

The Supervisory Practices of the Public Elementary School Heads in Improving the Instructional Competence of the Teachers in the Division of Camarines Sur

Mateo B. Padayao¹

¹School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026 Keywords: School Heads Instructional Supervision Teacher Competence Camarines Sur Kendall's W Professional Development	The study described public elementary school heads' supervisory practices, perceived effectiveness for teachers' instructional competence, problems, and proposed solutions in the Division of Camarines Sur during school year 2025–2026. A descriptive–evaluative–correlational questionnaire study reported 274 school heads drawn purposively from a frame of 865 across five congressional districts, with sample size also attributed to Slovin's formula. Weighted means and ranks summarized seven practice domains, seven perceived-effectiveness domains, seven problem domains, and 25 solutions. Kendall's W and chi-square tested concordance of district rankings. The detailed summaries reported supervisory practice at 4.56 (Very Much Employed), perceived effectiveness at 4.58 (Very Much Effective), problems at 4.55 (Very Much Serious), and solutions at 4.30 (Much Necessary). Classroom observation led the practice domains (4.70), positive classroom environment led perceived effectiveness (4.69), and inadequate training led problems (4.69). Mentoring/coaching was the highest proposed solution (4.86). The reported concordance tests were significant across all categories, but several abstract statistics differ from the detailed tables and some item counts differ between instrument specifications and analyses. The findings describe school heads' perceptions and area-level item rankings; no independent teacher competence or pupil achievement outcome was analyzed.

1. Introduction

School heads supervise instruction through classroom observation, feedback, curriculum guidance, teacher development, and decisions informed by assessment evidence. These activities can be formative when teachers receive usable advice and opportunities to practice it. The Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads identify expectations for leading schools, managing operations, and developing people (Department of Education [DepEd], 2020). The Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers provide a corresponding frame for classroom practice and professional growth (DepEd, 2017). The study examined how school heads across five congressional districts of Camarines Sur rated their own supervisory practices and the results they associated with those practices. Supervision should be distinguished from its outcomes. A principal may report frequent classroom visits, while teacher instructional competence is a separate construct that requires observation, artifacts, or independent evaluation. The study's perceived-effectiveness domains include higher student achievement, but the reported evidence is a questionnaire completed by school heads rather than pupil achievement records. Similar separation applies to the problems of inadequate training, communication, feedback, and favoritism: high seriousness ratings identify concerns for management review, but they do not establish that a particular problem caused a change in teaching.

Liu and Hallinger (2018) studied relationships among principal instructional leadership, teacher self-efficacy, and teacher professional learning in China. Their mediated model illustrates that leadership, professional learning, and classroom outcomes should be measured as different variables rather than collapsed into one favorable rating. In the Philippine setting, the Learning Action Cell policy offers a route for collaborative teacher development (DepEd, 2016). These sources provide context for interpreting Camarines Sur school heads' responses; they do not provide a causal estimate for this survey.

The study addressed four clusters of questions: the extent and rank concordance of seven supervisory-practice domains; the perceived effectiveness and rank concordance of seven teacher-competence domains; the seriousness and concordance of seven problems; and the necessity and concordance of 25 solutions. It also proposed a training design. The manuscript presents the tabulated summaries and tests, interprets each set of findings, and limits conclusions to what the measured ratings and rankings can support.

2. Methods

2.1 Design, setting, and respondents

The study called its design descriptive–evaluative–correlational. It surveyed public elementary school heads in the Division of Camarines Sur during school year 2025–2026. The methods state an 865-person school-head frame across five congressional districts and a sample of 274. They describe purposive sampling and use of Slovin's formula, but do not give the precision assumption, actual selection procedure within districts, invitation count, or response rate. The five sample counts in Table 1 total 274. The frame column, however, gives $134 + 158 + 118 + 274 + 172 = 856$, not the printed 865, so the underlying frame should be reconciled.

Table 1. Reported school-head distribution by congressional district

District	Printed frame count	Sample count	Printed percentage
1st	134	42	15
2nd	158	50	18
3rd	118	41	15
4th	274	87	32
5th	172	54	20
Grand total as printed	865	274	100

Note. The district frame entries sum to 856 rather than the printed 865. Sample counts sum to 274. Percentages are the study's rounded values. The fourth district contributed the largest sample (87, 32%), followed by the fifth (54, 20%). These are sample shares, not estimates of the prevalence of a practice in the division. The school-head-only respondent definition is important because the effectiveness items refer to teachers and learners, yet their own responses or performance records are absent from the analysis. Without selection probabilities or a verified frame, the results are most safely interpreted as the surveyed school heads' appraisals.

2.2 Instrument, data collection, and analysis

The researcher-made checklist had four parts: seven supervisory-practice domains, seven perceived-effectiveness domains, seven problem domains, and proposed solutions. The table of specifications gives 69 practice items, 71 effectiveness items, and a third part of problems, with item placements. The reported concordance tables instead analyze domain item counts of 8–10, and the solutions table lists 25 proposals. These differences mean the exact administered item set and analytic coding cannot be reconstructed from the published summaries. Five-point ratings were interpreted in bands: 4.50–5.00 as Very Much Employed, Very Much Effective, Very Much Serious, or Very Much Necessary, and 3.50–4.49 as the corresponding Much category.

The methods describe expert review, a dry run, permission, personal distribution, retrieval, and tallying. They do not give validator or pilot sample sizes, administration dates, nonresponse procedures, or independent checks on practice. Weighted means and rank orders summarized responses; Kendall's coefficient of concordance W compared rankings among the five congressional districts, with chi-square significance tests at .05. The reported W is about the alignment of district-level item orders, not a correlation between supervision and observed teaching quality. The study does not show a model adjusting for schools, teacher characteristics, or baseline instructional competence. Exact p values are not provided; the results tables use significance thresholds.

3. Results

3.1 Extent of supervisory practice

Table 2. Summary of school heads' supervisory-practice ratings

Domain	Overall W_x	Interpretation	Rank
Instructional Leadership	4.65	VME	3
Teacher Support and Development	4.59	VME	4
Classroom Observation	4.70	VME	1
Performance Evaluation	4.69	VME	2
Curriculum and Instructional Supervision	4.40	ME	7
Promoting a Positive School Climate	4.45	ME	5
Data-Driven Decision Making	4.43	ME	6
Average	4.56	VME	

Note. W_x = weighted mean; VME = Very Much Employed; ME = Much Employed. Values and labels reproduce the detailed Table 10. Its abstract gives classroom observation 4.71 rather than 4.70 and mentions only four domains in its abbreviated summary.

Classroom observation and performance evaluation were the highest-rated practices, while curriculum and instructional supervision was lowest at 4.40. The first four domains crossed the Very Much Employed threshold; the latter three remained Much Employed. This ordering suggests that visible evaluation tasks were rated more strongly than curriculum guidance and data-driven decisions. The difference does not mean those lower-rated domains were absent. A useful local review could compare observation records with subsequent support for lesson design and assessment use. The table alone cannot establish how constructive the feedback was or whether teachers changed their instruction.

Table 3. Reported Kendall concordance of district rankings for supervisory practice

Domain	Items	W	χ^2	df	Reported threshold
Instructional Leadership	8	0.71	24.85	7	.001
Teacher Support and Development	9	0.75	30.00	8	.001
Classroom Observation	10	0.80	36.00	9	.001
Performance Evaluation	8	0.74	25.9	7	.001
Curriculum and Instructional Supervision	9	0.79	31.60	8	.001
Promoting a Positive School Climate	10	0.84	37.80	9	.001
Data-Driven Decision Making	8	0.76	26.60	7	.001

Note. Statistics and printed significance thresholds follow detailed Table 11. All computed χ^2 values exceed that table's .001 critical values for their df. "Items" are analyzed indicators, not the number of respondents.

The five districts' item rankings were reported as concordant in all seven practice domains. Positive school climate had the largest W (0.84), while instructional leadership had the smallest among these values (0.71). This agreement pertains to relative ordering of

statements within each domain. It does not demonstrate that respondents personally agreed, that district means were equal, or that supervisory practices were effective. The findings are compatible with shared professional expectations across districts, but that explanation would require evidence about training and implementation that was not collected here.

3.2 Perceived effectiveness for instructional competence

Table 4. Summary of perceived effectiveness domains

Domain	Overall Wx	Interpretation	Rank
Improved Teaching Strategies	4.59	VME	4
Higher Student Achievement	4.53	VME	5
Consistent Professional Growth	4.68	VME	2
Effective Lesson Planning and Execution	4.43	ME	7
Positive Classroom Environment	4.69	VME	1
Regular Use of Assessment Data	4.49	ME	6
High Teacher Morale and Collaboration	4.61	VME	3
Average	4.58	VME	

Note. Wx = weighted mean; VME = Very Much Effective; ME = Much Effective. Values and ranks reproduce detailed Table 19. These are school heads' ratings, including the domain labeled "Higher Student Achievement."

Positive classroom environment (4.69) and professional growth (4.68) led the perceived-effectiveness domains. Lesson planning and execution (4.43) and regular use of assessment data (4.49) were the two Much Effective domains. The rating for higher student achievement was 4.53, but no learner score data appear in the study. The findings therefore indicate respondents' favorable judgments about associated outcomes. The comparatively lower lesson-planning and assessment-data means suggest a practical focus for follow-up: whether feedback after observations leads to a revised plan and an evidence-based response to identified learning gaps.

Table 5. Reported Kendall concordance for perceived-effectiveness item rankings

Domain	Items	W	χ^2	df	Reported threshold
Improved Teaching Strategies	8	0.70	24.5	7	.001
Higher Student Achievement	9	0.80	32.00	8	.001
Consistent Professional Growth	10	0.80	36.00	9	.001
Effective Lesson Planning and Execution	8	0.76	26.60	7	.001
Positive Classroom Environment	9	0.84	33.60	8	.001
Regular Use of Assessment Data	10	0.84	37.80	9	.001
High Teacher Morale and Collaboration	8	0.77	26.95	7	.001

Note. Values follow detailed Table 20. The preliminary abstract instead reports $\chi^2 = 36.00$ for Higher Student Achievement and 37.35 for Consistent Professional Growth. The test table governs here, pending author verification.

The reported χ^2 statistics in all seven domains exceed the detailed table's .001 critical values. Positive environment and assessment-data use each had $W = 0.84$, even though assessment-data use had a lower mean in Table 4. Concordance and level answer different questions: the areas may rank individual assessment practices similarly while rating the domain less highly. No inference about a causal pathway from school-head supervision to teacher competence or pupil achievement follows from these rankings. The χ^2 discrepancies between abstract and detailed results need resolution before exact inferential statements are finalized.

3.3 Problems and proposed solutions

Table 6. Summary of problems encountered in supervision

Domain	Overall Wx	Interpretation	Rank
Poor Communication	4.65	VMS	2
Micromanagement	4.58	VMS	4
Lack of Accountability, Responsibility, and Authority	4.43	MS	6
Inadequate Training	4.69	VMS	1
Lack of Constructive Feedback and Recognition	4.36	MS	7
Favoritism	4.61	VMS	3
Poor Relationship with Staff	4.50	VMS	5
Average	4.55	VMS	

Note. VMS = Very Much Serious; MS = Much Serious. Values, labels, and ranks reproduce detailed Table 28. The scale threshold includes 4.50 in VMS.

Inadequate training led the seriousness ratings, followed by communication and favoritism. These high appraisals coexist with high practice ratings in Table 2: school heads could report extensive supervision and still identify conditions that make it difficult to implement well. The lowest-ranked problem, constructive feedback and recognition, was nevertheless Much Serious at 4.36. The rankings should not be used to infer the actual frequency of favoritism or micromanagement; the items ask respondents to rate problem seriousness. A confidential, role-inclusive inquiry would be needed to understand how teachers experience these problems and whether they overlap with perceived support.

Table 7. Selected solutions from the 25-item priority table

Proposal	Overall Wx	Interpretation	Printed rank
Provided mentoring and coaching sessions	4.86	VMN	1
Implemented clear communication channels and protocols	4.84	VMN	2
Ensured equal opportunities for all staff members	4.79	VMN	3
Established regular staff meetings and open forums	4.66	VMN	4
Facilitated attendance in professional development programs	4.61	VMN	6
Defined lines of authority through written guidelines	3.54	MN	24
Average of all 25 proposals	4.30	MN	

Note. Selected proposal wording, means, labels, and printed ranks reproduce Table 29; its twenty-five items averaged 4.30. VMN = Very Much Necessary; MN = Much Necessary. The printed rank for the 3.54 proposal is 24, despite its placement as item 25.

Mentoring and coaching (4.86) and communication protocols (4.84) were the top priorities. Equal opportunity was also rated Very Much Necessary (4.79), which corresponds to the high seriousness rating for favoritism in Table 6. Yet the overall solution mean is only Much Necessary (4.30) because several of the other proposals scored below 4.50. This table contains recommendations valued by respondents, not trials of those interventions. The comparatively low ranking of written lines of authority does not prove that accountability guidance is unnecessary; the survey may favor more immediately visible support. A training design could sequence coaching, communication, and fair access, then monitor whether practice changes.

Table 8. Reported Kendall concordance for problem and solution rankings

Category	Items	W	χ^2	df	Reported threshold
Poor Communication	10	0.78	35.10	9	.001
Micromanagement	9	0.79	31.60	8	.001
Lack of Accountability, Responsibility, and Authority	8	0.74	25.90	7	.001
Inadequate Training	10	0.88	39.60	9	.001
Lack of Constructive Feedback and Recognition	9	0.81	32.40	8	.001
Favoritism	8	0.83	29.05	7	.001
Poor Relationship with Staff	8	0.82	28.70	7	.001
Solutions Offered	25	0.98	117.60	24	.001

Note. Table 30's W, χ^2 , df, and significance thresholds are reproduced. The table analyzes five district rankings; the coefficients do not show that a solution addresses a problem causally.

All eight categories were marked significant at the .001 threshold, and the proposed solutions had W = 0.98. A very high agreement in ordering proposals is distinct from the mean level of necessity and from implementation feasibility. Inadequate training had the largest W among problems (0.88), consistent with a similar ordering of its underlying concerns across districts. The agreement statistics cannot identify how many school heads experienced each problem, nor whether mentoring would reduce it. The results can support a common agenda for deliberation, subject to verification of the final item set and rankings.

4. Discussion

The practice results reveal a gap between the highly rated observation/evaluation work and the lower, although still favorable, curriculum and data-use domains. A supervision process can generate forms and ratings without always producing specific changes in lesson content. The PPSSH frames school leadership as a professional practice rather than a single event (DepEd, 2020), and the PPST offers a corresponding vocabulary for teacher growth (DepEd, 2017). The study did not map every questionnaire item to those standards, so the domain means should guide an audit of the feedback cycle rather than be treated as evidence of standard attainment. The effectiveness ratings invite an even narrower reading. They indicate school heads' impressions of teacher professional growth, classroom climate, and assessment use; they do not constitute an external test of teachers' competence. Liu and Hallinger (2018) distinguish leadership and teacher learning in a separately measured model. Here both the supervisory practice and alleged effectiveness are appraised by the same respondent group, increasing the risk of common response patterns. The strong concordance in item rankings is about shared relative priorities, not the effect of supervision on teacher or learner performance. A follow-up could triangulate principal reports with teachers' accounts, observation artifacts, and independent scoring of lesson and assessment work. The problem profile is not a simple contradiction of favorable practice ratings. A school head might conduct observations and still need training on constructive feedback, conflict resolution, equitable access, and how to use assessment evidence. High ratings for inadequate training and poor communication suggest where support could be concentrated. The LAC policy institutionalizes collaborative school-based professional development (DepEd, 2016). A useful implementation would specify a supervisory skill to practice, collect a sample of feedback, invite teacher reflection, and evaluate whether later feedback becomes more actionable. The present study did not test a LAC intervention.

A training design was proposed in the dissertation, but the questionnaire rankings cannot establish which element will produce improvement. The solution list indicates priorities: mentoring, clear protocols, and fair opportunity. Feasibility requires staffing, scheduling, confidentiality safeguards, and a baseline of current practice. Follow-up outcomes could include the specificity of post-observation feedback, completion of a jointly agreed action, teacher-rated usefulness, and independently observed instructional adjustments. These measures would connect the broad domains to behaviors that can be examined. Pupil outcomes, if included, would need their own data and an analytic strategy accounting for schools and baseline attainment.

Several reporting issues limit submission readiness. The district frame counts sum to 856 rather than the printed 865; the selection process mixes purposive sampling with a formula-based size without explaining respondent recruitment. The instrument

specification and concordance tables show different item counts, and the preliminary abstract differs from detailed summaries and chi-square entries. Exact dates, missing-data handling, scale reliability by domain, and external performance evidence are not supplied. The study's correlational label is broader than the reported tests, which assess rank concordance. The manuscript therefore preserves table-level results and avoids claims of verified improvement in teacher competence or student achievement.

For policy use, the descriptive findings are best treated as an agenda for a local, participatory needs assessment. School heads, teachers, and supervisors could examine how often observation feedback reaches a follow-up discussion, whether it provides an actionable change, and whether teachers have time to try it. Transparent communication and equitable access can be monitored through records and anonymous feedback. Training resources might prioritize curriculum-specific coaching and assessment use because those were lower-rated domains while inadequate training was the highest-rated problem. A subsequent evaluation should document exposure and outcomes before recommending scale-up.

5. Conclusion

The detailed results show Very Much Employed supervisory practices (4.56) and Very Much Effective perceived outcomes (4.58), alongside Very Much Serious problems (4.55). All four sets of item rankings were reported concordant across five districts, with mentoring/coaching the highest-rated solution (4.86). These are ratings and rank orders from school heads. They do not prove that supervision improved teachers' competence or pupils' achievement. Reconciliation of the sampling frame, instrument mapping, and conflicting statistics is required before journal submission, and direct teacher- and learner-level evidence is needed to evaluate improvement.

References

- [1] Department of Education. (2016). DO 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. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2016/06/07/do-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/>
- [2] Department of Education. (2017). DO 42, s. 2017: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2017/08/11/do-42-s-2017-national-adoption-and-implementation-of-the-philippine-professional-standards-for-teachers-2/>
- [3] Department of Education. (2020). DO 24, s. 2020: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024-.pdf
- [4] Liu, S., & Hallinger, P. (2018). Principal instructional leadership, teacher self-efficacy, and teacher professional learning in China: Testing a mediated-effects model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 54(4), 501–528. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X18769048>