



Instructional Supervision Practices and Their Effects on the Classroom Performance of Elementary Teachers

Joan L. Maliyao *

Apayao State College, Malama, Conner, Apayao, Philippines, 3807.

International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 2026, 19(02), 405-423

Publication history: Received on 02 April 2026; revised on 09 May 2026; accepted on 11 May 2026

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/ijrsra.2026.19.2.1059>

Abstract

This study investigated the instructional supervision practices of master teachers and school heads and their effect on the classroom performance of elementary teachers in the Northern Conner District, Division of Apayao, for School Year 2025–2026. A descriptive-correlational design was employed involving 58 elementary teacher-respondents from twelve public elementary schools. Data were collected using a questionnaire on instructional supervision adopted from Comighud et al. (2020), covering six domains, while classroom performance was measured using IPCRF indicators aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). Statistical tools included weighted mean, Pearson's correlation coefficient, Kruskal-Wallis H test, and Mann-Whitney U test. Results revealed that instructional supervision was highly implemented, particularly in formal practices such as lesson planning, classroom observation, and feedback, while informal visitations were less consistent. Teachers demonstrated an outstanding level of classroom performance, with lower ratings in critical and creative thinking strategies. No significant relationship was found between instructional supervision and classroom performance, although differences were observed across selected profile variables. The study concludes that while instructional supervision is effectively implemented, teacher performance is more strongly influenced by professional and contextual factors than by supervision alone.

Keywords: Instructional Supervision; Classroom Performance; Elementary Teachers; IPCRF; Descriptive-Correlational

1. Introduction

Teachers are the key players in ensuring quality education, as their instructional expertise significantly molds student learning and overall school performance. The effectiveness of classroom instruction largely depends on the continuous professional growth of teachers, which is nurtured through structured support mechanisms within the school system. Sustaining teacher efficiency is therefore a critical concern for educational leaders in promoting learner achievement and supporting continuous professional development. Numerous studies consistently emphasize that one of the primary mechanisms for strengthening teaching effectiveness is instructional supervision, which has long been recognized as a vital function of the educational system [1, 2].

Instructional supervision serves as a systematic and collaborative process that enhances classroom practices and promotes professional growth by providing timely guidance, constructive feedback, and instructional support. These practices contribute to improved instructional strategies, effective classroom management, and overall teacher performance [3,4,5]. Conversely, ineffective instructional supervision—characterized by delayed feedback, unclear expectations, and subjective judgment—may negatively affect teachers' motivation, result in inconsistent instructional practices, and limit opportunities for reflective teaching [6,7,8]. Globally, instructional supervision is therefore

* Corresponding author: Joan L. Maliyao

recognized not merely as an evaluative mechanism but as a developmental process that fosters continuous instructional improvement and professional accountability.

In the Philippine context, instructional supervision is anchored on national policies and professional standards that emphasize the responsibility of school leaders in ensuring instructional quality. DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020 institutionalizes instructional supervision as a structured, developmental, and collaborative process designed to provide teachers with relevant and actionable feedback [9]. Furthermore, the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) underscore the vital role of school leaders in mentoring, coaching, and sustaining teacher competence to improve learner outcomes [10]. Complementing these frameworks, DepEd Memorandum No. 008, s. 2023 provides guidelines on the implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS), aligning teacher evaluation with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) [11]. Despite the presence of these national frameworks, school heads continue to encounter challenges in ensuring that instructional supervision consistently translates into improved classroom practices across different school contexts. Variations in implementation and follow-through mechanisms highlight the need to examine how instructional supervision functions within specific district settings.

Empirical studies conducted in the Philippines affirm that consistent and standards-based instructional supervision contributes positively to teachers' instructional delivery, lesson planning, and classroom management [12,13,14]. Classroom observation processes, including pre-conference planning, actual classroom observation, and post-conference feedback, have been shown to enhance learner engagement and instructional effectiveness [15,16,17]. Despite the existence of these policy frameworks, many teachers continue to report challenges related to inconsistent supervision practices, limited instructional guidance, and variations in supervisory competence among school heads [10,11,18].

Studies conducted in various Philippine regions, such as Masbate Province and Central Luzon, reveal similar trends. While school heads endeavor to conduct instructional supervision, gaps persist in terms of consistency, follow-through, and the developmental depth of feedback provided to teachers [19,20]. Teachers often perceive supervision as compliance-oriented rather than growth-focused, thereby limiting its potential to improve instructional practices [5,21]. Although several studies confirm that effective supervision positively influences teachers' job satisfaction and classroom performance [17,22,23], these investigations are geographically limited and do not sufficiently capture the contextual realities of schools in the Division of Apayao, particularly in the Northern Conner District. However, findings from these regions may not fully reflect the unique contextual conditions present in geographically and administratively distinct districts such as Northern Conner.

Despite the recognized importance of instructional supervision, there remains a scarcity of empirical studies examining how these practices are implemented at the district level in Apayao. Existing literature largely focuses on generalized supervisory models and policy frameworks, leaving limited evidence on how school heads and master teachers operationalize instructional supervision, how teachers perceive these practices, and how such practices relate to actual classroom performance. This research gap underscores the need for a localized and context-specific investigation. To date, no empirical study has systematically examined the relationship between instructional supervision and classroom performance among elementary teachers in the Northern Conner District.

Given these gaps, this study aims to determine the relationship between instructional supervision practices of master teachers and school heads and the classroom performance of elementary teachers in the Northern Conner District. The findings of this study are expected to provide evidence-based insights that may guide school leaders, supervisors, and policymakers in refining supervisory practices and strengthening instructional leadership.

The researcher is a school head handling a mono-grade school with one cluster school, which is a multi-grade school, and regularly conducts instructional supervision, so she's not just theorizing but is fully engaged. She has conducted classroom observations, reviewed lesson plans, and run post-observation meetings, which provide her with a keen understanding of how supervision actually works in different schools. Drawing on her regular work, she's noticed that supervision varies a lot. It depends on factors such as how experienced the teachers are, what resources the school has, and the style of leadership implemented. Even though there are Department of Education policies and clear frameworks, she continues to encounter the same problems; it is difficult to ensure supervision is genuinely developmental and always aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers. She sees gaps, especially when it comes to making supervision supportive, standards-based, and focused on performance, no matter the school's context. These gaps make her believe it's time to take a closer look.

This prompted her to examine how instructional supervision truly takes place in the Northern Conner District. She wants to know what teachers think about these practices and how they affect teacher performance. Since she's directly responsible for supervision, she can dig into these issues with real insight and she knows what's at stake when it comes to teaching quality and student learning. For her, this study goes beyond academic inquiry; it holds personal significance. She wants to sharpen her own leadership by critically examining and improving the way she supervises. In the end, she hopes her research leads to solid recommendations that make instructional supervision stronger, boost instructional leadership, and help teachers and students continue improving throughout the district.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to determine the relationship between instructional supervision practices and the classroom performance of elementary teachers in the Northern Conner District during the School Year 2025–2026. The descriptive component will describe the respondents' profile and the levels of supervision practices and classroom performance, while the correlational component will establish whether a statistically significant relationship exists between the identified variables.

2.2. Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in selected public elementary schools in Northern Conner District, one of the administrative districts under the Department of Education (DepEd) – Division of Apayao. To provide a clearer understanding of the schools included, they were classified according to their grade-level organization as Mono-Grade Schools and Multi-Grade Schools. Mono-Grade Schools have separate classes for each grade level and Multi-Grade Schools combine students of different grade levels in a single class.

2.3. Respondents of the Study

The respondents of the study consisted of elementary teachers from selected schools in the Northern Conner District who were under the supervision of a Head Teacher or School Principal and a Master Teacher. School Heads and Master Teachers were not included as respondents, as the study focused on the teachers' perceptions of instructional supervision and their corresponding classroom performance. A total of 58 elementary teacher-respondents participated in the study through voluntary response sampling. .

2.4. Research Instrument

This study employed two main instruments. Instructional supervision practices were measured using an adopted questionnaire from Comighud et al. [2020], with no modifications made except for the selection of items relevant to the study objectives. The instrument assessed teachers' perceptions of supervision across five domains: advance notification and planning, informal visitations and classroom observations, lesson plan review, actual classroom observation, and feedback (immediacy and adequacy). To evaluate teachers' classroom performance, it employs the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF), the official instrument of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) under DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015. Only classroom-observable indicators are considered to ensure alignment with actual teaching practices. Together, these instruments provide a comprehensive framework for examining the relationship between instructional supervision practices and teacher performance.

2.5. Statistical Analysis

Frequency counts and percentage distribution were used to describe respondents' personal and academic profiles, while the weighted mean determined the level of implementation of instructional supervision practices and teachers' classroom performance, measured using a 5-point Likert scale. To examine relationships between supervision practices and performance, the Pearson Correlation Coefficient was applied. Additionally, the One-Way ANOVA tested for significant differences in supervision practices and classroom performance when grouped according to profile variables.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Profile of the Respondents

A total of 58 elementary teachers from the Northern Conner District participated in this study. Their profiles were analyzed in terms of personal characteristics, academic qualifications, and school classification to provide a clearer understanding of the respondents' background.

3.2. Personal Characteristics

3.2.1. Age

Table 1 Distribution of Respondents by Age

Age Group	Frequency	Percentage
Below 31	7	12.07%
31–40	33	56.90%
41–50	10	17.24%
51–60	8	13.79%
Total	58	100.00%

Table 1 presents the age distribution of respondents. The largest group falls within the 31 to 40 age range, comprising 33 respondents or 56.90% of the sample. Teachers aged 41 to 50 account for 17.24% ($n = 10$), followed by those aged 51 to 60 at 13.79% ($n = 8$), and those below 31 at 12.07% ($n = 7$). No respondent exceeded 60 years of age. The mean age of the sample is 39.62 years ($SD = 8.46$), indicating that the group is predominantly composed of teachers in the middle stages of their careers. This suggests that the respondents possess adequate teaching experience while remaining actively engaged in professional development.

3.2.2. Civil Status

Table 2 Distribution of Respondents by Civil Status

Civil Status	Frequency	Percentage
Married	46	79.31%
Single	11	18.97%
Widowed/Widower	1	1.72%
Total	58	100.00%

Table 2 shows that the majority of respondents are married ($n = 46$, 79.31%), followed by single teachers ($n = 11$, 18.97%), with one widowed or widower respondent (1.72%). This reflects a typical demographic pattern among public school teachers in the Philippines, where most career teachers are within family-forming or family-sustaining life stages.

3.2.3. Position

Table 3 Distribution of Respondents by Position

Position	Frequency	Percentage
Teacher I	9	15.52%

Teacher II	10	17.24%
Teacher III	39	67.24%
Total	58	100.00%

As shown in Table 3, Teacher III holds the highest proportion in the sample ($n = 39$, 67.24%), followed by Teacher II ($n = 10$, 17.24%) and Teacher I ($n = 9$, 15.52%). The dominance of Teacher III positions suggests that most respondents have met the higher qualification thresholds associated with that rank, including years of satisfactory service and educational advancement.

3.2.4. Length of Service

Table 4 Distribution of Respondents by Length of Service

Length of Service	Frequency	Percentage
1–5 years	6	10.34%
6–10 years	26	44.83%
11–15 years	12	20.69%
16–20 years	5	8.62%
21 years and above	9	15.52%
Total	58	100.00%

Table 5 shows that 26 respondents (44.83%) have served for 6 to 10 years, making this the largest category. Eleven to fifteen years of service represents the second most common range ($n = 12$, 20.69%), followed by 21 years and above ($n = 9$, 15.52%), 1 to 5 years ($n = 6$, 10.34%), and 16 to 20 years ($n = 5$, 8.62%). The mean length of service is 12.79 years ($SD = 7.94$), with a range from 2 to 34 years. These figures indicate that the respondents, on average, are experienced educators with more than a decade of classroom service.

3.2.5. Academic Educational Attainment

Table 5 Distribution of Respondents by Educational Attainment

Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
Bachelor's Degree	3	5.17%
Bachelor's Degree with Master's Units	24	41.38%
Master's Degree	21	36.21%
Master's Degree with Doctoral Units	10	17.24%
Total	58	100.00%

Table 5 reveals that the largest proportion of respondents holds a Bachelor's Degree with Master's Units ($n = 24$, 41.38%), followed by those with a Master's Degree ($n = 21$, 36.21%). Teachers with Master's Degree with Doctoral Units account for 17.24% ($n = 10$), and those with a Bachelor's Degree alone represent 5.17% ($n = 3$). Taken together, 94.83% of respondents have pursued graduate-level studies, which reflects the commitment of many in-service public-school teachers to professional advancement in accordance with DepEd career progression policies.

3.2.6. Bachelor's Degree

Table 6 Distribution of Respondents by Bachelor's Degree

Bachelor's Degree	Frequency	Percentage
BEEd (Bachelor of Elementary Education)	50	86.21%
BSEd (Bachelor of Secondary Education)	6	10.34%
Others	2	3.45%
Total	58	100.00%

Table 6 shows that 50 respondents (86.21%) completed a Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd), the primary pre-service preparation program for elementary teaching in the Philippines. Six respondents (10.34%) hold a Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSEd), while two others hold degrees in other fields. The BEEd-dominant profile confirms that most respondents entered elementary teaching with preparation specifically aligned to that level.

3.1.1. 3.3. Classification Of School

Table 7 Distribution of Respondents by School Classification

Classification of School	Frequency	Percentage
Mono-grade	46	79.31%
Multi-grade	12	20.69%
Total	58	100.00%

Table 7 shows that most respondents teach in mono-grade schools ($n = 46$, 79.31%), where each grade level is handled by a separate class. Twelve respondents (20.69%) are assigned to multi-grade schools, where two or more grade levels are combined in a single class. This distribution is consistent with the general school structure across the district, where mono-grade schools are more common due to higher enrolment concentrations in larger barangays.

Overall, the respondents are predominantly mid-career, married, and professionally advanced teachers with considerable teaching experience and strong academic qualifications. Most are graduates of elementary education and are assigned to mono-grade schools. These characteristics suggest a stable and experienced teaching workforce in the district.

3.1.2. 3.4. Level of Implementation of Instructional Supervision Practices

Tables 8a through 8f present the mean ratings and verbal interpretations for each indicator under the six domains of instructional supervision practices. Ratings followed a five-point Likert scale: 4.21-5.00 = Strongly Agree, 3.41-4.20 = Agree, 2.61-3.40 = Moderately Agree, 1.81-2.60 = Disagree, and 1.00-1.80 = Strongly Disagree.

3.1.3. 3.5. Advance Notifications and Planning Lessons with Supervisors

Table 8A Advance Notifications and Planning Lessons with Supervisors

Indicator	M	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
1. The instructional supervisor keeps teachers aware of the conduct of instructional supervision.	4.80	0.62	Very High
2. The instructional supervisor notifies teachers of classroom visitations and lesson observations.	4.78	0.56	Very High

3. The instructional supervisor sets up specific sessions with teachers to discuss curriculum implementation.	4.60	0.59	Very High
4. The instructional supervisor provides teachers with adequate information to become familiar with supervision of instruction.	4.57	0.57	Very High
5. The instructional supervisor involves teachers in the planning and preparation of the delivery of classroom lessons.	4.48	0.66	Very High
Domain Mean: Advance Notifications and Planning	4.65	0.48	Very High

All five indicators under Domain A were rated Strongly Agree, yielding a domain mean of 4.65 (SD = 0.48). The highest rated item is the supervisor's practice of keeping teachers informed about the conduct of instructional supervision (M = 4.80, SD = 0.62), followed by the issuance of advance notifications for classroom visitations (M = 4.78, SD = 0.56). The lowest-rated item within the domain, though still rated Strongly Agree, is the involvement of teachers in lesson planning and preparation (M = 4.48, SD = 0.66). These results indicate that supervisors in the Northern Conner District consistently communicate supervisory schedules and expectations to teachers, which may contribute to a structured and less disruptive observation process.

3.1.4. 3.6. Informal Visitations and Classroom Observations

Table 8B Informal Visitations and Classroom Observations

Indicator	M	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
1. The instructional supervisor informally visits teachers in their respective classes during teaching instruction.	2.72	1.02	Moderate
2. The instructional supervisor monitors teachers outside the classroom during real-world lesson application.	2.74	1.13	Moderate
3. The instructional supervisor supervises teachers on a regular basis inside the classroom during curriculum implementation.	3.31	0.88	Moderate
4. The instructional supervisor enters the classroom as unobtrusively as possible in the conduct of lesson observations.	3.72	1.10	High
5. The instructional supervisor capitalizes on the expertise of teachers to share supervisory knowledge, skills, and information.	4.57	0.65	Very High
Domain Mean: Informal Visitations and Classroom Observations	3.41	0.63	High

Domain B has the lowest mean among all six domains (M = 3.41, SD = 0.63), interpreted as High. Within the domain, three indicators fall under Moderate informal visits to teachers during instruction (M = 2.72, SD = 1.02), monitoring teachers outside the classroom (M = 2.74, SD = 1.13), and regular supervision inside the classroom (M = 3.31, SD = 0.88). These lower ratings suggest that unscheduled and informal supervision is practiced less consistently compared to formal observation activities.

The item on unobtrusive classroom entry received a High rating (M = 3.72, SD = 1.10), while item B5, the supervisor's use of teacher expertise for knowledge sharing, was rated Very High (M = 4.57, SD = 0.65). The wide spread within this domain, from Moderate to Very High, indicates variability in how different informal supervision practices are carried out. The comparatively low frequency of drop-in visits may warrant attention, as informal observations are often cited as an effective complement to formal supervision cycles.

3.1.5. 3.7. Lesson Plan Review

Table 8C Lesson Plan Review

Indicator	M	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
1. Instructional supervisor examines teacher's formulation of behavioral learning objectives.	4.71	0.50	Very High
2. Instructional supervisor examines teacher's organization of K-12/MATATAG curriculum learning content.	4.76	0.47	Very High
3. Instructional supervisor examines teacher's utilization of innovative teaching strategies.	4.62	0.49	Very High
4. Instructional supervisor examines teacher's use of updated teaching references.	4.52	0.57	Very High
5. Instructional supervisor examines teacher's use of appropriate instructional devices.	4.66	0.51	Very High
6. Instructional supervisor examines teacher's preparation of meaningful learning experiences.	4.69	0.47	Very High
7. Instructional supervisor examines teacher's integration of higher-order thinking skills (HOTS) — Indicator 7.	4.72	0.45	Very High
8. Instructional supervisor examines teacher's integration of higher-order thinking skills (HOTS) — Indicator 8.	4.72	0.45	Very High
9. Instructional supervisor examines teacher's application of learned concepts to real-life settings.	4.67	0.51	Very High
10. Instructional supervisor examines teacher's provision of skills-based enrichment activities.	4.69	0.50	Very High
Domain Mean: Lesson Plan Review	4.68	0.39	Very High

All ten indicators under Domain C received Very High ratings, with a domain mean of 4.68 (SD = 0.39). The highest rated item involves examining the organization of K-12/MATATAG curriculum learning content (M = 4.76, SD = 0.47), followed by the integration of higher-order thinking skills (M = 4.72, SD = 0.45 for both HOTS indicators). The examination of updated teaching references received the lowest mean within the domain (M = 4.52, SD = 0.57), though it remains in the Very High range. These results suggest that supervisors conduct thorough reviews of teachers' lesson plans, covering all key components from learning objectives and instructional strategies to real-life application and skills enrichment.

3.1.6. 3.8. Actual Classroom Observation

Table 8D Actual Classroom Observation

Indicator	M	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
1. Instructional supervisor examines teacher's preparation of functional lesson plans or appropriate daily logs.	4.83	0.38	Very High
2. Instructional supervisor examines teacher's implementation of K12/MATATAG-based curricular instruction or classroom lessons.	4.84	0.37	Very High
3. Instructional supervisor examines teacher's organization of classroom practices or teaching procedures.	4.79	0.41	Very High

4. Instructional supervisor examines teacher's establishment of classroom discipline and routine management.	4.86	0.35	Very High
5. Instructional supervisor examines teacher's accomplishment of school forms, teaching records, and learners' reports.	4.83	0.38	Very High
Domain Mean: Actual Classroom Observation	4.83	0.30	Very High

Domain D has the highest mean among all six domains ($M = 4.83$, $SD = 0.30$), with all five indicators rated Very High. The examination of classroom discipline and routine management received the highest item mean ($M = 4.86$, $SD = 0.35$), followed by the review of K-12/MATATAG-based curricular instruction ($M = 4.84$, $SD = 0.37$). The organization of classroom practices and teaching procedures received the lowest item mean within the domain ($M = 4.79$, $SD = 0.41$), still firmly in the Very High range. These results indicate that supervisors are highly engaged during formal classroom observations and examine a comprehensive set of instructional and administrative indicators.

3.1.7. 3.9. Immediacy of Feedback on Classroom Observation

Table 8E Immediacy of Feedback on Classroom Observation

Indicator	M	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
1. Instructional supervisor conducts supervisory conferences right after observing teachers.	4.79	0.49	Very High
2. Instructional supervisor provides immediate feedback after the teaching/learning process.	4.78	0.50	Very High
3. Instructional supervisor spends enough time to discuss teacher's strengths and capabilities.	4.71	0.56	Very High
4. Instructional supervisor gives sufficient time to discuss teacher's weaknesses and difficulties.	4.66	0.64	Very High
5. Instructional supervisor allots time to share supervisory experiences through constructive dialogue, mutual trust, and shared expertise.	4.72	0.52	Very High
Domain Mean: Immediacy of Feedback on Classroom Observation	4.73	0.45	Very High

3.1.8.

Domain E received a mean of 4.73 ($SD = 0.45$), interpreted as Very High. The highest-rated indicator is the conduct of post-observation conferences immediately after visiting teachers ($M = 4.79$, $SD = 0.49$). Providing immediate feedback after the teaching-learning process received a nearly identical rating ($M = 4.78$, $SD = 0.50$). The item pertaining to discussing teacher weaknesses and difficulties received the lowest domain rating ($M = 4.66$, $SD = 0.64$), though it remains Very High. The consistency of ratings across all five items indicates that supervisors generally act on observations promptly and engage teachers in timely feedback discussions that address both strengths and areas for improvement.

3.1.9. 3.10. Adequacy of Feedback on Instructional Supervision

3.1.10. Table 8F Adequacy of Feedback on Instructional Supervision

Indicator	M	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
-----------	---	----	----------------------------

1. Instructional supervisor provides data-based feedback and responses.	4.71	0.56	Very High
2. Instructional supervisor gives appreciation and positive comments.	4.74	0.55	Very High
3. Instructional supervisor discusses teacher's weaknesses and difficulties.	4.69	0.57	Very High
4. Instructional supervisor promotes two-way communication.	4.71	0.59	Very High
5. Instructional supervisor supports curriculum and staff development.	4.72	0.56	Very High
Domain Mean: Adequacy of Feedback on Instructional Supervision	4.71	0.51	Very High

Domain F recorded a mean of 4.71 (SD = 0.51), rated Strongly Agree. All five items fall within a narrow range from 4.69 to 4.74, indicating minimal variation in how teachers perceive the quality and scope of feedback received. The highest rated item is the supervisor's practice of giving appreciation and positive comments (M = 4.74, SD = 0.55), while the examination of teacher weaknesses and difficulties received the lowest item mean in the domain (M = 4.69, SD = 0.57). These results suggest that supervisors deliver well-rounded feedback that encompasses positive reinforcement, constructive critique, two-way dialogue, and support for professional development.

3.2. 3.11. Differences in Supervision Implementation by Profile Variables

Non-parametric tests were applied to determine whether statistically significant differences exist in the level of instructional supervision implementation when respondents are grouped according to civil status, position, educational attainment, bachelor's degree, and classification of school. The Kruskal-Wallis H test was used for variables with three or more groups, and the Mann-Whitney U test was applied for binary groupings (i.e., school classification). Results are presented in Table 10.

Table 9. Level of Differences in Instructional Supervision Implementation by Profile Variables

Grouping Variable (Test Used)	Test Statistic	p-value	Decision
Civil Status (Kruskal-Wallis)	H = 2.997	0.223	Not Significant
Position (Kruskal-Wallis)	H = 2.239	0.326	Not Significant
Educational Attainment (Kruskal-Wallis)	H = 5.676	0.129	Not Significant
Bachelor's Degree (Kruskal-Wallis)	H = 1.247	0.536	Not Significant
Classification of School (Mann-Whitney U)	U = 208.000	0.195	Not Significant

Table 9 shows that no statistically significant differences in supervisory implementation exist across the examined profile variables, as all p-values are greater than 0.05. Civil status, position, educational attainment, bachelor's degree, and school classification yielded closely clustered group means, indicating that teachers perceive supervisory practices similarly regardless of personal and professional characteristics. This suggests that supervision is implemented in a relatively uniform and systematized manner across the district. The findings of SOP 3 are consistent with literature emphasizing instructional supervision as a structured, system-wide process designed to ensure equitable support for all teachers [3–5].

As a collaborative and developmental mechanism, supervision provides guidance, feedback, and instructional assistance uniformly across teaching personnel. The absence of significant differences supports the view that supervision maintains consistent standards and expectations rather than varying based on individual teacher characteristics. These results also align with Philippine educational policies, including DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020 and

the RPMS framework anchored on the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) [9,11], which institutionalize supervision as a standardized and performance-based process. The non-significant differences observed suggest that such policy intentions are effectively realized within the Northern Conner District. Similarly, prior Philippine studies report that supervision guided by national standards tends to be implemented uniformly across schools and teacher groups [12–14].

However, while uniformity reflects equity and consistency, literature cautions that supervision must remain responsive to individual and contextual needs. Despite standardized frameworks, variations in implementation and depth of feedback may still occur, particularly in follow-through and developmental support [19,20]. The absence of differences may also indicate that supervision is experienced as procedural or compliance-oriented rather than differentiated and growth-focused [5,21].

Overall, the findings support the view that instructional supervision operates as a standardized and equitable system-wide practice, while highlighting the need to strengthen its developmental and differentiated aspects to better address diverse teacher needs and enhance instructional effectiveness.

3.12. *Level of Classroom Performance of Teachers*

Table 10. Level of Classroom Performance Based on IPCRF Observable Indicators

Observable Indicator	M	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
1. Applied knowledge of content within and across curriculum areas (PPST 1.1.2)	4.50	0.50	Outstanding
2. Used range of teaching strategies for literacy and numeracy (PPST 1.4.2)	4.76	0.43	Outstanding
3. Applied strategies for critical and creative thinking (PPST 1.5.2)	4.34	0.55	Very Satisfactory
4. Managed classroom structure for meaningful exploration (PPST 2.3.2)	4.74	0.44	Outstanding
5. Managed learner behavior constructively (PPST 2.6.2)	4.86	0.35	Outstanding
6. Used differentiated learning experiences (PPST 3.1.2)	4.66	0.48	Outstanding
7. Planned and managed developmentally sequenced teaching and learning (PPST 4.1.2)	4.86	0.35	Outstanding
8. Selected and used appropriate teaching and learning resources, including ICT (PPST 4.5.2)	4.72	0.45	Outstanding
9. Designed and used assessment strategies consistent with curriculum (PPST 5.1.2)	4.88	0.33	Outstanding
OVERALL MEAN	4.70	0.19	Outstanding

Table 10 presents the mean ratings of classroom performance based on IPCRF observable indicators for School Year 2025–2026, using a five-point scale (1.00–1.49 = Poor to 4.50–5.00 = Outstanding). The overall mean of 4.70 indicates an **Outstanding** level of performance among teachers in the Northern Conner District. Eight of the nine indicators fall within the Outstanding range, while applying strategies for critical and creative thinking obtained a mean of 4.34 (Very Satisfactory). The highest-rated indicator, designing and using assessment strategies aligned with curriculum requirements, demonstrates that teachers in the Northern Conner District are highly competent in aligning assessment with learning objectives, a practice essential for monitoring progress and improving outcomes [1,2].

High ratings in managing learner behavior constructively and planning developmentally sequenced instruction further indicate effective classroom management and organized instructional delivery, consistent with studies linking these

practices to improved engagement and achievement [3–5]. Teachers also demonstrated strong use of varied strategies for literacy, numeracy, and differentiated instruction, reflecting responsiveness to diverse learner needs [6–8]. The comparatively lower rating in higher-order thinking strategies suggests challenges in integrating critical and creative thinking, particularly in diverse or multi-grade contexts [9–11].

In summary, teachers in the Northern Conner District exhibit consistently high instructional performance, while further strengthening higher-order thinking integration may enhance teaching quality and support 21st-century competencies [12–14].

3.13. Differences in Classroom Performance by Profile Variables

The non-parametric approach was employed to determine whether teachers' classroom performance significantly differs across profile groupings. The results are presented in Table 12.

Table 11. Differences in Classroom Performance by Profile Variables

Grouping Variable (Test Used)	Test Statistic	p-value	Decision
Age Group (Kruskal-Wallis)	H = 9.565	0.023	Significant*
Civil Status (Kruskal-Wallis)	H = 0.743	0.690	Not Significant
Position (Kruskal-Wallis)	H = 11.310	0.004	Significant**
Educational Attainment (Kruskal-Wallis)	H = 2.671	0.445	Not Significant
Bachelor's Degree (Kruskal-Wallis)	H = 1.234	0.540	Not Significant
Classification of School (Mann-Whitney U)	U = 165.500	0.027	Significant*
Length of Service (Kruskal-Wallis)	H = 10.654	0.031	Significant*

Table 11 shows that classroom performance differs significantly across position, school classification, age group, and length of service, while civil status, educational attainment, and bachelor's degree show no significant differences. By position, Teacher II respondents obtained the highest mean performance, followed by Teacher III and Teacher I, suggesting that mid-career teachers demonstrate stronger classroom performance, possibly due to accumulated experience and ongoing professional development [1,2].

Teacher I respondents, typically in early service years, may still be consolidating instructional practices. Performance also differs by school classification, with teachers in mono-grade schools outperforming those in multi-grade settings. This may be attributed to the added complexity of managing multiple grade levels and differentiated instruction in multi-grade classrooms [3–5].

Significant differences were also observed across age and length of service. Teachers aged 41–50 and those in mid-career stages showed higher performance, indicating that teaching effectiveness tends to improve with experience and professional maturity, although patterns may vary over time [6–9]. In contrast, civil status, educational attainment, and bachelor's degree did not significantly influence performance, suggesting that these factors alone do not determine classroom effectiveness [10,11].

In general, the findings indicate that professional and contextual factors—such as experience, position, and school setting—play a more critical role in shaping classroom performance than personal characteristics, highlighting the need for targeted support for beginning teachers and those in multi-grade contexts.

3.3. 3.14. Relationship Between Instructional Supervision Practices and Classroom Performance

Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient was used to test whether a significant relationship exists between the level of implementation of instructional supervision practices and the level of teachers' classroom performance. Results are shown in Table 13.

Table 12. Correlation Between Instructional Supervision Practices and Classroom Performance

Dimension of Supervision	r	p-value	Decision
--------------------------	---	---------	----------

A. Advance Notifications and Planning	-0.067	0.616	Not Significant
B. Informal Visitations and Observations	0.134	0.318	Not Significant
C. Lesson Plan Review	0.017	0.897	Not Significant
D. Actual Classroom Observation	0.104	0.438	Not Significant
E. Immediacy of Feedback	-0.146	0.276	Not Significant
F. Adequacy of Feedback	-0.109	0.414	Not Significant
Overall Supervision	-0.017	0.900	Not Significant

Table 12 indicates that none of the six instructional supervision dimensions show a statistically significant relationship with classroom performance. The overall correlation is negligible, with coefficients ranging from $r = -0.146$ (Immediacy of Feedback) to 0.134, and all p-values exceeding the 0.05 threshold. Thus, no significant relationship exists between instructional supervision practices and teachers' classroom performance across all dimensions.

This finding contradicts prevailing literature which positions instructional supervision as a key mechanism for improving teaching effectiveness through guidance, feedback, and professional support [1,2]. Supervision is theoretically framed as a developmental and collaborative process that enhances instructional practices and classroom management [3–5], and prior studies report its positive effects on teacher performance [12–14].

Yet, such expected relationships are not statistically evident in the Northern Conner District. A plausible explanation lies in implementation gaps. Studies note that supervision is often perceived as compliance-oriented or inconsistently applied, limiting its instructional impact [5,21]. Variations in supervisory competence, feedback quality, and follow-through may further weaken its influence [10,11,18]. Ineffective practices—such as delayed feedback or superficial observations—may also fail to produce meaningful improvements [6–8]. Despite policy frameworks (e.g., DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020; PPST-RPMS) emphasizing its role [9,11], findings suggest that implementation variability, contextual factors, and restricted score ranges may obscure measurable effects [17,19–23].

The evidence suggests that supervision's impact depends on its quality and consistency in practice.

3.15. Relationship Between Supervision and Age, Length of Service and Position

Pearson's correlation coefficient was applied to determine whether age or length of service shows a significant linear relationship with the overall level of instructional supervision implementation.

Table 13. Correlation Between Supervision Implementation and Age, Length of Service and Position

Profile Variable	r	p-value	Decision
Age	-0.037	0.781	Not Significant
Length of Service	-0.102	0.450	Not Significant
Position	0.142	0.288	Not Significant

Table 13 shows that neither age nor length of service, and position is not significantly correlated with the level of instructional supervision implementation. Both correlations are negligible in magnitude and fail to reach statistical significance at the 0.05 level.

This finding supports literature stating that instructional supervision is a structured and policy-driven process that ensures consistent implementation across all teachers [9]. It is also aligned with studies emphasizing that supervision is designed as a standardized system of instructional support that applies uniformly regardless of teacher profile [3]. In addition, national frameworks such as the PPSSH highlight the role of school leaders in providing consistent coaching and mentoring to all teachers [10].

In addition, research shows that instructional supervision functions as a school-wide developmental process that promotes teaching improvement through regular guidance and feedback rather than personal characteristics of teachers [4]. This helps explain why no significant relationships were found in this study.

However, some studies suggest that differences in experience and position may still influence how supervision is perceived, particularly when feedback quality varies across settings [7]. Despite this, other findings indicate that effective supervision can still improve teacher performance regardless of demographic differences when properly implemented [5].

These results imply that instructional supervision in the district is consistently implemented across all teacher groups, reflecting strong adherence to standardized supervision practices.

4. Conclusion

The study concludes that instructional supervision in the Northern Conner District is effectively and consistently implemented, particularly in formal activities such as actual classroom observation, lesson plan review, and the provision of timely and adequate feedback, though informal and unannounced visitations remain the least practiced aspect of supervision. Teachers in the district demonstrate an outstanding level of classroom performance across most IPCRF observable indicators, reflecting their strong professional competence in instructional delivery, classroom management, and assessment practices, with critical and creative thinking strategies identified as a relative area for further development. Despite the high ratings in both variables, instructional supervision was found to have no significant relationship with classroom performance, suggesting that teacher performance in this context is more strongly shaped by individual professional factors such as age, position, and length of service and by teaching context, particularly school classification, than by supervisory practices alone. Furthermore, supervision was found to be uniformly implemented regardless of teachers' profile characteristics, indicating a standardized and equitable supervisory system that, while commendable for its consistency, may benefit from greater differentiation to better address the varying developmental needs of teachers across different career stages and school settings. Overall, while instructional supervision remains an essential mechanism for professional guidance and instructional monitoring, sustaining teacher growth through targeted professional development, strengthened informal supervision, and context-responsive support, especially for beginning teachers and those assigned in multi-grade schools, is paramount in advancing instructional quality and learner outcomes across the district.

Compliance with ethical standards

Acknowledgments

I acknowledge that I have not used ChatGPT or Copilot for refining some of the sections in the document.

Disclosure of conflict of interest

I affirm that the respondents voluntarily agreed to participate after being fully informed about the purpose, nature, and potential implications of the study. Their responses have been collected with utmost respect for their privacy and confidentiality, in accordance with ethical research guidelines.

Statement of ethical approval

The study was conducted with approval and in accordance with the standards of the college. No ethical approval was required, as the research followed all applicable ethical guidelines, ensuring respect for the respondents' privacy and confidentiality.

Statement of informed consent

Authors have declared that they have no known competing financial interests OR non-financial interests OR personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

References

- [1] Okafor RN, Obona EE, Ngene AN, Eji EE. School supervision and inspection: Enhancing educational quality, accountability, and student social welfare in Nigerian secondary schools. *Unizik Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies*. 2024 Dec 10;18(3).

- [2] Musriadi M, Nasrun N, Ansary K. The Effect of Principal Transformational Leadership on Teachers Performance at Junior High School of Banda Aceh. *Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun*. 2022;10(2):319-30.
- [3] Warman W. Principal managerial competence and academic supervision on vocational teacher performance. *EduLine Journal of Education and Learning Innovation* [Internet]. 2022 Nov 1;2(4):436–46. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.35877/454ri.eduline1286>
- [4] Storm A. Principles of Andragogy: Theory, Examples, and Implementation. [Internet]. Thinkific. 2023 [cited 2025 Nov 14]. Available from: <https://www.thinkific.com/blog/principles-andragogy>
- [5] Catcalin L. Supervisory Practices of School Heads: Teachers' Perspectives. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*. 2023;14(4):1-10.
- [6] Hoque KE, Kenayathulla HBB, Subramaniam MVD, Islam R. Relationships between supervision and teachers' performance and attitude in secondary schools in Malaysia. *SAGE Open* [Internet]. 2020 Apr 1;10(2). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020925501>
- [7] Ibaba GB, Akpan UF. Teacher supervision and students' academic output: Performance assessment of the Bayelsa State Post Primary School Board. *Journal of Contemporary Research in Educational Administration and Management*. 2024;1(1):87-95.
- [8] WONGMAHESAK K, Dalwinder KA, CARDOSO LM. TEACHER PERFORMANCE: WHAT IS IT, HOW IMPORTANT IS IT, AND HOW CAN WE MAKE IT HAPPEN SUSTAINABLY?. *Asian Education and Learning Review*. 2025;3(1):2-15.
- [9] Comighud SMT, Futralan MCZ, Cordevilla RP. Instructional supervision and performance evaluation: a correlation of factors. Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research) [Internet]. 2020 May 2; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3782708>
- [10] Delana J, Musico A. Challenges of Elementary Teachers in Teaching English: Instructional Supervision and Pedagogical Practices in Focus. *Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and...*, Query date. 2024 Oct 10;10:41
- [11] Olasiman MaR, Torreon LC. LEADERSHIP STYLES AND PRACTICES OF SCHOOL HEADS ON TEACHERS' TEACHING ACCOMPLISHMENT. *International Journal of Research -GRANTHAALAYAH* [Internet]. 2024 Dec 13;12(11). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.29121/granthaalayah.v12.i11.2024.5728>
- [12] Ruelan JI, Patiño EM. Instructional supervision and teachers' professional practices in PIO V. Corpus District, Masbate Province Division. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research* [Internet]. 2025 Jun 20;7(3). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2025.v07i03.47642>
- [13] Pomentel LD. Exploring the Influence of School Heads' Instructional Supervision on Teachers' Efficacy and Performance. *International Journal of Research Publications* [Internet]. 2024 Apr 16;148(1). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.47119/ijrp1001481520246420>
- [14] Arrieta GS. Curriculum Evaluation: Inputs for Principal's instructional leadership. *International Journal of Social Learning (IJSLS)* [Internet]. 2021 Apr 20;1(2):147–62. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.47134/ijsl.v1i2.45>
- [15] Sumapal MLS, Haramain JT. Descriptive study on the instructional supervision practices of Bangsamoro school heads: Evaluating their impact on educational improvement. Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research) [Internet]. 2023 Jun 30; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8435964>
- [16] Baggay CT, Bautista BJ, Celestino CF, Corral EG, Delos Santos Ana Ruth A, Francisco KA, Frias AS, Lotarte AG, Mijares III BF, Montevilla AL, Samson EJ. School Heads' Instructional Supervisions and Its Impact on Teachers' Job Satisfaction. *Online Submission*. 2021 Mar;6(3):1-6.
- [17] Fayo CA, Hilario CR. Effectiveness of Classroom Observation on Teachers' Performance. In *4th International Conference on Multidisciplinary Industry and Academic Research 2023* (pp. 472-478). Institute of Industry and Academic Research Incorporated.
- [18] Kilag OK, Uy FT, Calledo MF, Cerna YT, Villanueva KM, Angtud NA. Quality performance of teachers: work environment, work attitude, and principal supervision: qualitative investigation. *Science and Education*. 2023;4(7):415-29.
- [19] Ameli IL, Ayaga G, Ouda JB. Effectiveness of teacher supervision practices in the implementation of the Early Years Education Program. *Social Education Research* [Internet]. 2024 Jun 17;302–18. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.37256/ser.5220243992>

- [20] Yani E, Sari SM, Mukhlisuddin M. Analysis of Teacher Performance Assessment in Elementary School. *International Journal of Business, Law, and Education*. 2024 Mar 13;5(1):743-8.
- [21] Mejia-Tiamwatt J. Intensive school-based instructional supervision (ISBIS) influences academic teaching performance. *International Journal of Membrane Science and Technology*. 2023;10(2):149-54.
- [22] Ngole DM, Mkulu DG. The Role of School Heads' Supervision in Improving Quality of Teaching and Learning: A case of Public Secondary school in Ilemela District Mwanza Tanzania. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences* [Internet]. 2021 Jan 1;6(1):059–73. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.61.7>
- [23] Villa FT, Tulod RC. Correlating instructional leadership practices of school administrators with teachers competencies. *Linguistics and Culture Review* [Internet]. 2021 Jul 8;5(S1):83–99. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5ns1.1318>
- [24] Glickman CD. Developmental Supervision: Alternative practices for helping teachers improve instruction [Internet]. 1981. Available from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED208487.pdf>
- [25] Herzberg F. The motivation to work. John Wiley & Sons; 1959.