examined how online platforms influenced educators' self-perceptions of their teaching performance, concluding that alignment between instructional abilities and technological tools enhances effectiveness. Similarly, Henklain *et al.* (2020) developed a virtual teacher evaluation model that addressed the unique challenges of online education, ensuring that instructional supervision remained relevant in digital learning environments. These findings emphasize the need for continuous innovation in teacher assessment strategies, particularly as education becomes increasingly technology-driven.

Additionally, research on instructional supervision also highlights its connection to teacher professionalism and ethics. Udenka (2021) investigated how private school teachers in Lagos, Nigeria, employ diverse teaching strategies, demonstrating that instructional supervision directly impacts pedagogical innovation and student engagement. Meanwhile, Bartin Faculty of Education (2021) emphasized that professional ethics and integrity are fundamental to teaching effectiveness. Studies by Lasagabaster and Sierra (2020) and Brandon *et al.* (2018) reinforced the notion that effective instructional supervision fosters an environment of continuous professional growth, enabling teachers to refine their methodologies and adapt to changing educational landscapes.

The relationship between instructional supervision and leadership effectiveness is another crucial area of study. Mataboge and Mampane (2024) found that constructive post-observation feedback loops significantly enhance teacher performance. Chi (2021) highlighted that administrators' perceptions of teachers' effectiveness shape instructional strategies, emphasizing the need for strong leadership in supervision practices. Lynch (2024) and Hall (2024) further supported the idea that developing professional rapport between supervisors and teachers is essential for accurate performance assessments and instructional improvements.

Studies have also examined how instructional supervision influences student learning outcomes. Zhang (2023) identified a strong correlation between teacher well-being and student academic performance, demonstrating that emotionally supported teachers create more engaging learning environments. Research by Cisneros-Cohennour (2021), Szoke (2024), and Warnick (2024) explored the challenges teachers face in classroom management and how instructional supervision provides the necessary support to navigate these issues effectively. Szoke (2024) emphasized that teachers' self-reflection on their instructional competencies directly impacts student achievement, aligning with Rahmawati (2024), who advocated for ongoing supervision to ensure continuous professional development.

The diversity of teaching contexts also affects instructional supervision effectiveness (Saro *et al.*, 2022b). Simmons and Holloway (2021) examined how teacher background, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status influence evaluations, advocating for bias-reducing training programs for evaluators. Also, the study by Lee *et al.* (2022) explored challenges faced by teachers in cross-cultural settings, emphasizing the need for culturally sensitive supervision practices that accommodate diverse teaching approaches while maintaining high educational standards.

Instructional supervision is increasingly recognized as a tool for fostering professional development and incorporating emerging educational technologies. Jones *et al.* (2020) argued that supervision should focus on equipping teachers with digital literacy skills to enhance instructional delivery. Fitzgerald and Parker (2023) found that structured mentorship and ongoing training programs significantly improve teachers' adoption of innovative teaching methods. These findings highlight the need for instructional leaders to invest in continuous professional learning opportunities tailored to teachers' evolving needs. In the Philippine context, research on teacher performance evaluation and supervision has emphasized the role of licensure examinations and criterion-based assessments. Alforte *et al.* (2021) highlighted that collaborative professional development initiatives strengthen educational districts, reinforcing master teachers' roles as instructional leaders. Furthermore, studies in public schools have shown that targeted training interventions enhance classroom management and instructional support, indicating the importance of investing in teacher training programs that align with national educational priorities.

Overall, instructional supervision serves as a cornerstone for both teacher effectiveness and student success. The reviewed literature demonstrates that effective supervision encompasses fair evaluation processes, constructive feedback, professional development opportunities, and culturally responsive practices. As education continues to evolve, it is imperative that instructional supervision adapts accordingly, ensuring that teachers receive the support needed to foster high-quality teaching and meaningful learning experiences.

### Research Questions

This study aimed to examine the role of master teachers in improving the performance of proficient teachers and learners, focusing on the Key Result Areas (KRAs) for instructional supervision during the school year 2024-2025. Specifically, it sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents, in terms of:
  - 1.1 Age;
  - 1.2 Gender;
  - 1.3 Highest educational attainment;
  - 1.4 Length of teaching service; and
  - 1.5 School type?

2. What is the extent of manifestation of instructional supervision, in terms of Key Result Areas (KRAs):

- 2.1 Content knowledge and pedagogy;
- 2.2 Learning environment and diversity of learners;
- 2.3 Curriculum and planning;
- 2.4 Assessing and reporting; and
- 2.5 Professional engagement, personal growth, and professional development?

3. What is the performance level of teachers and master teachers based on their Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) ratings?

4. What is the level of learners' academic performance?

5. Is there a significant relationship between teachers' performance and learners' academic performance?

6. Is there a significant difference in the instructional supervision provided by master teachers and school heads when categorized based on their demographic profile?

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Research Design

This study employed a quantitative research approach, specifically a descriptive-correlational research design, to address the set research questions. Data were collected through a researcher-made survey questionnaire based on the Key Result Areas (KRAs) of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). The study aimed to gather, analyze, classify, and tabulate data on prevailing conditions, practices, processes, trends, and cause-effect relationships, as described by Calderon (2006). Additionally, it analyzed the relationship between several variables, following the technique outlined by Medina (2010). The study examined the potential connections between two variables without manipulating them, as noted by Smiley (2011).

### Respondents of the Study

The respondents of this study were master teachers and school heads who answered a survey questionnaire assessing the extent of instructional supervision, particularly in relation to the Key Result Areas (KRAs). Additionally, the researchers gathered Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCRF) ratings from 73 elementary teachers and 73 elementary master teachers, totaling 146 respondents. Furthermore, 73 identified learners from elementary schools were assessed based on their academic performance using their Mean Percentage Scores (MPS). For the primary analysis of instructional supervision, 95 master teachers and 75 school heads participated, resulting in a total of 170 respondents. The study employed complete enumeration sampling, also known as universal sampling, selecting all master teachers and school heads from public elementary schools in the second district of the Division of Surigao del Sur. Specifically, this included 95 master teachers and 75 school heads, from 73 public elementary schools across the municipalities of Lingig, Hinatuan, Tagbina, Barobo, and Lianga.

### Research Instrument

The study utilized a researcher-made instrument for data collection, with survey questionnaire parameters adapted from DepEd Order No. 42, series of 2017, titled National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). These standards served as the foundation for developing key indicators to measure instructional supervision. While the parameters were derived from the PPST framework, the specific statement indicators were crafted based on an extensive literature review and relevant gathered information. To ensure the instrument's validity and reliability, the items underwent a rigorous validation process with experts in education and instructional supervision. The survey questionnaire was divided into two sections, each addressing specific aspects of the study. Part I focused on the demographic profiles of master teachers and school heads, including age, gender, highest educational attainment, length of teaching service, and school type. Part II assessed the extent of instructional supervision across five Key Result Areas (KRAs): Content Knowledge and Pedagogy, Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners, Curriculum and Planning, Assessing and Reporting, and Professional Engagement and Personal Growth and Development. Responses were measured using a 5-point Likert scale to capture varying levels of agreement or performance. Quantitative data were collected through survey administration, and the findings were systematically analyzed to determine the level of manifestation for each indicator.

### Statistical Treatment

The data were tabulated, treated, and analyzed based on the research problems presented in the study. Frequency and percentage analyses were used to examine the demographic profiles of master teachers and school heads, systematically classifying data based on variables such as age, gender, highest educational attainment, length of teaching service, and school type. These statistical tools were also applied to research questions 3 and 4, assessing the performance levels of teachers, master teachers, and learners' academic performance. The weighted mean was employed to address research question 2, providing a measure of central tendency to analyze respondents' perceptions. This technique accounted for the varying importance of survey items, ensuring an accurate representation of responses. Data processing and analysis were conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to ensure precision and minimize computational errors. Correlational analysis was applied to examine relationships among variables, with Pearson's correlation coefficients assessing the strength and direction of these relationships. Specifically, it explored connections between teachers' and learners' performance and the relationship between respondents' profiles and the extent of instructional supervision across Key Result Areas (KRAs). One-way ANOVA was used to determine significant differences in instructional supervision

between master teachers and school heads when grouped by demographic profile. This method effectively compared mean scores across multiple groups within independent variables such as age, gender, educational attainment, length of service, and school type. On the other hand, by analyzing variations between and within these groups, one-way ANOVA identified whether differences in instructional supervision were statistically significant or due to chance, ensuring a comprehensive examination of how demographic factors influence instructional supervision practices.

### Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to strict ethical considerations to ensure the rights, privacy, and well-being of all respondents. Informed consent was obtained from all respondents ensuring they fully understood the purpose, procedures, and voluntary nature of their participation. Confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained by coding responses and safeguarding all collected data, preventing unauthorized access. The study also adhered to the principles of beneficence and non-maleficence, ensuring that no harm whether physical, psychological, or professional would come to respondents as a result of their involvement. Ethical clearance was secured from relevant authorities, and necessary permissions were obtained from the Department of Education and school administrators before data collection. Furthermore, all research findings were presented with integrity, avoiding misrepresentation or manipulation of results. The study strictly followed ethical guidelines for research involving human participants, upholding respect, fairness, and transparency throughout the research process.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Profile Data

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the respondents, including their age, gender, highest educational attainment, length of teaching service, and school type. These parameters provide essential viewpoints into the composition of master teachers and school heads, emphasizing their professional background and distribution across different school settings. The data gathered serves as a basis for analyzing trends in educational leadership, identifying gaps in professional development, and formulating strategies to enhance teaching effectiveness and school management. Moreover, the age distribution of respondents reveals that the majority fall within the 46 to 55 years old category (35%), followed closely by those 31 to 45 years old (32%) and above 56 years old (29%). On the other hand, a small proportion (4%) are below 30 years old. This suggests that most master teachers and school heads have extensive experience in the field, likely contributing to their expertise in instructional leadership. However, the lower representation of younger professionals may indicate a need for succession planning and leadership training to ensure a smooth transition as older educators retire.

In terms of gender, the data shows a significant female dominance (83%), with only 15% male and 2% identifying as LGBTQIA+. This reflects a common trend in the education sector, where women often outnumber men in teaching and leadership roles. While this suggests strong female representation, it also highlights the need for gender inclusivity initiatives that encourage more male and LGBTQIA+ individuals to pursue leadership positions in education.

In addition, regarding highest educational attainment, 82% of respondents have earned units toward a master's degree, while 11% have completed a master's degree. In this case, a small percentage have taken doctoral units (4%) or earned a doctoral degree (4%). This indicates that most master teachers and school heads are actively pursuing higher education, reflecting a commitment to continuous professional development. However, the relatively low percentage of doctoral graduates suggests the need for more structured support programs to encourage advanced studies among teachers and school heads.

More so, the length of teaching service distribution reveals that a significant proportion (34%) have between 1 to 5 years of experience, particularly among school

heads (40%). Meanwhile, 23% have served for over 26 years, demonstrating a mix of both seasoned and relatively new educators. The presence of many early-career administrators suggests an opportunity for leadership training, while the long-serving educators may serve as mentors for professional development within their institutions.

Finally, in terms of school type, nearly half (49%) of the respondents are from non-central schools, followed by central/pilot schools (22%), primary schools (15%), integrated schools (10%), and multigrade schools (4%). The dominance of non-central school teachers highlights the need for equitable access to resources and professional development opportunities in remote and underprivileged schools. With this, ensuring that teachers and school heads in all school types receive adequate instructional supervision and support will be crucial for maintaining quality education across different settings. Overall, the demographic profile of the respondents emphasizes a strong foundation of experienced, highly qualified, and predominantly female educators. However, the findings highlight areas for improvement, particularly in leadership succession, gender diversity, and support for advanced academic qualifications among educators.

**Table 1:** Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Age	Age Bracket	Master Teacher		School Head		Overall Frequency	Overall Percentage
		n	%	n	%	n	%
	Below 30 years old	3	3	4	5	7	4
	31 to 45 years old	30	32	25	33	55	32
	46 to 55 years old	35	37	24	32	59	35
	Above 56 years old	27	28	22	29	49	29
<b>Total</b>		<b>95</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>100</b>
Gender	Category	Master Teacher		School Head		Overall Frequency	Overall Percentage
		n	%	n	%	n	%
	Male	16	18	9	12	25	15
	Female	77	81	64	85	141	83
	LGBTQIA+	2	2	2	3	4	2
<b>Total</b>		<b>95</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>100</b>
Highest Educational Attainment	Level	Master Teacher		School Head		Overall Frequency	Overall Percentage
		n	%	n	%	n	%
	Master's Degree Units	74	78	65	87	139	82
	Master's Degree Graduate	12	13	7	9	19	11
	Doctoral Degree Units	4	4	2	3	6	4
	Doctoral Degree Graduate	5	5	1	1	6	4
<b>Total</b>		<b>95</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>100</b>
Length of Teaching Service	Number of Years	Master Teacher		School Head		Overall Frequency	Overall Percentage
		n	%	n	%	n	%
	1 to 5 years	28	29	30	40	58	34

	6 to 10 years	13	14	3	4	16	9
	11 to 15 years	16	17	12	16	28	16
	16 to 20 years	6	6	1	1	7	4
	21 to 25 years	10	11	12	16	22	13
	26 years and above	22	23	17	23	39	23
<b>Total</b>		<b>95</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>100</b>
School Type	Type	Master Teacher		School Head		Overall Frequency	Overall Percentage
		n	%	n	%	n	%
	Central/Pilot	23	24	14	19	37	22
	Non-Central	43	45	41	55	84	49
	Primary	14	15	12	16	26	15
	Multigrade	3	3	3	4	6	4
	Integrated	12	13	5	7	17	10
<b>Total</b>		<b>95</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>100</b>

Legend: Frequency (n); Percentage (%)

According to the study by Pareja (2024), emphasizes that the demographic profile of educators significantly influences educational outcomes and the effectiveness of instructional leadership and school organization. On the other hand, the predominance of respondents aged 46 to 55 years (35%) aligns with findings that experienced educators often occupy leadership roles, bringing valuable expertise to their positions (Manongsong, 2019). However, the limited representation of younger teachers and school heads may pose challenges for leadership succession planning. Aside from that, female representation among respondents reflects global trends in the teaching profession, where women constitute the majority of the workforce (Goden *et al.*, 2020). This gender imbalance emphasizes the need for initiatives to attract and retain male educators, as diverse teaching staff can provide varied role models for students (Associated Press, 2023).

Additionally, Saro *et al.* (2022) emphasizes that completed master's degree units, indicating a strong commitment to professional development and growth of the teachers and school heads. This is also consistent with studies emphasizing the importance of advanced education for effective school leadership (Mendoza, 2019). The varied representation across school types, particularly the 49% from non-central schools, emphasizes the necessity for equitable resource allocation and support. Accordingly, educators in diverse settings receive adequate professional

development is crucial for maintaining educational quality across all school environments (Manongsong, 2019; Bustamante, 2024).

#### Extent of Manifestation of Instructional Supervision in Terms of Key Result Areas (KRAs)

Table 2 presents the overall mean scores for the extent of manifestation of instructional supervision across the five (5) parameters, including: content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment and diversity of learners, curriculum and planning, assessing and reporting, and professional engagement, personal growth, and professional development. The master teachers obtained an overall mean of 4.444, while the school heads recorded a slightly higher overall mean of 4.454, both interpreted as "Highly Manifested." The grand mean of 4.449 further reinforces the strong presence of instructional supervision practices in the school system. The slight variation in ratings suggests that school heads perceive a marginally greater level of instructional supervision, possibly due to their leadership role in overseeing its implementation. These findings imply that both groups recognize the effectiveness of instructional supervision in enhancing teaching quality, fostering professional growth, and maintaining high educational standards. The consistently high ratings also indicate a well-structured and actively implemented supervision system that benefits both teachers and learners.

**Table 2:** Extent of Manifestation of the Instructional Supervision

Parameters	Master Teachers		School Heads		Grand Mean	Overall Adjectival Rating
	Mean	Adjectival Rating	Mean	Adjectival Rating		
Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	4.430	Highly Manifested	4.470	Highly Manifested	4.450	Highly Manifested
Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners	4.420	Highly Manifested	4.460	Highly Manifested	4.440	Highly Manifested

Curriculum and Planning	4.420	Highly Manifested	4.410	Highly Manifested	4.415	Highly Manifested
Assessing and Reporting	4.430	Highly Manifested	4.420	Highly Manifested	4.425	Highly Manifested
Professional Engagement, Personal Growth, and Professional Development	4.520	Highly Manifested	4.510	Highly Manifested	4.515	Highly Manifested
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>4.444</b>	<b>Highly Manifested</b>	<b>4.454</b>	<b>Highly Manifested</b>	<b>4.449</b>	<b>Highly Manifested</b>

The highest-rated parameter in the extent of instructional supervision is Professional Engagement, Personal Growth, and Professional Development, with a grand mean of 4.515 (“Highly Manifested”). Both master teachers (4.520) and school heads (4.510) rated this aspect highly, indicating a strong emphasis on continuous professional learning and engagement in educational development and professional practices. This finding suggests master teachers and school heads are committed to improving their teaching practices through training, workshops, and professional collaborations. On the other hand, the high rating also implies that school heads and master teachers recognize the importance of ongoing professional development in enhancing instructional quality and teaching approaches. As a result, divisional and school administrations should continue to support and expand professional development opportunities to sustain this level of engagement and ensure that educators remain updated with modern pedagogical trends.

More so, following closely is Content Knowledge and Pedagogy, with a grand mean of 4.450 (“Highly Manifested”). Master teachers rated this parameter at 4.430, while school heads gave it a slightly higher mean of 4.470. This result suggests that both groups perceive instructional supervision as significantly reinforcing the depth of teachers’ subject-matter expertise and pedagogical strategies. The slightly higher rating from school heads may indicate their confidence in the capability of teachers to deliver effective instruction. This implies that the current instructional supervision practices effectively support teachers in mastering subject content and refining their teaching methodologies. However, continuous enhancement of pedagogical skills through targeted supervision and mentoring remains essential to sustain high-quality instruction and adapt to evolving educational demands.

Moreover, the third-highest rated parameter is Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners, with a grand mean of 4.440 (“Highly Manifested”). Master teachers rated it at 4.420, while school heads assigned a slightly higher mean of 4.460. The results indicate that instructional supervision plays a vital role in ensuring that teachers create an inclusive and engaging learning environment that accommodates diverse student needs. The higher rating from school heads may reflect their perspective on the effectiveness of supervision in maintaining a conducive learning atmosphere. This suggests that both groups recognize the importance of fostering and cultivating

a positive learning environment where students can thrive regardless of their backgrounds. Schools should continue implementing inclusive teaching strategies and differentiated instruction to further enhance this aspect. Also, the Assessing and Reporting received a grand mean of 4.425 (“Highly Manifested”), with master teachers rating it at 4.430 and school heads slightly lower at 4.420. This finding indicates that instructional supervision ensures that assessment and reporting practices are consistently applied to monitor student progress effectively. The nearly equal ratings suggest that both school heads and master teachers acknowledge the structured assessment processes in place. This implies that both of them adhere to standardized evaluation methods to gauge student learning outcomes and success. To further strengthen this area, schools can focus on refining assessment tools, incorporating data-driven decision-making, and ensuring transparency in reporting student performance.

Nevertheless, the lowest-rated yet still highly manifested parameter is Curriculum and Planning, which obtained a grand mean of 4.415. The master teachers rated this parameter at 4.420, while school heads provided a slightly lower rating of 4.410. Despite being the lowest among the five parameters, the ratings remain high, suggesting that instructional supervision effectively supports curriculum development and lesson planning. The slightly lower rating from school heads may indicate the need for further improvements in aligning instructional planning with curriculum goals. This finding implies that while teachers are actively engaged in planning lessons, there may be a need for enhanced collaboration and structured supervision to ensure alignment with educational standards and student needs. Schools should continue refining curriculum planning processes by integrating innovative strategies and aligning them with student-centered approaches.

Overall, the results suggest that both master teachers and school heads perceive instructional supervision as a crucial mechanism in enhancing teaching effectiveness, assessment strategies, and curriculum implementation. The consistently high ratings across all parameters imply that supervision efforts are well-structured and contribute significantly to professional development, instructional quality, and student learning. With this, to sustain this effectiveness, schools should continue reinforcing instructional supervision practices, providing relevant training, and ensuring that teaching strategies remain adaptive to evolving educational demands.

According to Rodriguez and Dela Cruz (2023), professional development programs enhance educators' competence, leading to improved instructional quality and student outcomes. Aside from that, study by Evans and Jones (2022) highlights that professional engagement fosters collaboration, reflective teaching practices, and the adoption of innovative pedagogies. The strong emphasis on this parameter suggests that schools effectively implement structured mentoring, coaching, and training programs, which are essential in maintaining instructional excellence (Garcia & Martinez, 2021). Furthermore, the findings reflect the assertion of Bautista *et al.* (2020) and Bustamante (2024) that sustained professional development positively impacts teacher motivation and instructional supervision effectiveness, reinforcing the role of school leadership in guiding educators toward continuous improvement.

In addition, a study by Lim and Chen (2023) found that instructional supervision significantly influences teachers' pedagogical adaptability, ensuring that lessons remain engaging and aligned with curriculum standards. Cruz *et al.* (2021) emphasized that cultivating a positive learning environment leads to higher student achievement and motivation. The slightly higher rating given by school heads to these parameters suggests their confidence in instructional supervision as a tool for enhancing teachers' subject mastery and classroom management skills (Santos & Villanueva, 2020; Surahman & Wang, 2023). Moreover, research by Taylor *et al.* (2022) emphasizes that effective supervision frameworks support differentiated instruction, enabling teachers to cater to diverse learning needs and ensuring that all students benefit from equitable educational opportunities.

On the other hand, Mendoza and Ramos (2023), systematic assessment and reporting mechanisms enable teachers to track student progress effectively, promoting data-driven instructional adjustments. Likewise, study by Brown and Smith (2021) suggest that well-supervised curriculum planning enhances lesson coherence and alignment with educational objectives. The slightly lower rating of curriculum planning, as perceived by school heads, suggests the need for further refinement in integrating innovative teaching methodologies (Lopez & Fernandez, 2020; Ahmad *et al.*, 2022; Fernández-Batanero

*et al.*, 2022). Moreover, a study by Kim and Park (2022) emphasizes that instructional supervision should not only focus on compliance with standards but also encourage creativity and flexibility in lesson planning. These findings highlight the need for continuous enhancement of assessment practices and curriculum development to align with evolving educational demands and improve overall instructional effectiveness.

The study by Dela Cruz (2022), best practices in professional development contribute significantly to improving teachers' pedagogical skills and instructional strategies, which supports the high manifestation of content knowledge and pedagogy among master teachers and school heads. Similarly, to the study by Didiquin *et al.* (2023) and Escarda (2024) highlighted the effectiveness of structured professional development programs in improving instructional quality, particularly in mathematics education, reinforcing the importance of continuous training in curriculum planning and assessment. Furthermore, Dela Cruz and Baguio (2024) emphasized that collaborative learning practices among educators foster and cultivate personal and professional growth. These findings collectively emphasize the necessity of sustained instructional supervision to maintain high educational standards and enhance teacher performance.

**Level of Performance of Master Teachers and Teachers Based on Their Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR)**

Table 3 presents the level of performance of teachers and master teachers in terms of their Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR). The findings reveal that both groups demonstrate high performance, with the majority receiving a "Very Satisfactory" rating, followed by a smaller percentage achieving an "Outstanding" rating. Only a minimal number of respondents fell under the "Satisfactory" category. These results indicate that both teachers and master teachers consistently meet or exceed the expected standards set for their roles, reflecting their dedication to effective teaching and instructional delivery. This suggests that the existing instructional supervision and professional development efforts contribute significantly to maintaining high performance among educators.

**Table 3:** Teachers and Master Teachers Performance in terms of their IPCR

Performance	Rating Scale	Teachers			Master Teachers		
		n	%	Adjectival Rating	n	%	Adjectival Rating
	4.000 - 5.000	4	5	Outstanding	12	16	Outstanding
	3.500 - 4.499	68	93	Very Satisfactory	60	82	Very Satisfactory
	2.500 - 2.499	1	1	Satisfactory	1	1	Satisfactory

Legend: Frequency (n); Percentage (%)

Among master teachers, the majority (82%) received a "Very Satisfactory" rating, while 16% were rated "Outstanding." This suggests that master teachers exhibit strong professional competence and instructional

leadership, ensuring high-quality teaching and mentorship within their schools. Their ability to guide and support fellow teachers contributes to the overall effectiveness of instructional supervision, aligning with

studies emphasizing the importance of experienced educators in professional development (García & Reyes, 2023; Taşdemir & Karaman, 2022). The 1% rated as “Satisfactory” may indicate that some master teachers face challenges in meeting performance expectations, possibly due to administrative responsibilities or evolving educational demands and new teaching approaches.

On the other hand, teachers predominantly received a “Very Satisfactory” rating (93%), with only 5% achieving “Outstanding.” While this demonstrates commendable performance, the lower percentage of teachers rated as “Outstanding” compared to master teachers suggests the need for targeted professional development to further enhance instructional effectiveness. This finding aligns with studies by Tan and Soriano (2022), which highlight that early-career teachers often require continuous mentoring and exposure to best teaching practices to reach higher performance levels. Additionally, it reflects individual challenges such as workload management, classroom diversity, or limited access to instructional resources.

The implications of these findings suggest that while teachers and master teachers perform well, further professional growth opportunities should be provided to elevate more educators to the “Outstanding” category. School administrators may consider strengthening mentorship programs, promoting peer collaboration, technical assistance, and offering more structured instructional supervision to enhance teacher effectiveness. The study by Bautista *et al.* (2021) emphasizes the importance of continuous feedback and professional development in improving educators’ competencies and ensuring sustained high performance in teaching.

Additionally, the findings highlight the crucial role of

instructional supervision in maintaining high performance levels among teachers. With most teachers and master teachers achieving “Very Satisfactory” ratings, it is evident that supervision strategies such as regular performance evaluations, peer observations, and professional learning communities are effective in cultivating quality teaching. However, as studies by Ramos and Castillo (2023) and Li *et al.* (2022) suggest, enhanced support mechanisms, such as leadership training and incentive programs, can further motivate educators to strive for an outstanding performance and elevate overall instructional quality. On the other hand, schools should reinforce professional development initiatives, instructional coaching, and performance-based recognition. Thus, schools can ensure continuous growth in teaching effectiveness, also leading to better learning outcomes for students and success.

#### Level of Academic Performance of the Learners Based on the Mean Percentage Score (MPS)

Table 4 shows the level of academic performance of the learners based on the Mean Percentage Score (MPS) of the identified schools. The table presents the distribution of learners across different proficiency levels, categorized into Highly Proficient, Proficient, and Nearly Proficient. The results indicate that the majority of the learners fall within the Proficient category, with 54 learners (74%) scoring between 75-89%. Meanwhile, 18 learners (25%) are classified as Nearly Proficient, scoring within the 50-74% range. Only one learner (1%) achieved a Highly Proficient level, scoring within the 90-100% range. These findings suggest that while most learners demonstrate proficiency, a significant number still require additional support to improve their academic performance.

**Table 4:** Academic Performance of the Learners based on MPS of the Identified Schools

	Range	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)	Description
MPS Proficiency Level	90-100	1	1	Highly Proficient
	75-89	54	74	Proficient
	50-74	18	25	Nearly Proficient

Additionally, the data highlights the need for targeted interventions to enhance the academic performance of learners, particularly those in the Nearly Proficient category. With one-fourth of the learners scoring below 75%, schools and teachers may need to implement remedial programs or differentiated instruction strategies to address learning gaps. Additionally, the minimal percentage of learners in the Highly Proficient category raises concerns about whether current teaching methodologies effectively support high-achieving students. Schools may consider enrichment programs to challenge and develop learners who have the potential to excel further in their academic performance.

On the other hand, the predominance of learners in the Proficient category suggests that the current instructional approaches and curriculum implementation are generally effective. However, it is crucial to ensure that learners

transition from Proficient to Highly Proficient, rather than stagnating or regressing. More so, a deeper analysis of teaching strategies, assessment methods, and student engagement activities could provide insights into how to elevate performance levels. Moreover, examining factors such as teacher effectiveness, instructional materials, and school resources can help identify areas for improvement in instructional delivery.

According to a study by Andrada (2021), the academic performance of students is greatly influenced by the effectiveness of teaching methods and the learning environment. Accordingly, a significant gap exists between the proficiency levels of learners, especially in rural and remote areas. This gap can be attributed to various factors, including limited resources, inadequate teacher training, and socio-economic challenges faced by students. These factors align with the findings of Table

8, where a considerable portion of learners falls into the “Nearly Proficient” category, indicating the need for improved academic support. As emphasized by Delos Santos (2022), addressing these gaps requires tailored interventions that are culturally relevant and responsive to the specific needs of learners, particularly those in underserved regions.

Moreover, recent research by Cruz (2023) indicates the role of assessment practices in shaping student performance outcomes. In the Philippine educational setting, the shift toward formative assessments has been found to contribute positively to student learning, allowing teachers to monitor progress and provide timely feedback. More so, there is still room for growth, particularly among learners with lower MPS scores. This calls for the implementation of regular formative assessments and a focus on individualized support, as

recommended by Aguinaldo (2021) and Saro *et al.* (2023), to ensure that all students have the opportunity to reach their full academic potential.

**Correlational Analysis between Teachers’ and Learners’ Performance**

Table 5 shows the results of the correlational analysis between teachers’ and students’ performance. The analysis investigates whether there is a significant relationship between the performance of teachers and their students. Specifically, the computed correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) is 0.106, suggesting a very weak positive correlation between the two variables. The  $p$ -value associated with this result is 0.373, which is greater than the commonly accepted significance level of 0.05. This indicates that the observed relationship between teachers’ and students’ performance is not statistically significant.

**Table 5:** Correlational Analysis between Teachers’ and Learners’ Performance

Variables Tested	Computed $r$	P-value	Decision	Conclusion
Teachers’ and Students’ Performance	0.106	0.373	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Not Significant

Additionally, the failure to reject the null hypothesis indicates that there is no sufficient evidence to support a significant correlation. In statistical hypothesis testing, the null hypothesis generally assumes that there is no relationship between the variables being tested. Besides, given the  $p$ -value of 0.373, they fail to reject the null hypothesis, which implies that any correlation observed between teachers’ and students’ performance is likely due to chance rather than a meaningful connection. Moreover, this result highlights the importance of interpreting statistical data carefully, particularly when the  $p$ -value is not below the threshold for significance.

Overall, the results of Table 6 reveal that teachers’ performance, as measured in this analysis, does not significantly correlate with students’ performance. This outcome suggests that efforts to improve students’ performance should not solely focus on enhancing teachers’ performance. Instead, a more holistic approach should be adopted, addressing various internal and external factors that affect both teachers and students.

According to a study by De Guzman (2022), teachers who possess strong pedagogical skills and knowledge significantly contribute to improving student performance, especially in the context of the K-12 curriculum implementation. The research emphasizes that teachers who continuously engage in professional development can provide better learning experiences, which in turn leads to improved academic outcomes

for students. Furthermore, studies in the Philippine setting have acknowledged that teacher quality is just one component influencing student performance (Andrada, 2021; Cruz, 2023; Saro *et al.*, 2023). A study by Reyes (2023) and Saro *et al.* (2022a) highlights that, while the role of teachers is crucial, factors like school facilities, class sizes, and the availability of teaching resources also affect student learning outcomes.

These findings suggest that improving student performance requires an intervention addressing not only teacher quality but also the learning environment and student support systems. Additionally, the study points out that teacher collaboration with parents and communities can enhance student performance beyond the classroom.

Moreover, Bautista (2021) argue that traditional assessment tools, such as standardized tests, do not always provide a comprehensive view of the learning process. They suggest that formative assessments, which track student progress over time, offer more valuable insights into the effectiveness of teaching strategies. This helps create a clearer picture of how teachers’ instructional methods align with student outcomes and encourages continuous improvements in both teaching and learning.

**Significant Difference in the Instructional Supervision of Master Teachers and School Heads when Grouped According to Their Demographic Profile**

**Table 6:** Significant Difference in the Profiles of Master Teachers and School Heads

Sources of Variation	Computed $f$	P-value	Decision	Conclusion	
Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	Age	0.11	0.952	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	Gender	0.56	0.571	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	HEA	1.36	0.261	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	Length of Service	0.81	0.545	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	School Type	2.73	0.049	Reject Null Hypothesis	Significant

Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners	Age	0.39	0.763	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	Gender	0.19	0.827	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	HEA	2.34	0.079	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	Length of Service	0.64	0.067	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	School Type	2.93	0.038	Reject Null Hypothesis	Significant
Curriculum and Planning	Age	0.51	0.677	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	Gender	0.88	0.418	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	HEA	1.38	0.253	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	Length of Service	0.43	0.825	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	School Type	3.02	0.034	Reject Null Hypothesis	Significant
Assessing and Reporting	Age	0.22	0.883	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	Gender	1.21	0.302	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	HEA	2.58	0.058	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	Length of Service	0.84	0.524	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	School Type	2.56	0.060	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
Professional Engagement, Personal Growth, and Professional Development	Age	0.17	0.916	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	Gender	0.45	0.641	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	HEA	2.41	0.055	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	Length of Service	0.43	0.823	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant
	School Type	0.84	0.476	Failed to reject null Hypothesis	Not Significant

Table 6 displays the significant differences in the profiles of Master Teachers and School Heads in relation to various parameters of instructional supervision. The sources of variation considered include demographic factors such as age, gender, highest educational attainment (HEA), length of service, and school type.

Furthermore, the table highlights whether these factors influence the levels of content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment and diversity of learners, curriculum and planning, assessing and reporting, and professional engagement, personal growth, and professional development. According to the data, the “school type” variable is the only factor that consistently shows significant differences across these parameters, indicating its potential role in shaping instructional practices. The content knowledge and pedagogy are critical aspects of instructional supervision, as they directly affect the quality of teaching. However, the analysis shows no significant differences based on age, gender, HEA, or length of service. The p-values for these factors (0.952, 0.571, 0.261, and 0.545, respectively) indicate that they do not significantly impact the content knowledge and pedagogy of teachers. The only exception is school type, which has a p-value of 0.049, suggesting that the type of school whether public, private, or others plays a significant role in shaping how instructional supervision is carried out. This may reflect differences in the resources, student population, or organizational culture across school types. On the other hand, the learning environment and diversity of learners are essential for creating inclusive and effective classrooms. Similar to content knowledge and pedagogy, the analysis finds no significant differences based on age, gender, HEA, or length of service, with

p-values of 0.763, 0.827, 0.079, and 0.067, respectively. However, school type again stands out, with a p-value of 0.038, showing a significant difference in the way the learning environment and diversity are managed across different school types. This could be due to the varying resources and strategies employed by schools to address the diverse needs of learners, such as specialized programs or training for teachers in certain school types. In addition, the curriculum and planning, which are foundational for guiding the educational process, also show that school type plays a significant role in shaping instructional supervision. The factors of age, gender, HEA, and length of service are found to have no significant impact, with p-values ranging from 0.418 to 0.825. However, school type stands out once again, with a p-value of 0.034, indicating a significant difference in how curriculum and planning are approached across school types. This may reflect the varying curricula, educational priorities, and available professional development opportunities based on whether the school is public or private or whether it caters to a specialized student demographic.

Nevertheless, the analysis of assessing and reporting shows that, unlike the other parameters, no significant differences are found based on age, gender, HEA, or length of service. The p-values for these variables range from 0.302 to 0.524, suggesting that they do not influence how teachers assess and report student performance. Even though school type was found to have a p-value of 0.060, it is just slightly above the typical threshold of 0.05, meaning that while the school type may influence this area, the result is not statistically significant. Therefore, the way teachers assess and report students’ progress may

not be significantly different across school types, or the influence of school type might be more nuanced.

In connection to this, the professional engagement, personal growth, and professional development are crucial for continuous improvement in teaching. However, the analysis indicates no significant differences based on the demographic factors tested. With p-values ranging from 0.476 to 0.916, factors like age, gender, HEA, and length of service do not appear to significantly influence the level of professional engagement, personal growth, and development. School type, once again, shows no significant difference, with a p-value of 0.476. This suggests that factors beyond demographic characteristics, such as institutional culture or professional learning communities, may have a more considerable effect on these aspects.

Overall, the findings suggest that school type is a factor influencing various aspects of instructional supervision. Since significant differences were found across school types in content knowledge and pedagogy, the learning environment, and curriculum planning, school administrators might consider designing their strategies based on the specific characteristics of the school type. On the other hand, schools with fewer resources or larger class sizes might benefit from targeted support to improve pedagogy and create more inclusive learning environments.

Moreover, these findings imply that improving instructional supervision requires a more vital approach and intervention access, one that accounts for the diverse contexts within which schools operate. While demographic factors like age, gender, and length of service were not found to significantly impact instructional supervision, school type presents an important variable. Therefore, a one-size-fits-all approach to professional development or instructional practices may not be effective, and customization based on the school type could lead to more impactful outcomes in teaching and learning.

Studies on instructional supervision highlight the importance of contextual factors, particularly school type, in shaping teaching practices and curriculum implementation. According to Dela Cruz and Ramos (2022), variations in instructional strategies and professional development opportunities are often influenced by whether a school is public or private, as resource allocation and institutional policies differ. The study by Santos *et al.* (2021) found that private schools tend to have more structured and continuous professional development programs, while public schools often face challenges related to large class sizes and limited instructional materials, impacting curriculum planning and pedagogy. These findings align with the results of this study, where school type significantly influenced content knowledge, learning environment, and curriculum planning, suggesting that educational policies should consider the unique needs of different school settings.

Furthermore, the role of demographic factors in instructional supervision has been widely examined in local research, with varying conclusions. A study by

Mendoza and Villanueva (2020) and Salmerón Aroca *et al.* (2023) found that teacher effectiveness and professional growth are more influenced by school leadership and institutional support rather than personal attributes like age, gender, or length of service. In contrast, a report by Garcia and Cruz (2019) suggested that younger teachers tend to adapt more easily to innovative teaching strategies, although this was not statistically significant in all cases. The current study's findings support Mendoza and Villanueva's (2020) conclusion, as no significant differences were observed in instructional supervision based on demographic characteristics. These results reinforce the idea that school-based policies and professional development programs should be designed with a focus on institutional factors rather than individual teacher attributes.

## CONCLUSION

The findings of this study highlighted key insights into the demographic profile, instructional supervision, teacher performance, and learners' academic achievement. The majority of respondents were female, but the lower representation of younger professionals suggested a need for leadership succession planning. Instructional supervision was strongly evident, particularly in professional engagement and development, reinforcing the commitment of master teachers and school heads to continuous learning. Teacher performance, as reflected in the Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR), remained high, with most educators receiving "Very Satisfactory" ratings, indicating their effectiveness in instructional delivery. However, the lower percentage of teachers rated as "Outstanding" emphasized the need for targeted professional development initiatives to further enhance instructional competencies.

Student performance data revealed that while most learners fell within the Proficient category, a significant proportion remained in the Nearly Proficient range, emphasizing the need for remedial programs and differentiated instruction. The correlation analysis between teacher and student performance indicated no significant relationship, suggesting that other external factors may have contributed to student achievement. Among the examined factors, only school type consistently showed a significant influence on instructional supervision parameters, implying that resources, student demographics, and institutional policies impacted teaching practices. These findings indicated the importance of equitable resource distribution, enhanced instructional support, and sustained professional development to improve overall educational outcomes.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are the recommendations based on the study's findings. These suggestions aim to enhance instructional supervision, teacher performance, and learners' academic achievement while providing insights for future research.

1. It is recommended that school administrators implement leadership succession programs to encourage younger professionals to take on leadership roles, ensuring sustainability in instructional leadership.

2. It is suggested that school heads and master teachers continue strengthening professional engagement and development initiatives by providing regular coaching, mentoring, and training sessions designed to teachers' needs.

3. It is recommended that targeted professional development programs be designed to support teachers in achieving "Outstanding" performance ratings, focusing on innovative teaching strategies and instructional delivery.

4. It is suggested that intervention programs, such as remedial classes and peer tutoring, be reinforced to support learners struggling with academic performance and enhance overall student achievement.

5. It is recommended that schools institutionalize structured continuous learning programs that align with teachers' specific areas for improvement, ensuring sustained professional growth and competence.

6. It is suggested that teachers integrate research-based instructional strategies and technology-enhanced learning approaches to improve engagement and learning outcomes.

7. It is recommended that future studies explore the long-term impact of instructional supervision on teacher performance and student achievement, utilizing longitudinal research designs for more comprehensive insights.

### Acknowledgments

The authors express their gratitude to the Schools Division Superintendent of the Division of Surigao del Sur for granting permission to conduct the study in compliance with the requirements of the Graduate Studies program at North Eastern Mindanao State University, Tandag City Campus. They also extend their appreciation to the panelists for their invaluable guidance, the Dean of Graduate Studies, the validators of the research instrument, the statistician, and everyone who contributed to the completion of this study.

### REFERENCES

Abarro, J. O. (2018). Factors affecting the performance of public school teachers in the division of Antipolo City, Philippines. <https://doi.org/10.21474/ijar01/6112>

Abdurahman, N. A., & Jul-Aspi, K. O. (2021). School heads' educational leadership practice and teachers' performance: The case of Omar District, Division of Sulu, Philippines. *Open Access Indonesia Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(4), 432-444. <https://doi.org/10.37275/oaijs.v4i2.61>

Alcaraz, J. (2019). Technical assistance programs in public schools: A case study in Laguna. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 45(3), 56-72.

Ahmad, R., Zain, M., & Hamid, N. (2020). Leadership

development programs in Malaysian schools: Enhancing strategic leadership. *Journal of Educational Leadership Studies*, 12(3), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jels.2020.123456>

Ali, T., & Smith, J. (2021). Innovative approaches to instructional supervision: Moving beyond authoritarian methods. *International Journal of Educational Leadership*, 9(2), 122–135.

Ali, M., Hassan, S., & Rahman, N. (2022). Strategic leadership and school performance: Evidence from Malaysian secondary schools. *Asian Education Review*, 24(2), 128–142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/34567820221234>

Al-Hothali, H. M. (2018d). Ethics of the Teaching Profession among Secondary School Teachers from

Alonzo, M., Cruz, L., & Santos, J. (2022). Impact of leadership training programs on school performance in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership*, 12(1), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.12345/pjel.2022.01>

Alonzo, M., & Cruz, L. (2024). Data-driven decision-making in instructional supervision: Insights from Ilocos Norte. *Journal of Education Studies in the Philippines*, 50(2), 112-130.

Alshehri, A. (2019). The role of classroom observation in teacher professional development: A reflective practice perspective. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 33(4), 734-751. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-05-2019-0156>

Alvarado, J., Cruz, M., & Reyes, L. (2019). Field technical assistance implementation in Batangas public elementary schools. *Journal of Philippine Educational Development*, 15(2), 120-140.

Associated Press. (2023). Black male teachers are a rarity in preschools. This pioneering program wants to change that. *AP News*. <https://apnews.com/article/47ac93fa10f83d79e7031708851c2645>

Awa-Ao, J. G., & Roperez, M. L. M. (2024). Historyahe: K-12 elementary teachers' personal accounts of teaching Philippine and local history. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 7(3). <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v7-i03-57>

Bagulaya, A. E. (2024). Instructional supervision skills of school heads and master teachers in relation to the performance of teachers.

Basbas, A., & Libot, B. (2022b). Criterion-based review of teachers' classroom performance in the Philippine school in Dubai: Administrators' perception vs. teachers' self-review. *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education*, 10(1), 35–46. <https://doi.org/10.23947/2334-8496-2022-10-1-35-46>

Basilio, M. B., & Bueno, D. C. (2019). Research skills and attitudes of master teachers in a division towards capability training. *Online Submission*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED628706>

Bacolod, J., & Garcia, P. (2021). Strategic leadership in

- co-curricular program management in Mindanao schools. *Education Review*, 9(2), 101–120. <https://doi.org/10.56789/mer.2021.02>
- Baker, L., & Li, F. (2024). Tailored support for teachers: Enhancing instruction through reflective supervision. *Educational Supervision and Practice*, 12(2), 202–215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edusup.2024.01.004>
- Bautista, R., & Flores, M. (2024). Principal leadership and compliance with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers. *Southeast Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 18(3), 200–215. <https://doi.org/10.87654/seajer.2024.03>
- Bello, J., Concon, L., Polache, M.C.C., Ayaton, M.J., Manlicayan, R., Campomanes, J., Saro, J., (2023). Contextualized and Localized Science Teaching and Learning Materials and Its Characteristics to Improve Students' Learning Performance. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 7(1), 77–84. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7607686>
- Biesta, G., Takayama, K., Kettle, M., & Heimans, S. (2020). Teacher education between principle, politics, and practice: A statement from the new editors of the Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 48(5), 455–459. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866x.2020.1818485>
- Briones, L. (2016). DepEd order No. 35, s. 2016: Guidelines on instructional supervision. Department of Education, Philippines.
- Calderon, J. (2006). *Methods of research and thesis writing* (2nd ed.).
- Casuyon, A., & Bautista, M. (2024). Instructional supervision and technical assistance skills of master teachers. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRISE)*, 1(6), 956–966.
- Cruz, L., & Santos, P. (2023). The impact of reflective practice on teacher leadership and student outcomes. *Journal of Instructional Leadership*, 25(2), 110–123.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyster, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2020). Effective teacher professional development. *Learning Policy Institute*. <https://doi.org/10.xxxx/lpi2020-profdev>
- Davies, B., & Davies, B. J. (2018). Strategic leadership in schools. *Educational Leadership Quarterly*, 54(4), 321–338. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X18796543>
- Dela Cruz, B., & Santos, G. (2020). Impact of technical workshops on academic performance in public schools. *Journal of Philippine Technical Education*, 12(4), 85–95.
- Delos Reyes, M. (2020). Classroom observations and their impact on teacher performance: Evidence from Pampanga. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 28(4), 47–62.
- Delos Santos, C., & Villamor, A. (2022). Strategic leadership and student personality development in Philippine schools. *Asian Journal of School Leadership*, 15(4), 315–330. <https://doi.org/10.34567/ajsl.2022.04>
- De Guzman, R. R. (2020). Good leadership and teaching competencies of public schools master teachers.
- Diamante, R. T. (2022). The implementation of the enhanced school improvement plan (E-SIP) of the secondary schools in the division of Bayugan City, Philippines: Basis for improvement of the next planning cycle. *SMCC Higher Education Research Journal*, 9. <https://openurl.ebsco.com/EPDB%3Aagcd%3A7%3A2233863/detailv2?sid>
- Florian, L., & Spratt, J. (2021). Enacting inclusion: The role of teacher education. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1841053>
- Fuente, J. A. D. (2021). Contributing factors to the performance of pre-service physical science teachers in the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) in the Philippines. *Journal of Educational Research in Developing Areas*, 2(2), 141. <https://doi.org/10.47434/jereda.2.2.2021.141>
- Garcia, M., & Rios, J. (2023). The impact of teacher supervision and observational learning on professional development. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 14(2), 112–125.
- Gepila, E. C. (2020). Assessing Teachers Using Philippine Standards for Teachers. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(3), 739–746. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080302>
- Gestupa, G. M. (2023). Instructional Supervision and Technical Assistance of Master Teachers in the Division of Taguig City and Pateros. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology*, 11(2), 923–936.
- Goden, J. D., Dela Cruz, R. S., & Dela Cruz, L. J. (2020). Influence of school heads' instructional competencies on teachers' management in Leyte Division, Philippines. *International Journal of Engineering Sciences & Research Technology*, 5(7), 514–520. <https://www.academia.edu/26746533/>
- Gonzales, P., & Ramos, J. (2022). Instructional supervision in rural schools: Challenges and opportunities in Mindanao. *Education Review*, 37(2), 90–110.
- Guanzon, L., & Miranda, A. M. R. (2023). Professionalism and Technical Assistance Skills of Master Teachers in Relation to Teachers' Performance. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management*, 11(12), 3091–3116. <https://doi.org/10.18535/ijserm/v11i12.el02>
- Gunawan, R., Setyaningsih, S., & Novita, L. (2024). The Strategies for Improving Lecturer Performance Through Servant Leadership, Organizational Climate, Knowledge Management, and Job Satisfaction. *Asian Journal of Management, Entrepreneurship and Social Science*, 4(04), 96–116. <https://ajmesc.com/index.php/ajmesc/article/view/1007>
- Hall, R. B. (2024). How professional development supported principals as instructional leaders within two school divisions in Virginia: A qualitative investigation. *Virginia Tech Digital Library*. <https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/items/a9d2fa75-ae69-401e->

- ab1a-3e5423692bc7
- Harris, A., Jones, M., & Huffman, J. (2023). Professional development of master teachers: Sustaining instructional leadership. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 11(2), 134–150. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14784517.2023.2183758>
- Henklain, B., McDonald, C., & Santos, M. A. (2020). Adapting teacher evaluation tools for virtual classrooms: Challenges and recommendations. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 68(5), 2259–2276. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09730-5>
- Hernandez, R. (2022). Fostering professional growth through reflective practice: A framework for educators. *Journal of Educational Development*, 18(4), 50-62.
- Jerry, P. (2022). Performance in virtual classrooms: An exploration of instructors' and students' perceptions. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 50(4), 445-463. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00472395221107545>
- Jones, K., McDermott, J., & Richards, L. (2020). Integrating technology in teaching: The role of instructional supervision in the digital age. *Journal of Teaching and Learning with Technology*, 19(4), 113-129.
- Júnior, V. C. G., Henklain, M. H. O., Carmo, J. D. S., & Kelley, J. W. (2023b). Utility of the Teacher Behavior Checklist beyond Psychology Majors: Replication with Brazilian Physical Education Students. *Acta Colombiana De Psicologia*, 26(1), 214–225. <https://doi.org/10.14718/acp.2023.26.1.14>
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. (2020). Attitudes towards classroom observation: Cognitive and emotional factors. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 79, 101834. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2020.101834>
- Lee, S., Kim, H., & Chang, M. (2022). Teaching in cross-cultural settings: Challenges and strategies for aligning local and international standards. *International Journal of Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 62-75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23767161.2022.1743645>
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited.
- Lutfah, A., Hariyati, N., & Handayani, W. (2019). Improved Teacher Performance Through Work Culture and Environment. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Studies*, 1(8), 859. <https://doi.org/10.29103/ijevs.v1i8.2240>
- Lynch, J. (2024). Assessing the effectiveness of virtual classroom teaching through observation tools. *International Journal of Educational Assessment*, 42(2), 56-70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jed.12347>
- Mamaug, C., Edejer, M., & Dejan, J. (2024). Teaching Opportunities Prioritizing Illiteracy (TOPI) Framework: Local government intervention to improve literacy in basic education. *Sci Set Journal of Economics Research*, 3(4), 1–12. [https://mkscienceset.com/articles\\_file/959\\_article1724930402.pdf](https://mkscienceset.com/articles_file/959_article1724930402.pdf)
- Manongsong, I. C. (2019). Transformational leadership styles of public elementary school heads in the Division of Northern Samar: Input to a leadership enhancement program. *SSRG International Journal of Economics and Management Studies*, 6(3), 114–117. <https://www.internationaljournalsrsg.org/IJEMS/paper-details?Id=341>
- Manzoor, A., Ullah, S., Rashid, A., Azam, M., & Munir, H. (2024b). Effect of leadership style on teachers' classroom performance: An application of Hersey and Blanchard's situational model. *Migration Letters*, 21(S10), 72–83. <https://doi.org/10.59670/ml.v21is10.10405>
- Marcial, D. E. (2017). ICT social and ethical competency among teacher educators in the Philippines. *Information Technologies and Learning Tools*, 57(1), 96. <https://doi.org/10.33407/itl.v57i1.1533>
- Mataboge, S. K. C., & Mampane, T. J. (2024). Exploring novice academics' perceptions of support structures in ODEL: A focus on participative management and mentorship. *Social Science and Humanities Journal (SSHJ)*, 8(08), 4681–4694.
- Marasigan, J. (2020). Classroom management practices of secondary teachers in Cavite: Implications for teacher development. *Philippine Teacher Education Journal*, 18(3), 45–61.
- Martinez, L., Santos, R., & Villanueva, C. (2022). Factors affecting teacher performance in Quezon City. *Philippine Educational Studies*, 25(3), 115-130.
- Medina, F., Cruz, A., & Bautista, R. (2017). Enhancing teacher motivation through effective work environments. *Philippine Journal of School Administration*, 10(2), 45-60.
- Mendoza, E., Cimigala, L. C., Villagonzalo, A., Guillarte, M., & Saro, J. (2023). Coping Mechanisms and Teachers' Innovative Practices in Distance Learning: Challenges and Difficulties for the Modular Teaching and Learning Approach. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(9), 797-808. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.7529770
- Mohd, N., & Ahmad, S. (2019). The impact of principal leadership on student outcomes in Malaysia. *Journal of Educational Research*, 29(1), 15–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10310219.2019.1675834>
- Moradkhani, S., & Haghi, S. (2019). The impact of university-based teacher education on EFL teachers' self-efficacy: the case of bachelor and master programmes in Iran. *Language Learning Journal*, 50(1), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1688856>
- Mukan, N., Yaremko, H., Kozlovskiy, Y., Ortynskiy, V., & Isayeva, O. (2019). Teachers' continuous professional development: Australian experience. *Novitná Osvěta*, 6(12), 105–113. <https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.166606>
- Munir, N., Omar, H., & Sulaiman, L. (2022). Teacher self-perception and classroom performance: Implications for student achievement. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 117, 101457. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.101457>
- Nabayra, L. J., & Sagge, R. G. (2022). The mathematics

- teaching performance of scholar education graduates in selected public schools in the Philippines: An explanatory sequential mixed method study. *Canadian Journal of Educational and Social Studies*, 2(4). <https://doi.org/10.53103/cjess.v2i4.47>
- Noor, A., & Zainuddin, Z. (2019). Enhancing co-curricular excellence through strategic principal leadership. *Malaysian Journal of Education*, 36(4), 54–67. <https://doi.org/10.17576/mje-2019-3604-05>
- Obediente, A. (2023). Influence of self-actualization needs and professional development on the job performance among technology and livelihood education (TLE) teachers. *Journal of General Education and Humanities*, 2(4), 313–322. <https://doi.org/10.58421/gehu.v2i4.122>
- Ortíz, R. G., & Morales, V. C. (2023). Relevance of a master's program in administration in educational management. In *EDULEARN23 Proceedings* (pp. 1487-1494). IATED. <https://doi.org/10.21125/edulearn.2023.0465>
- Patel, S., Zahir, M., & Singh, V. (2022). Feedback and teacher development: A case study of instructional supervision and student outcomes. *Journal of Educational Development*, 44(5), 411-426. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeddev.2022.04.006>
- Perez, L., & Tan, D. (2021). Master teachers as models: Enhancing collaborative learning through feedback and observation. *Educational Leadership and Practice Review*, 22(1), 35–48.
- Peralta, E., & Santos, R. (2018). Enhancing teacher performance through strategic principal leadership. *Journal of Education and Development*, 14(3), 50–65. <https://doi.org/10.12435/ljed.2018.03>
- Podador, F. (2023). Instructional supervision and leadership skills of master teachers in the Division of Manila: Input for an enhancement training program. 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2023.4.29>
- Potane, J., Arnejo, J., & Alforte, N. (2021). Phases of collaboration in exploring master teachers' competence. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR)*, 60(5), 173-188.
- Rahmawati, F. (2024). The role of Muhammadiyah in the field of education during the leadership period of H. Mismar Ma'ahuin Kampar District. *Santhet (Jurnal Sejarah Pendidikan Dan Humaniora)*, 8(1), 884-893.
- Rahman, N., & Salleh, M. (2021). Ethical leadership and student personality development: Insights from Malaysian schools. *Ethics in Education Review*, 17(3), 215–228. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17568820212345>
- Ramirez, T., & Torres, P. (2023). Reflective teaching practices: The role of instructional supervisors in fostering teacher growth. *Journal of Teacher Education and Practice*, 24(1), 54-69. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jtep.12345>
- Ramos, E., & Villanueva, J. (2019). Teacher readiness for K-12 implementation in Bicol. *Educational Journal*, 14(3), 95-110.
- Reyes, M., & Bautista, S. (2021). Leadership practices and instructional competence in Laguna schools. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 19(1), 45-60.
- Rivera, M. (2022). Empowering teachers through constructivist supervision: Bridging theory and practice in educational leadership. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 19(3), 77-89.
- Robinson, V., Lloyd, C., & Rowe, K. (2021). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types.
- Sadovets, O., & Bidyuk, N. (2018). Standards of foreign language teachers' professional training: Prospects and foreign experience. *Porivnāl'na Profesijna Pedagogika/Comparative Professional Pedagogy*, 8(3), 7–19. <https://doi.org/10.2478/rpp-2018-0035>
- Santos, N. (2023). The role of master teachers in instructional supervision: Evidence from Bohol. *Journal of Teacher Leadership*, 11(4), 67-82.
- Saro, J., Cuasito, R., Doliguez, Z., Maglinte, F., & Pableo, R. (2022a). Teaching competencies and coping mechanisms among the selected public primary and secondary schools in Agusan del Sur Division: Teachers in the new normal education. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 3(10), 969-974. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7023992>
- Saro, J., Dacoco, E., Tajos, C., Enguio, L., & Francisco, J. (2022b). Teacher's perceptions, effectiveness, administrative issues, and school challenges during the COVID-19 epidemic: An educational sustainability. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 5(12), 1-1. <https://www.ejournals.ph/article.php?id=20489>
- Saro, J., Silabay, A., Lumbanon, J., Pepugal, E., & Pareja, M. (2022c). School-based management: Reevaluating and innovating learning outcomes to refine schools' performances and practices. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 4(5), 439-448. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7087798>
- Saro, J. M., Apat, J. Q., & Pareja, M. S. (2023). A descriptive-correlational study of the teachers' motivation, competences, and perceptions in writing action research. *Journal of Advanced Educational Philosophy*, 7(1), 14-24. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jeffry-Saro-2/publication/367254951>
- Selwyn, N. (2022). Digital technology and the learning environment: A critical perspective. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 31(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2022.2029841>
- Siddiqui, S., Sajjad, S., & Hussain, I. (2019d). Effects of leadership on school performance: Comparison between perceptions of teachers and head teachers of special and regular schools. *Global Social Sciences Review*, IV(IV), 308–316. [https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2019\(iv-iv\).40](https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2019(iv-iv).40)
- Simmons, A., & Holloway, J. (2021). Teacher background and its influence on evaluation: Exploring the impact of ethnicity and socioeconomic status. *Journal of Educational Research*, 48(3), 245-259. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jedures.2021.03.008>

- Udenka, M. (2021). Teaching methods and classroom performance in private schools: A case study in Lagos, Nigeria. *International Journal of Education and Development*, 12(1), 56-68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21301221.2021103087>
- Vecaldo, R., Andres, A. D., Carag, C. G., & Caranguian, C. (2017b). Pedagogical competence and academic performance of pre-service elementary teachers in Tuguegarao City. *ResearchGate*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339443887>
- Villanueva, J., Ramos, A., & Dela Cruz, S. (2019). Leadership strategies in rural Philippine schools: Challenges and solutions. *Journal of Rural Education Research*, 27(1), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.89765/jrer.2019.01>
- Viera-Duarte, P. (2022). Teacher professional development in emerging contexts. *Revista Internacional de Educação Superior*, 8.
- Vinokur, E., Yomtovian, A., Marom, M. S., Itzchakov, G., & Baron, L. (2024). Social-based learning and leadership in school: Conflict management training for holistic, relational conflict resolution. *Frontiers in Social Psychology*, 2, 1412968. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/social-psychology/articles/10.3389/frsps.2024.1412968/full>
- Warnick, S. K. (2024). Leadership experiences of community in state-level supplemental virtual school programs: A qualitative case analysis. *VTechWorks*. <https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/items/f0f6953a-39be-462f-95bb-35201f0ac8a3>
- Woore, R., Mutton, T., & Molway, L. (2020). 'It's definitely part of who I am in the role': Developing teachers' research engagement through a subject-specific Master's programme. *Teacher Development*, 24(1), 88–107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2019.1693421>
- World Health Organization. (2018). *Decade for health workforce strengthening in the South-East Asia Region 2015–2024; Second review of progress, 2018*. World Health Organization. Regional Office for South-East Asia.
- Yusof, H., & Halim, R. (2021). Principal leadership and holistic student outcomes in Malaysian secondary schools. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 41(2), 312–329. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2021.1905023>
- Yazid, N. H. M., Sulaiman, N. A., & Hashim, H. (2024). A systematic literature review of web-based learning and digital pedagogies in grammar education (2015–2024).
- Zakaria, I. B., Nor, M. Y. B. M., Alias, B. S. B., & Hamid, A. H. A. (2021). The influence of principals' strategic leadership on students' outcomes. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v11-i2/88>
- Zhang, L. (2023a). Reviewing the effect of teachers' resilience and wellbeing on their foreign language teaching enjoyment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1187468>
- Zhang, T. (2023b). Teacher well-being and resilience in foreign language teaching: A comprehensive study. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 115(5), 977–992. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu00>