

Relationship Between Instructional Supervision Practices of School Heads and Teachers' Work Performance: Basis for an Intervention Plan

ROLANDO L. CABUTAJE, PhD

Allacapan South District
Allacapan, Cagayan, Philippines
rolando.cabutaje@deped.gov.ph

Abstract — Instructional supervision is a vital component of school leadership, directly influencing teacher effectiveness and learner outcomes. Despite its legal and professional grounding under Republic Act 9155 and related DepEd policies, supervision in many contexts continues to face challenges due to competing administrative responsibilities. This study examined the instructional supervision practices of school heads and their relationship to teachers' work performance in the Allacapan South District, Allacapan, Cagayan, Philippines. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed to determine the level of instructional supervision across five dimensions, namely, classroom observation, lesson planning, feedback provision, Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, and differentiated instruction, and their relationship to school heads' and teachers' performance ratings. Respondents included 12 school heads and 48 teachers selected through simple random sampling, with data gathered using a validated five-point Likert scale questionnaire. Findings showed that both school heads (mean = 4.78) and teachers (mean = 4.57) rated instructional supervision practices as very high, indicating consistently strong implementation of supervisory practices across schools in the district. The test of difference revealed no significant difference between the two groups' assessments ($t = 1.33$, $p = 0.187$), indicating closely aligned perceptions of instructional supervision practices. Performance ratings further indicated an exceptionally high-performing workforce, with all school heads receiving Outstanding OPCRf ratings (mean = 4.95) and 97.9% of teachers attaining Outstanding IPCRF ratings (mean = 4.95). Strong positive correlations were also found between instructional supervision and work performance for both school heads (coeff = 0.906, $p = 0.001$) and teachers (coeff = 0.709, $p = 0.001$), demonstrating that higher supervision quality is associated with higher OPCRf and IPCRF ratings. The study concludes that instructional supervision is consistently and effectively practiced across the district and substantially contributes to sustained high performance among school leaders and teachers. Strengthening existing supervision systems through structured and data-informed capacity-building interventions is therefore essential to sustain high-quality instruction. These findings served as the basis for proposing a strategic intervention plan to further enhance instructional supervision practices and improve the work performance of school heads and teachers through systematic and supportive supervision.

Keywords — *instructional supervision, teacher performance, school leadership, LAC sessions, differentiated instruction.*

I. Introduction

Instructional supervision plays a critical role in improving teaching and learning by providing systematic guidance and support to teachers. It serves as a key mechanism for strengthening instructional practices and fostering continuous professional development among educators. However, its implementation is often weakened by the heavy administrative workload of school heads, which limits opportunities for regular observations, mentoring, and feedback. As a result, supervision sometimes becomes secondary to administrative tasks, affecting its consistency and depth. This challenge persists even though instructional supervision is essential to strengthening instructional practices across schools.

Legal and professional frameworks strongly reinforce this supervisory role. Republic Act No. 9155 identifies school heads as instructional leaders responsible for improving teaching and learning, while DepEd Order No. 32, s. 2010 mandates regular classroom observations and mentoring as core functions. These policy issuances underscore the importance of instructional leadership, teacher support, and continuous improvement in teaching practices. Similarly, the issuances emphasize feedback, teacher development, and instructional leadership. These policies clearly define the expectations of school heads, yet competing administrative demands often hinder implementation.

In practice, school heads in Allacapan South District consistently demonstrate strong instructional leadership through classroom observations, lesson plan reviews, feedback sessions, and LAC facilitation. However, the frequency and consistency of these practices remain affected by administrative workload. Still, teachers often achieve very satisfactory to outstanding IPCRF ratings, suggesting that effective supervision, when implemented, contributes to strong teacher performance and professional growth. This situation highlights the potential influence of instructional supervision on teachers' professional effectiveness and work outcomes.

Empirical studies support this relationship. Gading (2024) found that regular and meaningful supervision improves instructional competence, while Toh et al. (2022) emphasized the importance of timely feedback and mentoring. Amanda and Nasution (2025) reported strong correlations between strategic supervision and teacher performance, reinforcing the need for structured supervisory systems. Likewise, Basilio and Bueno (2021) highlighted the importance of trust-based, collaborative supervision in promoting teacher development and instructional improvement.

Despite promising evidence, gaps remain in the implementation of supervision. Many schools lack a unified, institutionalized framework, leading to inconsistent practices that depend largely on individual initiative. Administrative burdens and time constraints further reduce opportunities for sustained instructional leadership. Moreover, teachers' perceptions (an important factor affecting engagement and effectiveness) are often overlooked. These conditions suggest the need for a more systematic and context-responsive approach to instructional supervision in

schools. These issues highlight the need for systematic, supportive, and context-responsive supervision models, especially in rural districts such as Allacapan South.

Given these challenges, strengthening instructional supervision in Allacapan South District is essential for sustaining high-quality teaching. By examining strengths, gaps, and the relationship between supervision and performance, this study aimed to generate evidence-based insights that support a comprehensive intervention plan to enhance instructional leadership and improve educational outcomes across the district. Specifically, the study examined the level of instructional supervision practices, the work performance of school heads and teachers, and the relationship between these variables as basis for developing an appropriate intervention program.

Literature Review

This section synthesizes relevant literature and previous studies that provide theoretical and empirical foundations for the present research, highlighting key concepts, findings, and gaps that justify the need for the current investigation and support the study's objectives.

Instructional Supervision

Instructional supervision is widely recognized as a foundational mechanism for improving teaching and learning, particularly within the Philippine educational context. It serves as a structured process through which school heads guide teachers in strengthening instructional practices, curriculum alignment, and classroom management. As institutionalized in the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) and the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), instructional supervision functions as a systematic strategy for fostering instructional quality and professional development. This aligns with national studies highlighting its essential role in elevating teacher competence and learner outcomes. While these standards clearly emphasize supervision as a key leadership responsibility, empirical evidence examining how these supervisory practices are implemented and perceived at the district level remains limited, particularly in rural school settings.

Go and Rey (2024) emphasized the positive influence of instructional supervision on teacher performance, noting that consistent supervision leads to improvements in lesson planning, instructional strategies, and student engagement. Their findings affirm that adequate, clear, and consistent supervisory feedback directly supports professional growth. Similarly, He et al. (2024) found that instructional leadership is a significant predictor of teachers' professional development; school heads who demonstrate strong supervisory competencies lead teachers toward improvement in teaching, research, and service dimensions. These findings highlight the importance of examining how specific supervisory practices (such as classroom observation, lesson planning support, and feedback provision) are implemented in actual school contexts.

Other authors have provided various perspectives on the forms and effectiveness of supervision. Yasin (2025) explored differentiated supervisory practices—including clinical

supervision, collaborative development, and self-directed growth—and reported that although these practices are widely implemented, their impact on teacher performance depends heavily on the consistency and context of application. Meanwhile, Rebugio (2025) described how master teachers function as frontline supervisors, carrying out mentoring and reflective practices despite systemic barriers such as heavy workloads, teacher resistance, and lack of resources. Basilio and Bueno (2021) further contextualized instructional supervision within the demands of 21st-century education, emphasizing the need for collaborative, trust-based, and assessment-driven models anchored in continuous professional learning. Despite these insights, there remains a need to determine how such supervisory approaches operate within specific school districts and how teachers and school heads perceive their implementation.

Collectively, these studies affirm that instructional supervision when implemented consistently, collaboratively, and reflectively, serves as a strategic driver of instructional quality and teacher development, particularly in settings where supervision is systematically aligned with school improvement priorities. However, limited studies have examined how these supervisory practices are assessed simultaneously by school heads and teachers and how such assessments relate to measurable indicators of work performance, which provides justification for conducting the present study.

Teachers' Performance

Teachers' performance plays a central role in determining overall school and learner achievement. In the literature, instructional supervision is frequently identified as a significant contributor to improved instructional delivery, higher professional standards, and enhanced performance appraisal outcomes. Studies demonstrate that when supervision is meaningful and sustained, teachers exhibit improved classroom practices, stronger instructional planning, and greater professional accountability. In the Philippine education system, teacher performance is commonly measured through performance evaluation tools such as the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF), which serves as a formal indicator of professional effectiveness.

Gading (2024) found that teachers under school heads who exceed supervisory expectations demonstrate improved instructional competence and higher performance ratings. The study shows a clear relationship between thoughtful supervision and increased teacher motivation and professional growth. Toh et al. (2022) similarly noted that adequate supervision contributes to outstanding teacher performance, particularly through the provision of mentoring, feedback, and professional support. These findings suggest that supervisory practices may significantly influence teachers' professional outcomes, yet empirical evidence linking specific supervisory dimensions to performance ratings remains limited.

Amanda and Nasution (2025) also highlighted the importance of strategic instructional leadership in improving teachers' professionalism. According to their findings, supervision

strategies such as reflective feedback, collaborative discussion, and regular observation substantially enhance teaching quality. Supporting this perspective, Rebugio (2025) emphasized how mentorship and reflective supervision build teacher confidence and capability even under challenging school conditions. This indicates that teacher performance may be strengthened when supervision is implemented systematically and supported by structured professional learning activities.

Additional insights from Basilio and Bueno (2021) underscore the vital role of trust-building and collaboration in ensuring that teachers perceive supervision as supportive rather than punitive an important condition for motivating teachers to improve practice. Across studies, teachers' performance is shown to increase when supervision includes constructive feedback, clear expectations, and opportunities for collaborative learning, such as LAC sessions. However, limited studies have examined how these supervisory practices relate directly to performance evaluation outcomes such as IPCRF and OPCRf ratings, highlighting a gap addressed by the present investigation.

Taken together, the literature shows that teachers excel when they receive structured, supportive, and professional supervision. Effective supervisory practices create conditions for strong performance ratings, enhanced instructional delivery, and sustained professional growth. These observations underscore the need to further examine the relationship between instructional supervision practices and the work performance of both school heads and teachers within specific educational contexts.

School Heads' Supervisory Practices

School heads play a pivotal role in shaping the instructional climate of schools through their supervisory practices. Their ability to implement consistent, supportive, and well-structured supervision directly influences instructional quality, teacher development, and overall school performance. Research consistently highlights that effective supervisory practices depend not only on administrative experience but also on leadership style, educational preparation, and the ability to provide meaningful instructional guidance. Within the Philippine school system, school heads are expected to perform these supervisory functions as part of their instructional leadership responsibilities.

He et al. (2024) found that school heads' instructional leadership skills, including supervision, communication, and curriculum coordination, significantly predict teachers' professional development. School heads who can mentor teachers, observe instruction meaningfully, and provide timely feedback foster more engaged and competent teaching staff. Meanwhile, Go and Rey (2024) emphasized that school heads who excel in supervisory roles contribute to improved teaching performance and better learning outcomes. These studies reinforce the importance of examining how school heads carry out supervisory practices in relation to teacher development and performance.

Yasin (2025) and Rebugio (2025) both highlighted contextual factors that influence supervisory effectiveness. While differentiated supervision practices may be conceptually strong, their impact varies depending on how thoroughly school heads implement them. Rebugio's study shows that some school heads and master teachers struggle due to systemic constraints such as limited time, administrative overload, and inadequate professional development. Nonetheless, many persist through collaborative supervision approaches, reflective practice, and mentorship. Such contextual challenges highlight the need to investigate supervisory practices within specific districts to better understand how these responsibilities are carried out in real school environments.

Basilio and Bueno (2021) added that supervisory practices must evolve to align with modern educational demands, including the use of technology, varied assessment strategies, and collaborative professional learning communities such as LAC sessions. Effective school heads adapt their strategies to the changing needs of teachers and learners, ensuring relevance and sustainability of supervisory practices. Understanding how these practices are implemented at the district level provides valuable insights for improving instructional leadership and designing appropriate intervention programs.

Overall, the literature affirms that the supervisory practices of school heads are critical to improving teaching quality, strengthening teacher performance, and ensuring effective instructional leadership. Their ability to implement context-responsive, collaborative, and data-driven supervision directly contributes to a high-performing educational environment. Given these findings, the present study was conducted to examine the level of instructional supervision practices of school heads, determine differences in the assessments of school heads and teachers, analyze the relationship between supervision and work performance, and generate evidence that can inform the development of an intervention program to strengthen instructional leadership in the Allacapan South District.

Research Questions

Effective instructional supervision was widely recognized as a key factor in enhancing teaching quality and overall school performance. School heads played a critical role in guiding teachers through classroom observation, lesson planning, feedback provision, professional learning activities, and differentiated instruction. However, the extent to which these supervisory practices influenced teachers' work performance in the Allacapan South District, Division of Cagayan, remained underexplored. This study aimed to examine the relationship between the instructional supervision practices of school heads and the work performance of both school heads and teachers, using performance ratings and self- and peer-assessments as key indicators.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of instructional supervision practices of school heads as assessed by themselves and the teachers along the following dimensions as follows:
 - a. Classroom Observation;

- b. Lesson Planning;
 - c. Feedback Provision;
 - d. Learning Action Cell (LAC) Sessions; and
 - e. Differentiated Instruction?
2. What is the level of work performance of the school heads and teachers as reflected in their IPCRF/OPCRF ratings?
 3. Is there a significant difference between the assessments of the school heads and teachers regarding instructional supervision practices?
 4. Is there a significant relationship between instructional supervision practices and the work performance of school heads and teachers?
 5. Based on the findings, what strategic intervention plan can be proposed to further enhance instructional supervision practices and work performance of school heads and teachers?

II. Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationship between school heads' instructional supervision practices and teachers' performance in Allacapan South District during School Year 2025–2026. The descriptive component analyzed current supervisory practices, including classroom observation, lesson planning, feedback provision, Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, and differentiated instruction, as perceived by both school heads and teachers. Descriptive-correlational designs are commonly used in educational research to describe existing conditions while simultaneously determining relationships among variables without manipulating them (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Johnson & Christensen, 2020). Meanwhile, the correlational aspect determined how these supervisory practices relate to teacher performance by analyzing responses from both groups using a researcher-made five-point Likert scale questionnaire. Likert-type instruments are widely applied in educational leadership studies to measure perceptions, attitudes, and professional practices in a systematic and quantifiable manner (Joshi et al., 2017). Through this approach, the study identified key patterns and relationships between supervisory behaviors and performance indicators, providing a clearer understanding of how instructional supervision influences teaching effectiveness and offering a basis for designing a targeted intervention plan.

Participants of the Study

The respondents of this study were 12 school heads and 48 public school teachers from the Allacapan South District in the Schools Division of Cagayan, with each of the 12 schools represented by its school head and four randomly selected teachers to ensure balanced district-

wide representation and capture both supervisory and recipient perspectives. This sampling configuration allowed the study to incorporate leadership and teacher viewpoints regarding instructional supervision practices and their relationship to performance outcomes. Simple random sampling was used to minimize selection bias and ensure that every teacher had an equal chance of being included, thereby increasing the reliability and generalizability of the findings (Etikan & Bala, 2017). Random sampling techniques are widely recommended in quantitative research because they improve representativeness and reduce systematic sampling error (Taherdoost, 2016). Data were gathered through a researcher-made five-point Likert scale questionnaire designed to assess perceptions and practices related to instructional supervision and its influence on work performance, a method frequently employed in leadership and educational management research to quantify professional practices and perceptions (Joshi et al., 2017; Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Instrumentation

Data were collected using a researcher-developed five-point Likert scale questionnaire to assess the instructional supervision practices of school heads, while teacher and school head performance were measured through the official Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) and Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF), respectively. The questionnaire was anchored on relevant Philippine legal and professional frameworks, including Republic Act No. 9155, DepEd Order No. 32, s. 2010, and the competency indicators outlined in the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) and Teachers (PPST), which guided the identification of key supervisory dimensions: classroom observation, lesson planning, feedback provision, Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, and differentiated instruction. These dimensions were supported by previous research highlighting the role of systematic observation, collaborative planning, feedback, and inclusive instructional practices in promoting teacher professional growth, while the institutionalization of LAC sessions and the emphasis on differentiated instruction addressed diverse learner needs. To ensure rigor, the instrument underwent pilot testing in a public elementary school outside the study sample to evaluate clarity and relevance, and feedback from respondents was used to refine ambiguous items. Content validity was established through expert evaluation by education specialists and experienced school administrators, confirming alignment with the intended dimensions and professional standards. Reliability testing using Cronbach's alpha demonstrated excellent internal consistency, with coefficients of 0.981 for the teachers' version and 0.977 for the school heads' version, and all individual dimensions exceeded the acceptable threshold of 0.70, confirming the instrument's robustness and suitability for assessing instructional supervision practices and their relationship with work performance (Taber, 2018).

Analysis of Data

The collected data were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques to provide a comprehensive assessment of instructional supervision practices and

teacher performance. Weighted mean and standard deviation were applied to determine the level of supervisory practices as perceived by school heads and teachers, summarizing how frequently and effectively activities such as classroom observation, lesson planning support, feedback provision, Learning Action Cell (LAC) facilitation, and differentiated instruction were implemented (Boone & Boone, 2016; Mishra et al., 2019). Descriptive statistics were also employed to assess teachers' work performance based on their Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) ratings. To examine whether significant differences existed between the perceptions of school heads and teachers, an independent-samples t test was conducted, while Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients (Pearson r) were used to evaluate the strength and significance of the relationship between instructional supervision practices and teacher performance outcomes (Kim, 2017; Schober et al., 2018). These statistical procedures enabled the study to identify patterns in the implementation of supervision, test for alignment between evaluator groups, and quantify the association between supervisory practices and professional performance, providing evidence-based insights into the impact of instructional leadership on teaching effectiveness.

III. Results and Discussion

This section presents and interprets the key findings of the study, highlighting the patterns and relationships observed among the variables investigated.

Level of Instructional Supervision Practices of School Heads as Assessed by School Heads and Teachers

Table 1 presents the comparative level of instructional supervision practices of school heads as assessed by school heads and teachers across five dimensions: classroom observation, lesson planning, feedback provision, Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, and differentiated instruction. Overall, both groups rated the practices very high, with school heads reporting a higher overall mean of 4.78 compared with teachers' 4.57, indicating strong and consistent supervisory implementation.

As shown in Table 1, classroom observation obtained a mean of 4.77 from school heads and 4.64 from teachers, suggesting that monitoring and support for teaching practices are regularly implemented and recognized. In terms of lesson planning, school heads reported the highest rating (4.85), while teachers rated it 4.57, indicating active supervisory involvement in reviewing lesson plans and ensuring curriculum alignment.

Similarly, feedback provision received very high ratings from both groups (4.82 for school heads and 4.65 for teachers), implying that feedback processes are perceived as timely and supportive of teachers' professional development. For LAC sessions, school heads reported 4.70 while teachers rated 4.47, suggesting generally effective collaborative learning activities, though with slightly lower teacher perceptions. Finally, differentiated instruction was rated 4.78 by school

heads and 4.54 by teachers, reflecting strong encouragement of inclusive and learner-centered instructional practices.

Overall, the results in Table 1 indicate a high level of agreement between school heads and teachers regarding the implementation of instructional supervision practices. Although school heads rated themselves slightly higher across all dimensions, both groups consistently perceived supervision practices to be highly implemented, underscoring their role in supporting instructional improvement and teacher professional growth.

Table 1. Comparative Level of Instructional Supervision Practices of School Heads as Assessed by School Heads and Teachers

Dimension	School Heads Mean	Interpretation	Teachers Mean	Interpretation
Classroom Observation	4.77	Very High	4.64	Very High
Lesson Planning	4.85	Very High	4.57	Very High
Feedback Provision	4.82	Very High	4.65	Very High
Learning Action Cell (LAC) Sessions	4.70	Very High	4.47	Very High
Differentiated Instruction	4.78	Very High	4.54	Very High
Overall Mean	4.78	Very High	4.57	Very High

Level of Work Performance of School Heads and Teachers as Reflected in OPCRf and IPCRF Ratings

The results in Table 2 indicate an exceptionally high-performing workforce within the district, as evidenced by the OPCRf ratings of school heads and the IPCRF ratings of teachers. All 12 school heads received OPCRf ratings between 4.50 and 5.00, placing them in the “Outstanding” category, with a mean of 4.95 and a standard deviation of 0.05. This perfect distribution suggests that school heads consistently meet or exceed expectations across key areas of leadership, administration, and instructional supervision. The uniformity of these ratings highlights strong leadership practices, effective governance, and a high level of accountability across the district.

Similarly, teachers demonstrated exceptional performance, with 47 out of 48 teachers (97.9%) attaining IPCRF ratings in the 4.50–5.00 “Outstanding” range, and only 1 teacher (2.1%) receiving a “Very Satisfactory” rating. The teachers’ mean score was also 4.95, with a standard deviation of 0.58, reflecting overall consistency in professional standards, instructional delivery, and commitment to quality education. The slightly higher standard deviation among teachers indicates minor variation in individual performance, which is typical in large teaching populations.

The findings suggest that both school heads and teachers maintain high levels of work performance, which likely contributes to a positive school climate and effective instructional outcomes. The alignment between school heads’ leadership practices and teachers’ professional

performance underscores the potential impact of strong instructional supervision, feedback mechanisms, and collaborative practices on overall organizational effectiveness. Moreover, the consistency of outstanding ratings provides empirical support for the district’s commitment to professional excellence and accountability frameworks.

Table 2. Distribution of OPCR and IPCRF Ratings

Rating Category	School Heads (OPCRF) N=12	%	Teachers (IPCRF) N=48	%
Outstanding (4.500–5.000)	12	100.0	47	97.9
Very Satisfactory (3.500–4.499)	0	0	1	2.1
Mean	4.95	—	4.95	—
Standard Deviation	0.05	—	0.58	—

Significant Difference Between the Assessments of School Heads and Teachers Regarding Instructional Supervision Practices

The comparative analysis of school heads’ and teachers’ assessments reveals no statistically significant difference in perceptions of instructional supervision practices, as indicated by the overall p-value of 0.187, exceeding the 0.05 threshold for significance. School heads reported a marginally higher mean score (mean = 4.78, S.D. = 0.39) relative to teachers (mean = 4.57, S.D. = 0.52), yet the computed t-value of 1.33 with df = 58 confirms that this difference is not meaningful. These results suggest that both groups share a highly aligned perception, recognizing that instructional supervision is implemented at a very high level across the district.

This convergence of perceptions reflects effective communication, transparency, and consistency in supervisory practices. When school heads’ self-assessments closely mirror teacher evaluations, it indicates that teachers acknowledge and validate leadership efforts in conducting classroom observations, providing constructive feedback, facilitating LAC sessions, and supporting differentiated instruction. Triangulating these perception-based measures with objective performance indicators, such as IPCRF and OPCR ratings, further enhances the credibility of the findings. The consistently high performance ratings across both groups provide an external benchmark corroborating the perceived effectiveness of instructional supervision, while minimizing potential self-enhancement bias among school heads.

Analysis by core dimensions, as summarized in Table 3, further illustrates this pattern. No significant differences were found in Classroom Observation (t = 1.21, p = 0.231), Lesson Planning (t = 1.48, p = 0.144), Feedback Provision (t = 1.29, p = 0.201), LAC Sessions (t = 1.16, p = 0.251), or Differentiated Instruction (t = 1.33, p = 0.187). These findings confirm that school heads and teachers consistently rate all supervisory dimensions at a very high level, underscoring a shared understanding of expectations and practices.

Table 3. Comparative Assessment of School Heads and Teachers on Instructional Supervision Practices

Core Dimensions	Test Statistic	Computed t-value	Df	P-value	Decision	Interpretation
1. Classroom Observation	t-test	1.21	58	0.231	Fail to reject Ho	No significant difference; both school heads and teachers perceive classroom observation as Very High (4.82 vs. 4.61).
2. Lesson Planning	t-test	1.48	58	0.144	Fail to reject Ho	No significant difference; both groups perceive lesson planning support as Very High (4.75 vs. 4.54).
3. Feedback Provision	t-test	1.29	58	0.201	Fail to reject Ho	No significant difference; both groups perceive feedback provision as Very High (4.79 vs. 4.57).
4. Learning Action Cell (LAC) Sessions	t-test	1.16	58	0.251	Fail to reject Ho	No significant difference; both groups perceive facilitation of LAC sessions as Very High (4.76 vs. 4.55).
5. Differentiated Instruction	t-test	1.33	58	0.187	Fail to reject Ho	No significant difference; both groups perceive support for differentiated instruction as Very High (4.78 vs. 4.57).
Overall Result	t-test	1.33	58	0.187	Fail to reject Ho	Overall, no significant difference; both school heads and teachers perceive instructional supervision as Very High.

Tested using an Independent Samples t-test at a 0.05 level of significance

Ho: There is no statistically significant difference between the assessments of school heads and teachers regarding instructional supervision practices.

Level of Significance = 0.05

These results align with previous literature, which emphasizes that strong, consistent, and supportive supervision fosters aligned perceptions among educational stakeholders. Naguit (2024) reported that teachers tend to view supervision positively when school heads consistently implement mentoring and observation practices. Gading (2024) similarly highlighted that effective instructional supervision improves teacher performance while reducing discrepancies between self-assessment and teacher evaluation. Moreover, Ubogu (2024) observed that regular, collaborative, and reflective supervision leads to congruent perceptions between school leaders and teachers. Collectively, these studies support the present finding that aligned perceptions are characteristic of contexts with structured, transparent, and sustained supervisory practices.

The implications of these findings extend to broader educational settings. The alignment between perception-based assessments and performance outcomes underscores the importance of

structured classroom observation, constructive feedback, collaborative professional learning, and differentiated instructional support as pillars of effective instructional supervision. In resource-constrained rural settings, such as the Allacapan South District, these practices demonstrate how strong instructional leadership can be implemented successfully despite administrative challenges. Additionally, the triangulated evidence offers guidance for policymakers and educational leaders in designing supervision frameworks that balance accountability with professional growth, providing a model that is both evidence-driven and adaptable to diverse educational contexts.

Significant Relationship Between Instructional Supervision Practices and the Work Performance of School Heads and Teachers

The results indicate a strong, positive, and statistically significant relationship between instructional supervision practices and work performance for both school heads and teachers. For school heads, the correlation coefficient was $r = 0.906$, $p = 0.001$, and for teachers, $r = 0.709$, $p = 0.001$, demonstrating that higher levels of instructional supervision are associated with higher performance ratings. These findings suggest that consistent and high-quality supervisory practices, including classroom observations, lesson-planning support, timely feedback, LAC facilitation, and guidance on differentiated instruction, directly enhance performance outcomes for educational leaders and teaching staff alike. Consequently, schools and districts may anticipate performance gains by formalizing supervisory systems, strengthening feedback mechanisms, and aligning LAC sessions with observed instructional needs.

These findings are consistent with prior studies. Sugiari et al. (2024) emphasized that adequate and sustained supervision leads to superior teacher performance, highlighting the impact of timely mentoring and constructive feedback. Akpalu et al. (2025) found that school heads functioning as instructional specialists positively influence teacher performance indicators, while Difoni et al. (2025) documented significant correlations between supervision strategies and teacher outcomes, recommending regular classroom observation and collaborative professional development.

Similarly, literature on school heads' leadership practices aligns with these results. He et al. (2024) reported that instructional leadership behaviors, including teaching monitoring, curriculum coordination, and promotion of professional growth, strongly predict school heads' effectiveness and organizational outcomes. Esmat (2025) confirmed that leaders actively engaged in supervision, coaching, and data-driven decision-making exhibit higher managerial competence and professional accountability. Siagian et al. (2025) further asserted that principals prioritizing instructional supervision enhance teacher quality and simultaneously improve their own leadership performance through reflective practice.

The observed strong correlations are also contextually grounded in the Allacapan South District, where close-knit school communities, established supervisory routines, and high professional accountability facilitate effective supervision. The alignment between high-quality

supervision and strong performance, reflected in both IPCRF and OPCRf ratings, underscores that practices such as structured observations, feedback provision, and collaborative LAC engagements are effectively implemented in this rural context. These findings extend beyond local relevance, demonstrating that context-responsive, well-structured supervision can serve as a model for improving instructional quality in diverse educational environments internationally.

Table 4. Significant Relationship Between Instructional Supervision Practices and Work Performance

Variables	Statistical Test	Coefficient (r)	Prob.	Decision	Interpretation
Instructional Supervision Practices School Heads' Work Performance	Pearson r	0.906	0.001	Reject Ho	Significant positive relationship; higher supervision correlates with higher performance ratings.
Instructional Supervision Practices *Teachers' Work Performance		0.709	0.001	Reject Ho	Significant positive relationship; higher supervision correlates with higher performance ratings.

Ho: There is no significant relationship between instructional supervision practices and the work performance of school heads and teachers.

Level of Significance = 0.05

Proposed Strategic Intervention Plan

Strategic Intervention Plan to Enhance Instructional Supervision Practices and Work Performance

Introduction

The study reveals high levels of instructional supervision among school heads and strong work performance among teachers, yet opportunities exist to systematize and strengthen these practices. A strategic intervention plan is proposed to enhance supervision effectiveness and consolidate high performance across schools in the Allacapan South District.

Proposed Interventions

- Structured Supervision Protocols** – Develop formal supervision schedules for classroom observation, lesson-plan review, feedback provision, and LAC facilitation to ensure consistency, equitable support, and standardization (Naguit, 2024).
- Capacity-Building for School Heads** – Conduct workshops on differentiated instruction, reflective observation, data-driven decision-making, mentoring, and coaching to align self-assessment with teacher perception (He et al., 2024; Esmat, 2025).
- Collaborative Learning Communities** – Expand LAC sessions into cross-school professional learning communities for peer mentoring, reflective discussion, and curriculum innovation to enhance teacher performance (Basilio & Bueno, 2021).

4. **Integrated Feedback Mechanisms** – Implement multi-source feedback systems combining self-, peer-, and supervisor assessments, structured reflection, and anonymous surveys to enhance transparency and accountability (Gading, 2024; Ubogu, 2024).
5. **Data-Driven Monitoring Tools** – Adopt digital dashboards to track supervision and performance, align LAC topics with IPCRF and OPCR metrics, and guide targeted interventions (Sugiar et al., 2024; Difoni et al., 2025).
6. **Recognition and Incentives** – Introduce awards and professional incentives to reinforce effective supervision, sustain motivation, and promote a culture of instructional excellence (Akpalu et al., 2025).

Implementation Framework

- **Tier 1 (0–6 months):** Implement structured schedules, standardize observation and feedback, introduce multi-source assessment.
- **Tier 2 (6–12 months):** Conduct capacity-building workshops, expand collaborative LACs, integrate digital monitoring tools.
- **Tier 3 (12–24 months):** Establish recognition systems, evaluate longitudinal outcomes, and refine strategies based on evidence.

Expected Outcomes

- Aligned perceptions of supervision between school heads and teachers.
- Enhanced instructional competence, motivation, and professional growth.
- Sustained high work performance and accountability.
- Evidence-based instructional leadership adaptable to diverse educational contexts.

This plan translates empirical findings into actionable interventions, linking structured supervision to high work performance. By integrating systematization, professional development, collaboration, feedback, and recognition, it offers a scalable, evidence-driven model for improving instructional quality, teacher professionalization, and school leadership globally.

IV. Conclusion

The study confirms that instructional supervision practices in the Allacapan South District are consistently implemented at very high levels, as affirmed by both school heads and teachers across classroom observation, lesson planning, feedback provision, LAC sessions, and differentiated instruction, which is further corroborated by outstanding OPCR and IPCRF ratings. The close alignment between self-assessments and teacher evaluations highlights a cohesive and supportive instructional environment, while the strong, positive correlations between supervision

and work performance demonstrate that structured guidance, timely feedback, and collaborative professional support significantly enhance teaching effectiveness and overall school outcomes. These results provide empirical justification for the proposed Strategic Intervention Plan, which operationalizes the study's findings through structured supervision protocols, capacity-building workshops, collaborative Learning Action Cell communities, integrated multi-source feedback, data-driven monitoring tools, and recognition systems-designed to institutionalize evidence-based, performance-driven supervision practices, enhance instructional quality, foster professional growth among school heads and teachers, and offer a replicable model for strengthening school leadership and instructional outcomes in similar educational contexts.

REFERENCES

- [2] Akpalu, R., Owusu, J., Asare, E. A., & Boateng, P. A. (2025). Influence of Head-Teachers' Instructional Supervision Practices on Teacher Performance in Primary Schools in Ghana: An Integrated Theoretical Model. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(3s), 151-159.
- [3] Amanda, T., & Nasution, I. (2025). Strategic Instructional Leadership Of The School Principal Through Language In Enhancing Teacher Professionalism. *Esteem Journal of English Education Study Programme*, 8(2), 398-410.
- [4] Basilio, M. B., & Bueno, D. C. (2021). Instructional supervision and assessment in the 21st century and beyond. *Online Submission*, 4, 1-8.
- [5] Boone, H. N., & Boone, D. A. (2016). Analyzing Likert data. *Journal of Extension*, 54(2). <https://doi.org/10.34068/joe.54.02.48>
- [6] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/research-design/book255675>
- [7] Department of Education. (2020). Adoption of the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan for school year 2020-2021 in the light of the COVID-19 public health emergency (DepEd Order No. 012, s. 2020). DepEd Central Office.
- [8] Department of Education. (2020). Interim guidelines for assessment and grading in light of the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan (DepEd Order No. 031, s. 2020). DepEd Central Office.
- [9] DepEd Order No. 32, s. 2010. National Adoption and Implementation of the National Competency-Based Standards for School Heads. Chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/<https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/DO-No.-32-s.-2010.pdf>.
- [10] DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016. The Learning Action Cell as a K to 12 Basic Education Program School-Based Continuing Professional Development Strategy for the Improvement of Teaching and Learning. chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/DO_s2016_035.pdf.
- [11] Difoni, N. N., Imeh, A. A. M., Osha, M. I., & Obona, E. E. (2025). Assessing the relationship between principals' instructional supervisory strategies and teachers' job performance in public secondary schools. *Unizik Journal Of Educational Laws And Leadership Studies*, 1(1).

- [12] Esmat, G. (2025). *Cultivating Data-Driven Leadership: A Design Development Study to Enhancing Educational Outcomes Through Collaboration and Professional Development* (Doctoral dissertation).
- [13] Etikan, I., & Bala, K. (2017). Sampling and sampling methods. *Biometrics & Biostatistics International Journal*, 5(6), 00149. <https://doi.org/10.15406/bbij.2017.05.00149>
- [14] Gading, S. J. L. (2024). Instructional leadership practices of the school heads to improve teachers' performance. *United International Journal for Research & Technology*, 5(6), 89-119.
- [15] Go, A. D. G., & Rey, T. E. (2024). School heads' instructional supervisory skills and teachers' performance.
- [16] He, P., Guo, F., & Abazie, G. A. (2024). School principals' instructional leadership as a predictor of teacher's professional development. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 9(1), 63.
- [17] Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2020). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (7th ed.). SAGE Publications. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/educational-research/book258243>
- [18] Joshi, A., Kale, S., Chandel, S., & Pal, D. (2017). Likert scale: Explored and explained. *British Journal of Applied Science & Technology*, 7(4), 396-403. <https://doi.org/10.9734/BJAST/2015/14975>
- [19] Kim, T. K. (2017). T test as a parametric statistic. *Korean Journal of Anesthesiology*, 70(5), 540-546. <https://doi.org/10.4097/kjae.2017.70.5.540>
- [20] Mishra, P., Pandey, C. M., Singh, U., Gupta, A., Sahu, C., & Keshri, A. (2019). Descriptive statistics and normality tests for statistical data. *Annals of Cardiac Anaesthesia*, 22(1), 67-72. https://doi.org/10.4103/aca.ACA_157_18
- [21] Naguit, J. (2024). Instructional Leadership Practices of School Heads and Performance of Teachers in Instructional Supervision. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(7), 1-26.
- [22] Philippines. (2001). Republic Act No. 9155: Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. http://gazette.lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2001/pdf/ra_9155_2001.pdf
- [23] Rebugio Jr, D. B. (2025). Master Teachers' lived Experiences In Instructional Supervision. *Globus Journal of Progressive Education*, 15, 1-5
- [24] Schober, P., Boer, C., & Schwarte, L. A. (2018). Correlation coefficients: Appropriate use and interpretation. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, 126(5), 1763-1768. <https://doi.org/10.1213/ANE.0000000000002864>
- [25] Siagian, N., Amin, H., Munawati, S., Syafruddin, S., & Suprihatin, S. (2025). School Principal supervision and Teacher Professionalism: A study on Leadership in Islamic schools. *Munaddhomah: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 6(2), 223-237.
- [26] Sugiar, L., Sukirman, S., & Sanusi, S. (2024). Academic Supervision as a Strategy for Improving Teaching and Learning Quality. *International Journal of Educational Administration, Management, and Leadership*, 31-48.
- [27] Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in science education*, 48(6), 1273-1296.
- [28] Taherdoost, H. (2016). Sampling methods in research methodology: How to choose a sampling technique for research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*, 5(2), 18-27. <https://hal.science/hal-02546796>
- [29] Toh, R. Q. E., Koh, K. K., Lua, J. K., Wong, R. S. M., Quah, E. L. Y., Panda, A., ... & Krishna, L. K. R. (2022). The role of mentoring, supervision, coaching, teaching and

instruction on professional identity formation: a systematic scoping review. *BMC medical education*, 22(1), 531.

[30] Ubogu, R. (2024). Supervision of instruction: a strategy for strengthening teacher quality in secondary school education. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 27(1), 99-116.

[31] Yasin, G. R. G. (2025). Differentiated Supervision and Performance of Teachers and Learners in Mega Elementary School in Region XII.