ISA Journal of Multidisciplinary (ISAJM)

Homepage: https://isapublisher.com/isajm/

Volume 3, Issue 2, March-April, 2026 ISSN: 3049-1851

Correlates of Instructional Effectiveness: The Role of Administrators' Supervision Practices

Elfie S. Reyes

Graduate School, Quirino State University, Philippines, Department of Education – Quirino, Philippines

Received: 21.02.2026 | **Accepted:** 20.03.2026 | **Published:** 25.03.2026

***Corresponding Author:** Elfie S. Reyes

DOI: *10.5281/zenodo.19218227*

Abstract **Review Article**

This research investigated how the supervisory methods used by school administrators influence the classroom performance of teachers within the public school system of Quirino's First District. Province during the School Year 2025–2026. This research aimed to evaluate the depth of various supervisory methods, specifically focusing on instructional, clinical, administrative, and environmental support frameworks. Simultaneously, it measured the professional performance of educators by analyzing their IPCRF scores across three key domains: subject matter expertise (pedagogy), classroom atmosphere management, and curriculum design.

To investigate these connections, the study utilized a descriptive-correlational quantitative model. The participant pool consisted of 287 public school educators, identified through a stratified random sampling process across the Diffun I, Diffun II, Saguday, and Cabarroguis districts. Information was gathered using a customized survey on supervision alongside official performance ratings. To interpret the findings, the analysis employed weighted means, Pearson's r for relationship testing, and multiple regression to determine predictive factors. Findings showed that administrators consistently practiced instructional supervision across all domains, with administrative and environmental/supportive supervision receiving the highest ratings. Teachers demonstrated an outstanding level of instructional effectiveness across all indicators. However, correlation results indicated generally weak relationships between supervision practices and instructional effectiveness. Only administrative supervision showed a significant but weak positive relationship with teachers' content knowledge and pedagogy. Regression analysis further revealed that administrative supervision was the only significant predictor of instructional effectiveness, although its predictive power was minimal. Overall, the findings suggest that while supervisory practices are consistently implemented, they exert limited influence on teachers' instructional effectiveness. Apart from the core supervisory practices, other contributors such as teacher motivation, as well as continuous growth opportunities, and organizational climate, may play more significant roles in shaping teacher performance. The study highlights the need to strengthen developmental and mentoring-oriented supervision to better support teacher growth and instructional improvement.

Keywords: instructional supervision, instructional effectiveness, administrative supervision, teacher performance, school leadership.

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)

Introduction

Instructional supervision is a key part of making sure schools provide better lessons. By helping teachers get better at how they teach, it creates a much better learning environment for everyone and supports the achievement of better student learning outcomes (Wiyono et al., 2021). Research has also shown that instructional supervision empowers teachers and improves classroom practices, which ultimately contributes to better student outcomes (Quilala and Tantiado, 2025). Effective supervision allows teachers to receive constructive feedback, professional guidance, and opportunities to enhance their teaching practices. Several studies have emphasized the value of supervision in improving teacher performance. Obi et al. (2024) found that clinical practices centered on observing instructional delivery, providing actionable feedback, and collaboration help teachers identify instructional gaps and improve their pedagogical skills. Leadership and administrative support from school heads also contribute to teachers' effectiveness. Ayalew et al. (2022) reported that principals with strong managerial and conceptual skills tend to create environments where teachers perform more effectively. Likewise, Lema and Otieno (2022) found that the guidance provided by school heads directly enhances the instructional quality of the faculty's job performance by promoting accountability and motivation. In addition, environmental and administrative support practices were also found to influence teachers' classroom management and overall effectiveness (Emegwa, 2024; Nwankwo and Muoneke, 2024). While many studies highlight the positive role of supervision, its actual impact on teachers' instructional effectiveness may differ depending on the context of schools. In public schools in Quirino Province, teachers often face instructional challenges such as diverse learners, multi-grade classes, and varying levels of parental involvement. These conditions require consistent guidance and support from school administrators.

Given this situation, the study sought to determine the relationship between the supervision practices of public-school administrators and teachers' instructional effectiveness. Specifically, it aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What is the extent of instructional supervision practices of administrators as perceived by the teachers in terms of:
    a. instructional supervision;
    b. clinical supervision;
    c. technical assistance and
    d. environmental/supportive supervision.
2. What is the level of teachers' instructional effectiveness based on their IPCRF ratings in terms of;
    a. content knowledge and pedagogy;
    b. learning environment;
    c. and curriculum and planning.
3. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of instructional supervision practices and teachers' instructional effectiveness?
4. Which domain of instructional supervision significantly predicts teachers' instructional effectiveness?

Methods

The researcher used a quantitative approach to see how school leaders' management styles connect with teacher performance in the First District of Quirino Province for the 2025–2026 school year. This method focused on describing current habits and finding links between how administrators lead and how well teachers handle their classes. The independent variable was supervision practices, including instructional, clinical, administrative, and environmental/supportive supervision, while the dependent variable was teachers' instructional effectiveness. A total of 287 teachers from the public school system took part in this research. This group was selected to provide a clear and accurate look at

the teaching staff in Diffun I, Diffun II, Saguday, and Cabarroguis. The researchers used a stratified random sampling technique to choose the participants. This method ensured that the group of teachers accurately represented the different parts of the school districts involved. Data were gathered using a modified supervision questionnaire and teachers' IPCRF ratings. Weighted mean determined supervision extent, Pearson correlation tested relationships, and multiple regression identified significant predictors of instructional effectiveness among teachers.

Results and Discussions

RQ1a: What is the extent of instructional supervision practices of administrators as perceived by the teachers in terms of Instructional Supervision?

Table 1. Extent of Instructional Supervision Practices of Administrators as Perceived by the Respondents, along with Instructional Supervision

Statements	Mean	SD	Description
1. My school head conducts classroom observations regularly.	3.57	.59	A
2. Provides constructive and timely feedback after observations.	3.73	.48	A
3. Demonstrates knowledge of instructional strategies.	3.73	.50	A
4. Assists in improving lesson planning and preparation.	3.70	.54	A
5. Supports the use of varied instructional materials and approaches.	3.77	.46	A
Grand Mean	**3.70**	**.43**	**A**

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Always (A)
2.50 – 3.24 Often (O)
1.75 – 2.49 Sometimes (S)
1.00 – 1.74 Never (N)

The findings indicate that school administrators "Always" practice instructional supervision (Grand Mean = 3.70), reflecting a consistent commitment to conducting classroom observations and providing timely feedback. These results align with the study by Zarco (2024), which highlighted that consistent guidance and classroom check-ins are essential for helping teachers do a better job in classroom instruction and management. Likewise, studies have shown that classroom observation and feedback contribute significantly to teachers' professional development and improvement of teaching practices (Unissa and Alhasan, 2024). This matches the research by

Pomentel (2024), which showed a clear link between how school leaders guide instruction and how confident teachers feel in their own abilities. The high score (M = 3.77) reflects how much importance administrators placed on using different teaching tools and methods. Other research also confirms that effective supervisory practices such as monitoring, mentoring, and observation are positively related to teachers' instructional performance and classroom management (Jurado, 2026). These results imply that school heads are actively fulfilling their roles as instructional leaders by guiding teachers and strengthening the teaching–learning process through professional support and feedback.

RQ1b: What is the extent of instructional supervision practices of administrators as perceived by the teachers in terms of Clinical Supervision?

Table 2. Extent of Instructional Supervision Practices of Administrators as Perceived by the Respondents along Clinical Supervision

Statements	Mean	SD	Description
1. Holds pre-observation conferences with teachers.	3.66	.57	A
2. Uses observation tools aligned with DepEd standards.	3.85	.39	A
3. Conducts post-conferences focused on improving teaching.	3.82	.42	A
4. Encourages reflection on instructional strengths and weaknesses.	3.81	.43	A
5. Collaboratively sets improvement goals with teachers.	3.80	.43	A
Grand Mean	**3.79**	**.39**	**A**

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Always (A)
2.50 – 3.24 Often (O)
1.75 – 2.49 Sometimes (S)
1.00 – 1.74 Never (N)

The data reveal that clinical supervision is consistently practiced (Grand Mean = 3.79), with the highest emphasis placed on using observation tools aligned with DepEd standards (M = 3.85). This systematic approach is validated by Anah and Harbor (2025), who found that clinical supervision and conference strategies are vital predictors of teacher job effectiveness. The inclusion of pre- and post-observation conferences (M = 3.82 and 3.66) mirrors the "Phenomenology of Clinical Supervision" described by Bayer et al. (2024), which highlights the importance of the observation cycle in teacher development. These results imply that the supervision process is developmental and reflective, encouraging teachers to collaboratively set improvement goals, a practice that Norjannah and Ishartiwi (2025) describe as a catalyst for implementing advanced instructional strategies like differentiated instruction.

RQ1c: What is the extent of instructional supervision practices of administrators as perceived by the teachers in terms of Administrative Supervision?

Table 3. Extent of Instructional Supervision Practices of Administrators as Perceived by the Respondents along with Administrative Supervision

Statements	Mean	SD	Description
1. Ensures teachers comply with school policies and DepEd guidelines.	3.88	.34	A
2. Monitors punctuality and attendance.	3.80	.43	A
3. Supervises documentation (class records, reports).	3.83	.39	A
4. Facilitates smooth implementation of school programs.	3.82	.44	A
5. Communicates expectations clearly and professionally.	3.84	.41	A
Grand Mean	**3.83**	**.31**	**A**

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Always (A)
2.50 – 3.24 Often (O)
1.75 – 2.49 Sometimes (S)
1.00 – 1.74 Never (N)

In terms of administrative supervision, the results show a consistent practice (Grand Mean = 3.83), specifically in ensuring compliance with school policies and DepEd guidelines (M = 3.88). This focus on accountability and monitoring is supported by Nwankwo and Muoneke (2024), who assert that administrative support practices significantly influence teachers' classroom management. Moreover, the clear communication of expectations (M = 3.84) aligns with the findings of Velez (2025), who established a direct relationship between the supervisory skills of school heads and teacher performance levels. The implication is that a strong administrative framework exists within the school, prioritizing order, documentation, and professional standards, which creates a structured environment for both teachers and students.

RQ1d: What is the extent of instructional supervision practices of administrators as perceived by the teachers in terms of Environmental/Supportive Supervision?

Table 4. Extent of Instructional Supervision Practices of Administrators as Perceived by the Respondents along Environmental/Supportive Supervision

Statements	Mean	SD	Description
1. Provides a safe and conducive learning environment.	3.85	.37	A
2. Supports teachers with necessary materials and resources.	3.78	.45	A
3. Encourages teamwork and professional collaboration.	3.87	.36	A
4. Maintains positive school culture and relationships.	3.84	.40	A
5. Recognizes teachers' achievements and contributions.	3.87	.35	A
Grand Mean	**3.84**	**.33**	**A**

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Always (A)
2.50 – 3.24 Often (O)
1.75 – 2.49 Sometimes (S)
1.00 – 1.74 Never (N)

The study reveals that school administrators "Always" provide environmental and supportive supervision (Grand Mean = 3.84), with a notable focus on encouraging teamwork and recognizing teacher achievements (M = 3.87). The results match what was found in the study by Inatimi (2025) and Dawaye and Ogbemudia (2025), who found that the learning environment and supervisory support are significant correlates of teacher performance. Furthermore, the high rating for maintaining a positive school culture aligns with Rafiqie (2025), who identifies supportive management strategies as essential for improving teacher morale and performance through clinical and coaching mindsets. The implication is that school heads are acting as culture-builders, fostering a collegial atmosphere that values appreciation and collaboration, which is essential for mitigating the professional challenges noted by Andal (2024).

RQ2: What is the level of teachers' instructional effectiveness based on their IPCRF ratings?

Table 5. Level of Respondents' Instructional Effectiveness Based on Their IPCRF Ratings

Statements	Mean	SD	Description
Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	4.89	.27	O
Learning Environment	4.89	.29	O
Curriculum and Planning	4.78	.41	O
Grand Mean	**4.85**	**.23**	**O**

Legend: 4.500 – 5.000 Outstanding (O)
3.500 – 4.499 Very Satisfactory (VS)
2.500 – 3.499 Satisfactory (S)
1.500 – 2.499 Unsatisfactory (US)
1.000 – 1.499 Poor

The results for instructional effectiveness show that teachers are performing at an "Outstanding" level (Grand Mean = 4.85), particularly in the domains of Content Knowledge and Learning Environment (M = 4.89). This excellence in professional competence is supported by Siahaan (2025) and Mekarsari et al. (2025), who argue that academic supervision directly impacts the pedagogical competencies and learning quality in schools. The slightly lower, yet still outstanding, score in Curriculum and Planning (M = 4.78) suggests that while teachers are highly effective, they may still benefit from the systematic support in training-teaching alignment described by Kim (2025). These imply that the teachers possess a high degree of mastery in their craft, resulting in a well-managed and effective learning environment.

RQ3: Is there a significant relationship between the extent of instructional supervision practices and teachers' instructional effectiveness?

Table 6. Pearson r Correlation between the Extent of Instructional Supervision Practices and Respondents' Instructional Effectiveness

	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy			Learning Environment			Curriculum and Planning		
	r	p	Decision	r	p	Decision	r	p	Decision
Instructional Supervision	.054	.384	Fail to reject Ho	.063	.305	Fail to reject Ho	.065	.294	Fail to reject Ho
Clinical Supervision	.076	.216	Fail to reject Ho	.104	.091	Fail to reject Ho	.086	.161	Fail to reject Ho
Administrative Supervision	**.158**	**.010**	**Reject Ho**	.105	.087	Fail to reject Ho	.078	.209	Fail to reject Ho
Environmental/ Supportive Supervision	.120	.051	Fail to reject Ho	.077	.214	Fail to reject Ho	.056	.369	Fail to reject Ho

Table 6 reveals a very weak positive correlation between most supervision practices and instructional effectiveness indicators. This is supported by Quilala and Tantiado (2025), who reported that there is only a weak positive correlation between overall instructional supervision and

teachers' efficacy, indicating that supervision practices may not strongly predict instructional effectiveness.

However, only one relationship was statistically significant. Specifically, administrative supervision showed a significant but weak positive relationship with content knowledge and pedagogy ($r = .158$, $p = .010$). Because the p-value fell below the 0.05 threshold, the null hypothesis was rejected. This confirms that the connection between supervision and teaching quality is statistically significant rather than just a coincidence. This implies that as administrative supervision practices increase, there is a slight improvement in teachers' content knowledge and pedagogical competence. Although the relationship is weak, it suggests that monitoring compliance, checking documents, and enforcing policies may contribute in some way to improving teachers' professional practices. This correlational study measured instructional supervision practices and teacher efficacy. Similarly, Daigon and Alcopra (2024) stated that the significant correlation between supervision and teacher outcomes aligns with the idea of weak/modest relationships.

In contrast, instructional supervision, clinical supervision, and environmental/supportive supervision did not show significant relationships with any of the three instructional effectiveness domains, as evidenced by p-values greater than .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis for these variables was not rejected. This indicates that the perceived extent of these supervision practices was not significantly associated with improvements in teachers' learning environment management or curriculum and planning competencies. This was supported by Quilala and Tantiado (2025), who found a weak but significant correlation between overall instructional supervision and teachers' efficacy, indicating supervision may contribute only slightly to teacher outcomes.

The generally low correlation coefficients (r values ranging from .054 to .158) suggest that supervision practices alone may not strongly influence instructional effectiveness. Other factors, such as teachers' experience, motivation, professional development, and school resources, may play a significant role.

RQ4: Which domain of instructional supervision significantly predicts teachers' instructional effectiveness?

Table 7. Regression Analysis of Supervision Types as Predictors of Content Knowledge and Pedagogy

Dependent Variable	Predictor Variable/s	Regression Model	R^2	F	p-value
Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	Instructional Supervision (X_1)	$Y = 4.763 + .034X_1$	.003	.761	.384
Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	Clinical Supervision (X_2)	$Y = 4.686 + .054X_2$	.006	1.536	.216
Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	Administrative Supervision (X_3)	$Y = 4.358 + .139X_3$	.025	6.697	.010

Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	Environmental/ Supportive Supervision (X_4)	$Y = 4.503 + .100X_4$	.014	3.849	.051
Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	Instructional, Clinical, Administrative and Environmental/ Supportive Supervision	$Y = 4.369 - .049X_1 - .019X_2 + .199X_3 + .003X_4$	.030	1.999	.095

Table 7 indicates that the different supervision types are, overall, weak predictors of content knowledge and pedagogy. Instructional and clinical supervision individually explain less than 1% of the variance (R^2 = .003 and .006) and are not statistically significant (p = .384; p = .216), suggesting that in this sample they do not meaningfully predict teachers' content and pedagogical competence. This modest impact is consistent with recent work showing that instructional supervision is related to teacher performance and efficacy, but typically with only moderate strength and alongside many other influential factors (Pomentel, 2024); Musa, 2020; Ngatini et al., 2025). Environmental/supportive supervision has a slightly higher R^2 (.014) and a borderline p-value (p = .051), which fits current evidence that supportive, coaching-oriented supervision improves teacher reflection and classroom practice but works mainly by creating conducive conditions rather than exerting a strong direct effect on competence measures (Anzaku and Tashi, 2025; Hasanah and Sururi, 2025).

Administrative supervision stands out as the only significant single predictor (p = .010, R^2 = .025), indicating that stronger administrative or principal-led supervision is associated with slightly higher levels of content knowledge and pedagogy. Recent systematic reviews and quantitative studies similarly report that well-structured academic supervision by school leaders characterized by clear expectations, monitoring, feedback, and follow-up can enhance pedagogical competence and overall teacher performance (Sulistiana et al., 2025; Ukwigize et al., 2025; Nofianti et al., 2025; Siahaan, 2025; Ngatini et al., 2025). For example, principal supervision and academic supervision have been found to account for substantial proportions of variance in teacher performance and learning quality when implemented systematically and continuously (Kartini et al., 2020; Nofianti et al., 2025; Ngatini et al., 2025).

However, when all four supervision types are entered together in multiple regression, the model remains non-significant (p = .095) and explains only 3% of the variance (R^2 = .030), implying strong overlap among supervision dimensions and, more importantly, that most differences in content knowledge and pedagogy are driven by other variables such as teachers' prior training, professional development opportunities, and organizational climate (Nofianti et al., 2025); Kim, 2025).

Table 8. Regression Analysis of Supervision Types as Predictors of Learning Environment

Dependent Variable	Predictor Variable/s	Regression Model	R^2	F	p-value
Learning Environment	Instructional Supervision (X_1)	$Y = 4.738 + .042X_1$	.004	1.057	.305
Learning Environment	Clinical Supervision (X_2)	$Y = 4.603 + .077X_2$	.011	2.869	.091
Learning Environment	Administrative Supervision (X_3)	$Y = 4.521 + .139X_3$	.097	2.949	.087
Learning Environment	Environmental/ Supportive Supervision (X_4)	$Y = 4.635 + .067X_4$	.006	1.554	.214
Learning Environment	Instructional, Clinical, Administrative and Environmental/ Supportive Supervision	$Y = 4.507 - .047X_1 + .078X_2 + .077X_3 - .008X_4$	.015	.962	.429

The regression results in Table 8 show that, in this sample, the four types of supervision are only very weak predictors of the learning environment. Each supervision dimension, when entered separately, yields very low coefficients of determination ($R^2 = .004$ for instructional, .011 for clinical, .097 for administrative, and .006 for environmental/supportive supervision) and non-significant p-values (all $p > .05$). Even when all supervision types are combined in a single model, the explained variance remains minimal ($R^2 = .015$, $F = .962$, $p = .429$). These findings suggest that while supervision may be present, it does not independently account for substantial variation in how teachers perceive or create the learning environment. This pattern contrasts with several recent studies where academic or instructional supervision and school environment jointly explain a much larger share of quality or learning-environment related outcomes. For example, academic supervision and school environment together explained 67% of the variance in education quality in Indonesian elementary schools, indicating a strong synergistic effect when supervision is tightly integrated with environmental improvements (Purwanti et al., 2025). Other studies similarly report that academic supervision alone can account for 29–56% of the variance in learning quality, particularly when it is structured, continuous, and explicitly focused on improving classroom processes and climate (Listiyorini et al., 2025); Anggraeni et al.,

2025; Mekarsari and Sudana, 2025; Apriliyanti et al., 2025).

In addition, there is emerging evidence that learning environment variables themselves, such as classroom infrastructure, resources, and school climate, are often more powerful predictors of teacher performance and learning outcomes than supervision in isolation. A 2025 Nigerian study found that the learning environment had a moderate positive relationship with teachers' job performance, whereas supervision showed only a weak positive relationship, implying that supervision practices must be embedded within a conducive environment to be impactful (Dawaye and Ogbemudia, 2025; Inatimi, 2025). Research on academic supervision with learning environment as a mediating variable also shows that supervision affects outcomes partly by shaping the broader climate and conditions in which teaching occurs (Nugroho et al., 2025). Systematic reviews and conceptual work echo that educational supervision improves learning environments when it is planned, collaborative, and linked to leadership, infrastructure, and teacher development, rather than functioning as a stand-alone administrative activity (Sari et al., 2025; Mutiara, 2025; Lestari and Bedi, 2025).

Table 9. Regression Analysis of Supervision Types as Predictors of Curriculum and Planning

Dependent Variable	Predictor Variable/s	Regression Model	R^2	F	p-value
Curriculum and Planning	Instructional Supervision (X_1)	$Y = 4.551 + .061X_1$	.004	1.108	.294
Curriculum and Planning	Clinical Supervision (X_2)	$Y = 4.435 + .090X_2$	.007	1.973	.161
Curriculum and Planning	Administrative Supervision (X_3)	$Y = 4.389 + .101X_3$	.006	1.585	.209
Curriculum and Planning	Environmental/ Supportive Supervision (X_4)	$Y = 4.512 + .069X_4$	.003	.811	.369
Curriculum and Planning	Instructional, Clinical, Administrative and Environmental/ Supportive Supervision	$Y = 4.379 - .015X_1 + .078X_2 + .062X_3 - .021X_4$	.008	.535	.710

The regression analysis in Table 9 indicates that none of the four supervision types is a meaningful statistical predictor of curriculum and planning in your sample. Instructional, clinical, administrative,

and environmental/supportive supervision each yield extremely low coefficients of determination (R^2 = .003–.007) and non-significant p-values (p = .161–.369), meaning each variable alone explains well under 1% of the variance in how teachers plan and work with the curriculum. When all four are entered simultaneously, the model remains non-significant (F = .535, p = .710) with R^2 = .008, reinforcing that, as currently practiced, supervision has only a negligible direct association with teachers' curriculum and planning behaviors. This contrasts with recent evidence showing that well-designed, intensive, and curriculum-focused supervision can have small-to-moderate effects on planning skills. The results of meta-analysis on coaching, mentoring, and supervision among pre-service teachers revealed a small but significant overall effect ($d \approx 0.41$) on instructional skills such as lesson planning and clarity of instruction, with much stronger effects ($d \approx 0.90$) when supervisors explicitly modelled how to plan and teach lessons ("cognitive modelling") (Mok and Staub, 2021).

Recent field studies also show that when instructional or academic supervision is tightly linked to curriculum implementation through monitoring of schemes of work, checking lesson plans, and collaborative lesson study, it is positively associated with curriculum execution and learning quality (Warta et al., 2025; Fauzan et al., 2025). For example, supervision methods in Kenyan secondary schools were significantly and positively correlated with curriculum implementation, leading to recommendations that principals systematically check lesson plans and observe instruction to promote faithful implementation (Njoki and Manduku, 2025).

Qualitative and mixed-methods work further emphasizes that curriculum-oriented academic supervision, when collaborative and continuous, helps teachers interpret curriculum demands, integrate differentiated instruction, and align planning with learning goals (Norjannah and Ishartiwi, 2025; Lyadi, 2024; Rafiqie. 2025). The gap between these findings and your very low R^2 values suggests that in your context, supervision may be too infrequent, too administrative, or insufficiently focused on concrete planning practices to produce measurable differences in curriculum and planning.

Public-school administrators in the First District are highly consistent in performing their supervisory duties, particularly in administrative and supportive areas. This formal oversight is not the primary driver of teacher performance. Our teachers have achieved an Outstanding level of instructional effectiveness, demonstrating mastery in pedagogy and classroom management; however, the data reveal only a weak association between these supervisory practices and actual classroom success. This mirrors the findings of Castillo (2025), who noted that in the Philippine context, supervision is often implemented as a consistent administrative routine or a "box-checking" exercise that does not necessarily translate into professional transformation for the teacher.

Furthermore, the minimal predictive power of administrative supervision suggests that teacher excellence in this district is fueled by factors outside the current supervisory framework. The very low explained variance in the regression models indicates that the "secret sauce" to teacher success likely stems from internal drivers such as self-efficacy Aswinda et al, 2019), personal grit, or peer collaboration, rather than formal observations. Ultimately, while the system of supervision is functioning as a procedural requirement, it currently lacks the pedagogical depth needed to significantly shift instructional quality. This implies a critical need to evolve from traditional, top-down monitoring toward more dynamic, growth-oriented mentoring that directly addresses the complex needs of high-performing teachers.

Several key recommendations have been proposed to enhance the educational landscape. First, school administrators are encouraged to maintain their supportive roles while evolving their supervisory approach to feel less like a "check-the-box" compliance task and more like a developmental journey; by fostering this growth-oriented mindset, leaders can create a safer environment for teachers to experiment and improve. Simultaneously, teachers are urged to take a more active role in their

professional evolution by treating Classroom Observation Teaching (COT) conferences as genuine spaces for reflection and leaning into professional development, particularly in curriculum planning and diverse teaching styles, to better meet the shifting needs of their students.

To support these grassroots efforts, it is recommended that the Department of Education design specialized programs aimed at sharpening the mentoring and coaching skills of principals, thereby formalizing the vital link between administrative oversight and teacher effectiveness. Finally, future researchers should look toward a broader horizon by exploring variables such as teacher motivation, years of experience, school culture, and resource availability. By implementing more rigorous monitoring through increased frequency and unannounced "spot-checks" during COT visits, researchers can capture a more authentic picture of daily teaching life and provide a deeper, more nuanced analysis of how supervision functions in practice.

Acknowledgement

The researcher extends sincere gratitude to Quirino State University for providing invaluable institutional support throughout this research. Special appreciation is also given to the Department of Education for its cooperation and for facilitating the necessary academic coordination. Profound thanks are extended to the 1st District of Quirino Province, particularly the local community, for their hospitality during the data collection process. I am also deeply grateful to my mentors for their expert guidance and to my friends for their constant encouragement. Finally, my heartfelt gratitude goes to my family, whose love and sacrifices made this achievement possible.

References

Anah, O. E., & Harbor, A. C. (2025). Principals' clinical supervision and conference strategies on teachers' job effectiveness in public secondary schools in Udu Local Government Area. *Leadership, 7*(3), 544–559. https://www.ijilpm.com.ng/assets/vol.%2C-7(3)-anah%2C-o.-e.%2C---harbor%2C-c.-a.pdf

Andal, L. L. (2024). Challenges in instructional supervision: A phenomenological study of master teachers in Cabuyao. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives, 2*(8). https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0283

Anggraeni, L., Kusumaningsih, W., & Soedjono, S. (2025). The influence of academic supervision and teacher professionalism on the quality of learning. *Cetta: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan.* https://doi.org/10.37329/cetta.v8i3.4375

Apriliyanti, T., Ysh, A., & B. (2025). The influence of academic supervision, work motivation, and pedagogical competence on the quality of learning implementation. *IQRO: Journal of Islamic Education.* https://doi.org/10.24256/iqro.v7i2.6557

Aswinda, A., Siraj, A., & Saprin, S. (2019). Effect of principal supervision on teacher pedagogic competencies. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Administrasi Publik, 9*(1). https://doi.org/10.26858/jiap.v9i1.9331

Ayalew, H. R., Itegi, F. M., & Muchanje, P. N. (2022). Principals' conceptual managerial skills and teachers' instructional effectiveness in secondary schools, Central Gondar Zone, Ethiopia. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences, 11*(2), 336. https://european-science.com/eojnss/article/view/6327

Bayer, R. P., Blanco, C. T., Alferez, E. C., Alipio, A. C., Suligan, J. K. A., & Cayogyog, A. O. (2024). Phenomenology of clinical supervision: Examining pre-observation to post-observation in teacher development. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 8*(10), 2232–2243. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.80100171

Castillo, R. C. (2025). *Instructional supervision and teachers' job performance: Insights from academic heads*. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 46*(2), 156–168. https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.460203

Dawaye, E., & Ogbemudia, E. (2025). Learning environment and supervision as correlates of teachers' job performance in secondary schools in Bayelsa State. *International Journal of Educational Research and Library Science.* https://doi.org/10.70382/tijerls.v07i8.038

Daigon, M. E., & Alcopra, A. R. (2024). Instructional supervision practices and efficacy of teachers. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis, 7*(8). https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i08-13

Emegwa, T. U. (2024). Influence of head teachers' environmental supervision practices on teachers' classroom management in primary schools in Onitsha education zone of Anambra State. *African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies, 13*(3). https://ajemates.org/index.php/ajemates/article/view/588

Fauzan, R., Harjito, H., & Nurkolis, N. (2025). The influence of data-based planning, learning communities, and academic supervision on learning quality in public high school students in Pemalang Regency. *Scaffolding: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam dan Multikulturalisme.* https://doi.org/10.37680/scaffolding.v7i2.7827

Hasanah, C., & Sururi, S. (2025). Principal's supervision strategy to improve teachers' performance based on professional competence. *JMKSP (Jurnal Manajemen, Kepemimpinan, dan Supervisi Pendidikan).* https://doi.org/10.31851/jmksp.v10i1.18104

Inatimi, I. (2025). Learning environment and supervision as correlates of teachers' job performance in secondary schools in Bayelsa State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Assessment and Evaluation in Education.* https://doi.org/10.70382/mejaee.v9i8.061

Jurado, M. S. (2026). Supervisory practices of school heads and their relationship to teachers' instructional performance in the Division of Tangub City. *United International Journal for Research & Technology, 7*(4). https://uijrt.com/articles/v7/i4/UIJRTV7I40010.pdf

Kim, A. (2025). Impact of systematic support in teacher education and professional development on training-teaching alignment and instructional quality. *Journal for STEM Education Research.* https://doi.org/10.1007/s41979-025-00154-3

Lema, E. S., & Otieno, K. O. (2022). Head teachers' supervisory practices and its effectiveness on teachers' job performance in public primary schools in Arusha District Council, Tanzania. *Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education, 6*(1), 190–200.

Lestari, T., & Bedi, F. (2025). Supervision strategies for improving learning outcomes in Islamic-based general education institutions. *Journal of Islamic Education Research.* https://doi.org/10.35719/jier.v6i1.452

Listiyorini, L., Ginting, R., & Muhtarom, M. (2025). The influence of academic supervision, learning communities, and collaborative leadership of principals on the quality of learning in public elementary schools. *Scaffolding: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam dan Multikulturalisme.* https://doi.org/10.37680/scaffolding.v7i2.7878

Lyadi, M., Syarif, S., & Syaifuddin, M. (2024). The role of supervision in curriculum implementation in educational units. *JISIP (Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Pendidikan).* https://doi.org/10.58258/jisip.v8i3.7162

Mutiara, G. (2025). Educational supervision as improving the quality of learning in schools: Systematic literature review. *PPSDP International Journal of Education, 4*(2), 722–739. https://doi.org/10.59175/pijed.v4i2.568

Nofianti, R., Raharja, S., & Yogyakarta, U. (2025). The effect of principal supervision, teacher pedagogic competence, and organizational climate on teacher performance. *International Journal of Educational Technology Research.* https://doi.org/10.59890/ijetr.v3i1.409

Norjannah, N., & Ishartiwi, I. (2025). Clinical supervision as a catalyst for differentiated instruction implementation in early childhood education. *Journal of Innovation and Research in Primary Education.* https://doi.org/10.56916/jirpe.v4i4.2369

Nugroho, D., Ruhiat, Y., & Atikah, C. (2025). The impact of academic supervision and infrastructure management on education quality with learning environment as a mediating variable. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Profesi Guru.* https://doi.org/10.23887/jippg.v8i1.95035

Nwankwo, I. N., & Muoneke, P. A. (2024). Influence of head teachers' administrative support practices on teachers' classroom management practices in primary schools in Enugu State. *UNIZIK Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies, 18*(2).

Obi, M. O., Offu, O. E., & Otu, M. N. (2024). Clinical supervisory skills and teachers' instructional effectiveness in public secondary schools in Calabar education zone, Nigeria. *Journal of Association of Educational Management and Policy Practitioners, 6*(2), 325–334.

Pomentel, L. (2024). Exploring the influence of school heads' instructional supervision on teachers' efficacy and performance. *International Journal of Research Publications.* https://doi.org/10.47119/ijrp1001481520246420

Purwanti, A., Harapan, E., & Rohana, R. (2025). The quality of education as reviewed from the influence of academic supervision and the school environment. *Journal of Social Work and Science Education.* https://doi.org/10.52690/jswse.v6i2.1246

Quilala, R. L., & Tantiado, R. C. (2025). Instructional supervision and teachers' efficacy. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis, 8*(3), 1004–1011. https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v8-i03-13

Rafiqie, M. (2025). School management strategies for improving teacher performance through clinical supervision. *Journal of Educational Management Research.* https://doi.org/10.61987/jemr.v4i5.1191

Sari, R. N. (2025). *The principal's academic supervision on improving teachers' performance and students' learning achievement*. *PPSDP International Journal of Education, 4*(2), 559–567. https://doi.org/10.59175/pijed.v4i2.537

Siahaan, S. (2025). The effectiveness of principal's academic supervision in enhancing teachers' pedagogical competency: A systematic literature review. *PPSDP International Journal of Education.* https://doi.org/10.59175/pijed.v4i2.571

Unissa, R., & Alhasan, N. A. (2024). Investigating educators' perspectives on classroom observation and the impact of feedback on professional development. *Innovare Journal of Education, 12*(6), 16–24. https://doi.org/10.22159/ijoe.2024v12i6.52896

Velez, D. E. (2025). Administrative and supervisory skills and performance of school heads and their relationship to teachers' performance.

Warta, W., Gunawan, A., Saepudin, E., Ripandi, A., Hermawan, E., Mulyanah, U., & Purwanti, H. (2025). The role of academic supervision in strengthening curriculum implementation. *International Journal of Sustainable Social Science*. https://doi.org/10.59890/ijsss.v3i2.15

Wiyono, B. B., Maisyaroh, M., Hardika, H., Valdez, A. V., Mangorsi, S. B., & Canapi, S. P. T. (2021). The implementation of instructional supervision in Indonesia and the Philippines and its effect on the variation of teacher learning models and materials. *Cogent Education*, *8*(1), 1962232. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.1962232

Zarco, K. M. (2024). Conduct of regular instructional supervision in improving the performance of teachers in classroom instruction and management.