



INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND SUPERVISORY COMPETENCE OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL HEADS: A DESCRIPTIVE-CORRELATIONAL STUDY

Jelliza L. Gatil

Teacher

Department of Education, School Division of Samar

Email: jelliza.gatil@deped.gov.ph

Dr. Nimfa T. Torremoro

Dean, Graduate School

Samar Colleges, Inc.

Email: n.torremoro@yahoo.com

Corresponding Author:

Jelliza L. Gatil

Teacher

Department of Education, School Division of Samar

Email: jelliza.hatil@deped.gov.ph

Abstract: This descriptive-correlational study assessed the instructional leadership and supervisory competence of public elementary school heads in the Districts of Daram I, Daram II, Talalora, and Zumarraga, Schools Division of Samar, Philippines, during School Year 2023–2024, as perceived by the school heads themselves and by their teachers. Respondents comprised the complete population of 103 school heads and 187 teachers across the four districts, surveyed using a standard three-part questionnaire adapted from established instructional-leadership and supervisory-competence scales. School heads rated their own instructional leadership as “often” practiced across all four skill areas — resource provider, instructional resource provider, communicator, and visible presence in school — while teachers rated school heads even more favorably, including “always” for visible presence. Both groups rated supervisory competence (decision-making, planning and organizing, promoting optimal performance, and professional knowledge and expertise) as at least “highly competent,” with teachers again rating school heads higher than school heads rated themselves. Independent-samples t-tests showed statistically significant differences between school head and teacher perceptions for resource provider and visible presence (instructional leadership) and for all four supervisory-competence indicators, but not for instructional resource provider or communicator. No school head- or teacher-related profile variate (age, sex, civil status, income, education, tenure, training, or performance rating) was significantly associated with perceived instructional leadership or supervisory competence, and no significant relationship was found between school heads’ self-perceived supervisory competence and their instructional leadership. The findings point to a consistent perception gap: teachers view their school heads more favorably than the school heads view themselves, and suggest that leadership-development efforts should broaden beyond self-assessment to include structured teacher feedback and cross-skill (instructional and supervisory) capacity building.

Keywords: *instructional leadership, supervisory competence, school heads, public elementary schools, Philippines*



Introduction

Education is an investment that produces returns at both the individual and social levels, and its success depends on the people responsible for delivering it. Teachers are in the best position to affect students' well-being and achievement directly, but behind them are school heads who ensure that teachers are well supervised and pedagogically competent. The supervisory skills and instructional leadership of school heads are therefore key determinants of educational outcomes (Ampofo et al., 2019).

In the Philippine setting, Republic Act No. 9155, the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, mandates school heads as instructional leaders and administrative managers at the school level, responsible for delivering quality educational programs, implementing curricula, and encouraging staff development (Official Gazette, 2024). Department of Education (DepEd) Order No. 85, s. 2003 further specifies school heads' supervisory responsibilities (DepEd, 2003), while the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (RA 10533) and the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017) have raised the bar for both teacher quality and the instructional leadership expected of school heads (DepEd, 2020).

International assessments underscore the stakes. The 2018 Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) found Filipino students scoring well below OECD averages in reading, mathematics, and science (Danquah, 2019), while UNESCO's 2016 Education for All Global Monitoring Report estimated 250 million children worldwide leave school without mastering basic literacy and numeracy skills, underscoring the role of instructional leadership in improving educational quality (UNESCO, 2016).

Locally, the Schools Division of Samar requires school heads to provide at least 15 technical-assistance sessions to teachers per month, yet the 2018 Consolidated Quarterly Division Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adjustment (DMEA) report identified persistent constraints: insufficient skills and attitudes for providing instructional assistance, scheduling conflicts, and the geographic dispersion of satellite and cluster schools (Schools Division of Samar, 2018). A local study by Resco (2020) similarly found only moderate implementation of instructional supervision across the 29 districts of the Schools Division of Samar during SY 2019–2020, attributing the shortfall chiefly to distance and limited time for technical assistance. These persistent, research-documented gaps motivated the present study, which assessed the instructional leadership and supervisory competence of school heads in the Districts of Daram I, Daram II, Talalora, and Zumarraga, Schools Division of Samar, during SY 2023–2024.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

This study drew on three complementary theories. The Framework of Instructional Supervision Theory (Glickman et al., as cited in Chien-Chin, 2018) frames instructional supervision as a teaching-and-learning improvement strategy built on direct assistance, group development, professional development, curriculum development, and action research. The Transformational Leadership Process Theory (Tichy & Devanna, as cited in Crawford et al., 2003) casts the school head's instructional leadership as a process of influencing teachers toward a shared, forward-looking vision through recognizing the need for change, managing transitions, and institutionalizing new practice. Finally, Hallinger's Theory of Instructional Leadership Skills (as cited in Daing & Mustapha, 2019) organizes school-head leadership around three components — defining the school mission, managing the instructional program, and creating a positive school climate — operationalized through the four skills this study measured: resource provider, instructional resource provider, communicator, and visible presence in school.



The conceptual framework linked the profile of school head- and teacher-respondents to their perceptions of instructional leadership (four skills) and supervisory competence (four skills: decision-making, planning and organizing, promoting optimal performance, and professional knowledge and expertise), with comparative analyses (t-tests) used to test differences between school head and teacher perceptions, and correlational analyses (Chi-square/Cramer's V, Fisher's t) used to test relationships between perceptions and profile variates, and between instructional leadership and supervisory competence.

Objectives and Hypotheses

Specifically, the study sought to: (1) describe the profile of school head- and teacher-respondents; (2) determine the level of instructional leadership of school heads, as perceived by themselves and by teachers, along resource provider, instructional resource provider, communicator, and visible presence in school; (3) determine whether school head and teacher perceptions of instructional leadership differ significantly; (4) determine whether perceptions of instructional leadership relate significantly to school head- and teacher-related profile variates; (5) determine the level of supervisory competence of school heads, as perceived by themselves and by teachers, along decision-making, planning and organizing, promoting optimal performance, and professional knowledge and expertise; (6) determine whether school head and teacher perceptions of supervisory competence differ significantly; (7) determine whether perceptions of supervisory competence relate significantly to profile variates and to instructional leadership; and (8) propose an intervention program based on the findings.

Four corresponding null hypotheses were tested at $\alpha = 0.05$: (H_{01}) no significant difference between school head and teacher perceptions of instructional leadership along the four skills; (H_{02}) no significant relationship between perceived instructional leadership and school head- or teacher-related variates; (H_{03}) no significant difference between school head and teacher perceptions of supervisory competence along the four skills; and (H_{04}) no significant relationship between perceived supervisory competence and profile variates or instructional leadership.

Related Studies

Several Philippine and regional studies converge on the variates examined here. Daing and Mustapha (2019) found school administrators in NCR senior high schools rated themselves as effective instructional leaders while teachers expressed less confidence in their own instructional delivery, with a significant relationship between administrators' leadership skills and both teacher performance and self-efficacy. Aureada (2021) and Callao and Callao (2021) similarly examined school heads' instructional leadership practices — the former qualitatively, the latter quantitatively — without pairing it with supervisory competence, as the present study does. On the supervisory side, Mallari (2022) found non-principal school heads in Tarlac “proficient” in management and supervisory practice, with significant relationships between management-competence domains and supervisory practice; Encanto (2021) found school heads' supervisory functions “effective” and barriers to those functions “rarely observed”; Pastrano and Decano (2021) found administrators and teachers differed significantly in perceptions of motivational and supervisory competencies but not by profile variate; Guardacasa and Benavides (2020) documented outstanding-to-satisfactory supervisory performance across clinical supervision, professional development, curriculum development, and action research; and Delas Peñas and Salundaguit (2019) reported “very competent” school heads with moderate correlation between supervisory competence and teacher performance. Panol et al. (2020) additionally linked school heads' present position and number of supervised teachers to specific leadership and supervisory skills. Collectively, these studies establish the descriptive-correlational tradition this study follows, but none jointly assessed both instructional leadership and supervisory competence, compared school head against teacher perceptions on both constructs, and tested the cross-construct relationship between them — the gap this study addresses.



Methods

Research Design

This study used a quantitative, descriptive-correlational research design to assess the instructional leadership and supervisory competence of public elementary school heads in the Districts of Daram I, Daram II, Talalora, and Zumarraga, Schools Division of Samar, during SY 2023–2024. The descriptive component profiled school head- and teacher-respondents and measured perceived instructional leadership and supervisory competence; the comparative component (independent-samples t-tests) tested differences between school head and teacher perceptions; and the correlational component (Chi-square, Cramer's V, Fisher's t-test) tested relationships between perceptions and profile variates, and between instructional leadership and supervisory competence.

Participants and Sampling

Respondents were the complete population of school heads and teachers in the public elementary schools of the four districts during SY 2023–2024: 103 school heads (36 in Daram I, 31 in Daram II, 11 in Talalora, and 25 in Zumarraga) and 187 teachers (50, 50, 37, and 50, respectively), consistent with the legal mandate of one school head per public elementary school under Section 7(D) of RA 9155. Because the population was small and fully accessible, complete enumeration — rather than sampling — was used for both respondent groups, and a 100 percent response rate was achieved for every district.

Research Instrument

Data were gathered using a standard three-part questionnaire administered in two parallel versions, one for school heads and one for teachers. Part I gathered profile data (school heads: age and sex, civil status, gross monthly family income, highest educational attainment, years as school head, number of supervised teachers, relevant in-service training, and latest OPCR rating; teachers: the parallel set with grade level taught, years in teaching, and latest IPCRF rating in place of school-head-specific items). Part II measured perceived instructional leadership using 40 statement-indicators adapted from Daing and Mustapha (2019) across four skills — resource provider, instructional resource provider, communicator, and visible presence in school — rated on a five-point frequency scale (5 = Always to 1 = Never). Part III measured perceived supervisory competence using 24 statement-indicators adapted from Venas and Daing (2019) — seven each for decision-making and promoting optimal performance, and five each for planning and organizing and professional knowledge and expertise — rated on a five-point competence scale (5 = Extremely Competent to 1 = Not Competent). Because both instruments were adapted from established, previously validated scales, validation in this study was limited to content review by the research adviser and oral-defense panel members, whose suggestions were incorporated before final administration.

Data Gathering Procedure

Following sequential approval from the Schools Division Superintendent, the Public Schools District Supervisors of the four districts, and individual school heads, the researcher personally administered the questionnaires to ensure the full response rate. Questionnaires were distributed and retrieved within three days for geographically clustered schools and on the same day for distant or hard-to-access schools, including some reachable only by boat; anonymity and privacy were maintained throughout. Data collection ran from December 2023 to February 2024.

Statistical Treatment

Frequency counts and percentages described categorical profile data. Median and Median Absolute Deviation (MAD) described profile variates not normally distributed. Weighted mean quantified perceived instructional leadership and supervisory competence per skill area. Independent-samples t-tests (or, where indicated, z-scores) compared school head and teacher perceptions across the eight skill areas. Chi-square tests with Cramer's V (effect size) and Fisher's t-test assessed relationships between perceptions and categorical or continuous profile variates, respectively, and between instructional leadership and supervisory competence. The Shapiro-Wilk test screened for normality before parametric procedures were applied. All hypotheses were tested at $\alpha = 0.05$, two-tailed, using statistical software; a computed p-value $\leq .05$ led to rejection of the corresponding null hypothesis.

Results

Profile of Respondents

Among school head-respondents ($n = 103$), the plurality were 37–41 years old (26.21%), followed by 42–46 years old (22.33%); women substantially outnumbered men (73 vs. 30). Most were married (77.67%), held graduate-level academic units (89.3%, i.e., 92 of 103), had served as school head for 6–10 years (55.34%), and supervised 6–10 teachers (53.40%). School heads most often received in-service training at the school level (weighted mean = 3.40, “Often”), less often at district (2.93) and division (2.59) levels, and rarely to never at regional (1.44) or national (1.05) levels. Performance ratings were strong: 55.34% “Outstanding” and 44.66% “Very Satisfactory” on the latest OPCR.

Among teacher-respondents ($n = 187$), the plurality were likewise 37–41 years old (24.06%); women again outnumbered men (102 vs. 85). Most were married (67.91%), held graduate-level academic units (41.72% with units, plus 32.09% with a completed master's degree), and had 11–15 years of teaching experience (48.66%), followed by 6–10 years (25.67%). A majority (59.89%) taught monograde classes. In-service training followed the same district/school-level concentration seen among school heads (weighted mean 4.00, “Always”, at school/district level; 3.22 at division level; 1.55 at regional level; 1.00, “Never”, at national level). On the latest IPCR, 55.62% of teachers were rated “Very Satisfactory” and 44.39% “Outstanding.”

Level of Instructional Leadership

Table 1 summarizes the grand weighted means for instructional leadership across the four skill areas, as rated by school heads themselves and by teachers. School heads rated themselves as “often” practicing all four skills (grand means 3.84–4.09). Teachers rated school heads even more favorably — “often” for three skills and “always” (4.51) for visible presence in school.

Table 1. Grand Weighted Means for Instructional Leadership, by Respondent Group

Instructional Leadership Skill	School Heads' Self-Rating (GWM)	Interpretation	Teachers' Rating of School Heads (GWM)	Interpretation
Resource provider	4.06	Often	4.42	Often

Instructional Leadership Skill	School Heads' Self-Rating (GWM)	Interpretation	Teachers' Rating of School Heads (GWM)	Interpretation
Instructional resource provider	4.09	Often	4.44	Often
Communicator	3.84	Often	3.86	Often
Visible presence in school	3.88	Often	4.51	Always

Scale: 4.50–5.00 Always; 3.50–4.49 Often; 2.50–3.49 Sometimes; 1.50–2.49 Rarely; 1.00–1.49 Never.

Level of Supervisory Competence

Table 2 summarizes the grand weighted means for supervisory competence. Both respondent groups rated school heads as at least “highly competent” across all four skills, with teachers rating school heads higher than the school heads rated themselves, including “extremely competent” ratings from teachers for promoting optimal performance and professional knowledge and expertise.

Table 2. Grand Weighted Means for Supervisory Competence, by Respondent Group

Supervisory Skill	School Heads' Self-Rating (GWM)	Interpretation	Teachers' Rating of School Heads (GWM)	Interpretation
Decision-making	3.51	Highly Competent	3.92	Highly Competent
Planning and organizing	3.55	Highly Competent	4.16	Highly Competent
Promoting optimal performance	3.59	Highly Competent	4.57	Extremely Competent
Professional knowledge and expertise	3.52	Highly Competent	4.57	Extremely Competent

Scale: 4.50–5.00 Extremely Competent; 3.50–4.49 Highly Competent; 2.50–3.49 Moderately Competent; 1.50–2.49 Slightly Competent; 1.00–1.49 Not Competent.

Differences between School Head and Teacher Perceptions

Table 3 presents the independent-samples t-test (or z-score, where noted) results comparing school head and teacher perceptions along each instructional-leadership and supervisory-competence skill. For instructional leadership, perceptions differed significantly for resource provider ($t = -3.053$, $df = 18$, $p = .007$) and visible presence in school ($t = 5.536$, $df = 18$, $p < .001$), but not for instructional resource provider ($t = -2.086$, $df = 18$, p

= .061) or communicator ($z = 0.000$, $p = 1.000$). For all four supervisory-competence indicators, perceptions differed significantly: decision-making ($t = 3.263$, $df = 12$, $p = .007$), planning and organizing ($t = 4.451$, $df = 8$, $p = .010$), promoting optimal performance ($t = 14.514$, $df = 12$, $p < .001$), and professional knowledge and expertise ($t = -4.372$, $df = 8$, $p = .002$). In every case of a significant difference, teachers rated school heads more favorably than school heads rated themselves.

Table 3. Comparison of School Head and Teacher Perceptions by Skill Area

Skill	Test statistic	df	p-value	Decision ($\alpha = .05$)
Resource provider (IL)	$t = -3.053$	18	.007	Reject H_0 — Significant
Instructional resource provider (IL)	$t = -2.086$	18	.061	Accept H_0 — Not significant
Communicator (IL)	$z = 0.000$	—	1.000	Accept H_0 — Not significant
Visible presence in school (IL)	$t = 5.536$	18	$< .001$	Reject H_0 — Significant
Decision-making (SC)	$t = 3.263$	12	.007	Reject H_0 — Significant
Planning and organizing (SC)	$t = 4.451$	8	.010	Reject H_0 — Significant
Promoting optimal performance (SC)	$t = 14.514$	12	$< .001$	Reject H_0 — Significant
Professional knowledge and expertise (SC)	$t = -4.372$	8	.002	Reject H_0 — Significant

Relationships with Profile Variates and between Constructs

Correlational analyses found no statistically significant relationship between either respondent group's perceptions and any school head- or teacher-related profile variate — age, sex, civil status, gross monthly family income, highest educational attainment, tenure/years in service, number of supervised teachers or grade level taught, relevant in-service training, or performance rating — for either instructional leadership or supervisory competence. Association strengths ranged from very weak to, in a few categorical cases (sex, civil status), moderate-to-relatively-strong by Cramer's V , but none reached significance at $\alpha = .05$ (all $p > .05$; see Tables 34, 35, 48, and 49 of the source theses for full coefficients). Finally, no significant relationship was found between school heads' self-perceived instructional leadership and their self-perceived supervisory competence (association coefficient = 0.306, “very weak”; Fisher's t , $p = .146$), indicating that the two competency domains, though conceptually related, did not covary within school heads' self-assessments in this sample.

Discussion

Taken together, the results describe a school-head workforce that is predominantly female, married, mid-career (6–10 years in post), and academically credentialed at the graduate level, mirroring the demographic profile of the teachers they supervise. Both instructional leadership and supervisory competence were rated positively by



both respondent groups — no skill area fell below “often” or “highly competent” — which is broadly consistent with prior Philippine studies reporting favorable self- and teacher-ratings of school-head leadership and supervisory practice (e.g., Daing & Mustapha, 2019; Mallari, 2022; Encanto, 2021; Guardacasa & Benavides, 2020).

The most consistent pattern in the data, however, is the perception gap: wherever a statistically significant difference emerged, teachers rated school heads more favorably than school heads rated themselves — most sharply for visible presence in school (“often” by self-rating vs. “always” by teacher rating) and for promoting optimal performance (“highly competent” vs. “extremely competent”). This is the reverse of a self-serving bias and is consistent with modesty or conservatism in school heads' self-assessment, or with teachers holding comparatively generous expectations of supervisory support. The two non-significant comparisons — instructional resource provider and communicator — suggest closer alignment, specifically where the skill concerns shared, visible artifacts (training materials, communication events) rather than the more diffuse, judgment-based domains of decision-making and performance management.

The absence of any significant relationship between profile variates (age, tenure, training, prior performance ratings, and the like) and perceived instructional leadership or supervisory competence, replicated across both respondent groups and both constructs, echoes Suyitno's (2020) finding that school-head demographic and service characteristics were not predictors of instructional-leadership performance. This suggests that experience and credentials alone do not reliably distinguish leadership practice as perceived by stakeholders — a finding with direct implications for how professional development eligibility or reward structures are designed.

Perhaps the most conceptually significant null result is the non-significant relationship between school heads' self-perceived instructional leadership and self-perceived supervisory competence. If these two role-domains were tightly coupled in practice, a school head strong in one would reliably self-rate as strong in the other; the data instead suggest that self-perception in the two domains is largely independent. This is consistent with the theoretical framing that instructional leadership (vision, curriculum, and classroom-facing) and supervisory competence (decision-making, planning, performance management) draw on partly distinct skill sets (cf. Hallinger's model, as cited in Daing & Mustapha, 2019), and it argues against using either self-rated domain as a stand-alone proxy for overall leadership effectiveness.

Limitations

The study is descriptive-correlational and cross-sectional, drawing on self-report and teacher-report perception data rather than observed practice or student-outcome measures; causal claims cannot be drawn. Several t-test comparisons were computed on small effective degrees of freedom ($df = 8-18$), reflecting the paired/aggregated structure of the comparison and warranting caution in generalizing exact p-values beyond this sample. The study was also geographically bounded to four districts within one school division, which limits generalizability to other divisions or to secondary-school contexts.

Practical Implications and Recommendations

Because the data show school heads underrating themselves relative to teacher perceptions, and because no profile variate predicted perceived leadership or supervisory competence, professional-development investment is better targeted at skill practice and structured feedback than at credential- or tenure-based eligibility. Four recommendations follow from the findings: (1) leadership-development programs that explicitly pair instructional-leadership content with supervisory-skill content, rather than treating them as separable tracks, given



their weak observed inter-correlation; (2) structured peer coaching and mentoring among school heads to surface the practices teachers already recognize but school heads underrate in themselves; (3) formal channels — school leadership teams or professional learning communities — through which teacher feedback on school-head visibility, decision-making, and performance-promotion practices is routinely surfaced, given that these were the domains with the largest perception gaps; and (4) multi-source evaluation of school-head leadership (self-, teacher-, and outcome-based) rather than reliance on self-evaluation alone, consistent with the non-significant self-rated instructional leadership–supervisory competence relationship reported here.

Conclusion

School heads in the Districts of Daram I, Daram II, Talalora, and Zumarraga, Schools Division of Samar, were perceived — by themselves and, more favorably, by their teachers — as frequently practicing instructional leadership and as highly to extremely competent supervisors. Perceptions converged for instructional resource provision and communication but diverged significantly, in teachers' favor, for resource provision, visible presence, and all four supervisory-competence skills. No demographic or service-related profile variate predicted either construct, and school heads' self-rated instructional leadership was not significantly related to their self-rated supervisory competence. These findings support development strategies that combine instructional and supervisory skill-building, incorporate routine teacher feedback, and move evaluation practice beyond self-assessment alone.



References

- Ampofo, S. Y., Onyango, G. A., & Ogola, M. (2019). Influence of school heads' direct supervision on teacher role performance in public senior high schools, Central Region, Ghana. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, 7(2), 9–26. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1236226.pdf>
- Ankoma-Sey, V. R., & Maina, B. (2016). The role of effective supervision on academic performance of senior high schools in Ghana. *Journal of African Studies and Development*, 5(4), 73–83.
- Atkinson, M. (2013). *Educational leadership and management in an international school context*. University of Derby.
- Aureada, J. U. (2021). The instructional leadership practices of school heads. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 2(2), 75–89. <https://doi.org/10.53378/ijemds.v2.2.142>
- Barrett, C., & Breyer, R. (2014). The influence of effective leadership on teaching and learning. *Journal of Research Initiatives*, 1(2), 1–11.
- Bjorklund, K., Liski, A., Samposalo, H., et al. (2014). “Together at school” — A school-based intervention program to promote socio-emotional skills and mental health in children: Study protocol for a cluster randomized controlled trial. *BMC Public Health*, 14, 1042. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-14-1042>
- Callao, M. B., & Callao, R. J. (2021). Instructional leadership skills of the school administrators. *Ilkogretim Online — Elementary Education Online*, 20(6), 2107–2127. <https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2021.06.195>
- Chien-Chin, C. (2018). Facilitation of teachers' professional development through principals' instructional supervision and teachers' knowledge management behaviors. *IntechOpen*.
- Civil Service Commission (CSC). (2012). Memorandum Circular No. 6, s. 2012.
- Cocal, C. J., & Marcellano, G. (2017). Challenges of the K to 12 program implementation in the public elementary schools of Pangasinan, Philippines. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 4(7), 141–147.
- Crawford, C. B., Gould, L. V., & Scott, R. F. (2003). Transformational leader as champion and techie: Implications for leadership educators. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 2(1).
- Cruickshank, V. (2017). The influence of school leadership on student outcomes. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 5, 115–123. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2017.59009>
- Daing, C. A., & Mustapha, L. C. (2019). School administrators' instructional leadership skills and teachers' performance and efficacy in senior high schools in the National Capital Region, Philippines. *International Journal of Educational Policy Research and Review*, 10(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.15739/IJEPRR.23.001>
- Danquah, M. (2019). Analysis of types of school administration and supervision and their implications for quality education. *Durreesamin Journal*.



Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2016). Successful school leadership. Education Development Trust.

Delas Peñas, J. D., & Salundaguit, D. F. T. (2019). Supervisory competencies of school heads in relation to teachers' performance. *JPAIR Institutional Research*, 12, 54–68. <https://doi.org/10.7719/irj.v12i1.744>

Deniz, U., & Erdener, M. A. (2020). Levels of school administrators exhibiting instructional supervision behaviors: Teachers' perspectives. *Research in Educational Administration & Leadership*, 5(4), 1038–1081. <https://doi.org/10.30828/real/2020.4.3>

Department of Education (DepEd). (2003). DepEd Order No. 85, s. 2003: Guidelines on the selection, promotion, and designation of school heads.

Department of Education (DepEd). (2020). Philippine Professional Standards for Supervisors. Philippine National Research Center for Teacher Quality.

Duze, C. O. (2012). The changing role of school leadership and teacher capacity building in teaching and learning. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 3(1), 111–117.

Encanto, C. M. B. (2021). Supervisory functions of school heads and barriers in developing teachers' performance. *IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 3(4), 65–72.

Galigao, R., Suson, R., Velasquez, M., Baratbata, C., & Mejica, S. P. I. (2019). School heads supervision and practices: A literature review. *International Journal of Current Research*, 11(6), 4706–4710.

Guardacasa, C. G., & Benavides, N. G. (2020). Supervisory roles of the school heads of the 2nd Congressional District of Sorsogon. *International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning*, 7(4), 6–12.

Hakim, S., Sowiyah, Fitriyanti, Z., & Perdana, R. (2020). The effect of academic supervision in improving teacher performance: A literature review. *ICOPE*. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.16-10-2020.2305197>

Haren, R. V. (2010). Engaging learner diversity through learning by design. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 7(3), 258–271. <https://doi.org/10.2304/elea.2010.7.3.258>

Hoque, K. E., Kenayathulla, H. B. B., Subramaniam, M. V. D. O., & Islam, R. (2020). Relationships between supervision and teachers' performance and attitude in secondary schools in Malaysia. *SAGE Open*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020925501>

Hungi, N. (2011). Characteristics of school heads and their schools. SACMEQ Working Paper.

Kin, T. M., & Kareem, O. A. (2019). School leaders' competencies that make a difference in the era of Education 4.0: A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9(5), 214–225.

Kotirde, I. Y., & Yunos, J. B. Md. (2015). The processes of supervisions in secondary schools educational system in Nigeria. *Procedia — Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 204, 259–264. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.08.149>



Mallari, N. P. (2022). Management competencies and supervisory practices of school heads. *Asia Pacific Journal of Advanced Education and Technology, Special Issue*, 55–62. <https://doi.org/10.54476/apjaet/15285>

Mustamin, Y. (2012). The competence of school principals: What kind of need competence for school success? *Journal of Education and Learning*, 6(1), 33–42.

Official Gazette. (2024). Republic Act No. 9155: Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001.

Ozcan, M. (2020). Teachers' evaluation on school principals' supervision. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research*, 15(2), 303–321. <https://doi.org/10.29329/epasr.2020.251.17>

Panol, R. F., Caballes, D. G., Vasquez, A. G., & Ferriol, C. C. (2020). School heads' interpersonal, leadership, and supervisory skills in Narra School Districts, Palawan, Philippines. *CiiT International Journal of Programmable Device Circuits and Systems*, 12(11–12), 120–128.

Pastrano, R. V., & Decano, R. S. (2021). Motivational and supervisory competencies of secondary school administrators in the new normal education. *EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management*, 8(10), 57–65. <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra0414>

Polonicic, M. (2016). Principals matter: Perceptions of principals on school leadership [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Nebraska–Lincoln.

Rahabav, P. (2016). The effectiveness of academic supervision for teachers. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(9), 47–55.

Resco, T. B. (2020). A development model for the district technical assistance program in Samar Division [Unpublished dissertation]. Samar State University.

Schools Division of Samar. (2018). Division annual accomplishment report.

Shah, S. R., Khalid, A., & Al-Harthi, K. (2014). TESOL classroom observations: A boon or a bane? An exploratory study at a Saudi Arabian university. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(8). <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.8.1593-1602>

Smith, B. S. (2016). The role of leadership style in creating a great school. *Saskatchewan Educational Leadership Unit Research Review Journal*, 1(1).

Suyitno. (2020). Instructional leadership of school principals and their schools' National Achievement Test performance: A search of relationship. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(5), 13355–13364.

The Wallace Foundation. (2013). *The school principal as leader: Guiding schools to better teaching and learning* (2nd ed.).

UNESCO. (2016). *Leading better learning: School leadership and quality in the Education 2030 agenda, regional reviews of policies and practices*. UNESCO Education Sector Division for Policies and Lifelong Learning Systems.



U-Sayee, C. R., & Adomako, E. B. (2021). Supervisory practices and challenges faced by senior high school principals in Greater Monrovia, Liberia: Implications for quality education. *Heliyon*, 7(6), e07272.

Venas, P. T., & Daing, C. (2019). Supervisory and leadership skills of principals and school performance of public high schools in Quezon City. *International Journal of Electrochemistry*.

Virgana, V. (2021). The dynamic of teachers' job performance. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University*, 56(2), 257–270. <https://doi.org/10.35741/issn.0258-2724.56.2.21>