RESEARCH ARTICLE

JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research
Volume 2, Issue 10, Page 661-665 | Article No. 72
DOI: 10.4898/jenerv2i10.a72
ISSN: 7895-9216
Journal homepage: https://jenerjournal.com
Journal email: editor@jenerjournal.com

The Supervisory Roles of the School Heads in Improving the Teaching and the Learning Conditions in the Public Elementary Schools in Cabusao District, Division of Camarines Sur

Susan P. Beralde[1]

[1]School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:
Published: October 2026

Keywords:
Instructional Supervision
School Heads
Teaching Conditions
School Improvement Planning
Teacher Welfare
Kendall Concordance

ABSTRACT

The study examined school heads' supervisory roles and initiatives for teaching and learning conditions in eight public elementary schools of Cabusao District, Division of Camarines Sur, during school year 2025–2026. A descriptive–evaluative–correlational survey included 8 school heads and 114 teachers (N = 122), grouped by big, medium, and small schools. A 107-item questionnaire yielded weighted means and three-group Kendall concordance statistics. Among six supervisory-role domains, adopting the Department of Education mission and vision was highest (4.51, Very Much Employed), and crafting the school improvement plan lowest (4.06, Much Employed). Among five initiative domains, a positive learning environment led (4.18, Much Evident), while teacher welfare was lowest (3.28, Evident). All eleven domain-level rank-concordance tests were labeled significant, with W from 0.97 to 1.00. The findings characterize respondent ratings and closely aligned group rankings, not measured improvements in instruction or learning. Planning, materials, and teacher welfare warrant closer review.

1. Introduction

School heads coordinate instruction, staffing, resources, and the conditions in which teachers and learners work. The Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads describe leadership practice across school leadership and management domains (Department of Education [DepEd], 2020). In Cabusao District, the study examined both reported supervisory roles and concrete school initiatives. These are related but distinct: declaring an institutional mission, selecting materials, and supporting teachers require different forms of action and evidence.

A favorable rating for supervision can coexist with uneven provision of facilities or welfare support. The study therefore separated six role domains—conducive environment, DepEd mission and vision, curriculum, strategies, materials, and school improvement planning—from five initiative domains—resources, facilities, teacher welfare, positive environment, and stakeholder collaboration. It then asked whether big, medium, and small school groups ranked the individual indicators within each domain similarly. Agreement in rankings is an ordering property and does not establish an effect on learners.

Collaborative professionalism requires intentional joint work that connects discussion to practice (Hargreaves & O'Connor, 2018). This perspective is useful when interpreting the study's lower ratings for planning and welfare, but the survey did not observe collaborative planning meetings or follow teachers and pupils over time. The study addresses the local questions of extent and rank concordance, followed by policy recommendations.

2. Methods

2.1 Design and participants

The study described a descriptive–evaluative–correlational survey in the public elementary schools of Cabusao District for school year 2025–2026. Purposive selection identified the locale, and total enumeration included 8 school heads and 114 teachers from eight schools. Five schools were classified big, one medium, and two small. The basis for those size categories, the proportion of teachers who returned questionnaires, and role-specific response patterns were not reported. Table 1 presents the participant counts printed in the respondent table.

The group sizes were strongly unequal: 94 respondents in big schools, 11 in the single medium school, and 17 in small schools. A school-size average therefore needs care: the medium-school result reflects one school, and the group rankings are not independent replications of eight schools. The table totals 122, whereas a nearby prose sentence calls the small-school group "6 or 19 percent"; that sentence conflicts with the 17 and 14 percent in the table. No correction is inferred.

2.2 Instrument and procedure

The researcher-developed 107-item questionnaire allocated 54 items to six supervisory-role domains (8, 9, 10, 8, 9, and 10) and 53 items to five initiative domains (10, 11, 12, 9, and 11). Five-point responses were classified from Not at All to Very Much Employed for roles and from Not at All to Very Much Evident for initiatives. The 3.50–4.49 band corresponded to Much Employed or Much Evident; 4.50–5.00 corresponded to Very Much. A questionnaire and interview were mentioned, but no independent qualitative analysis appears in the results.

The chapter describes juror review and a Kuder–Richardson Formula 21 reliability value of 0.824, without a pilot sample, item scores, or a suitable explanation of applying a dichotomous-item formula to five-category ratings. The precise dates of administration and missing-response handling were not reported. Thus the means are treated as reported descriptive summaries, and the reliability claim remains to be substantiated.

2.3 Analysis

Weighted means and ranks summarized the five-point ratings. Kendall's coefficient of concordance W and a chi-square approximation tested whether three school-size groups ranked indicators similarly within each domain. The detailed results tabulate item counts as cases rather than 122 independent respondents. A significant W indicates agreement in the relative item order across the three group profiles; it is neither a test of difference between group means nor a correlation between supervision and measured learning. Printed W, χ^2, and significance thresholds are reported without recomputation.

3. Results

3.1 Respondent distribution

Table 1. Respondents by school-size category

Category	Schools	School heads	Teachers	Total	Printed %
Big	5	5	89	94	77
Medium	1	1	10	11	9
Small	2	2	15	17	14
Grand total	8	8	114	122	100

Note. Counts and percentages reproduce the respondent table. A neighboring narrative gives an incompatible small-school count and share. The large concentration in big schools matters for interpretation of the overall survey, while the concordance tests use only three group rank orders. The table establishes the local respondent composition but not an equal-probability sample of schools elsewhere. It also shows that school heads were a small minority of respondents; without role-stratified results, the means cannot be attributed solely to school heads' self-appraisal or teachers' appraisal.

3.2 Extent of supervisory roles

Table 2. Summary of supervisory-role ratings

Domain	Big Wx	Medium Wx	Small Wx	Average Wx	Printed interpretation
Creating a conducive environment	4.46	4.43	4.41	4.43	ME
Adopting the mission and vision of DepEd	4.53	4.51	4.49	4.51	VME
Implementing the curriculum	4.49	4.47	4.45	4.47	ME
Utilizing appropriate strategies	4.43	4.40	4.38	4.40	ME
Using suitable materials	4.23	4.21	4.19	4.21	ME
Crafting school improvement plan	4.08	4.06	4.04	4.06	ME
Printed average weighted mean	4.08	4.06	4.04	4.06	ME

Note. Wx = weighted mean; VME = Very Much Employed; ME = Much Employed. The last line reproduces the printed Table 9 although it repeats the planning row and is arithmetically inconsistent with the six domains.

The mission-and-vision domain was the only average classified Very Much Employed. The ratings declined through curriculum and strategy to materials and planning. This ordering can guide inspection of the concrete work behind each domain: a school might articulate its mission clearly yet face limitations when budgeting or mobilizing materials. The near-parallel ordering of big, medium, and small group means is visible, but the absolute differences are slight; no independent observation was used to validate the judgments.

Table 3. Kendall concordance of supervisory-role indicator rankings

Domain	Indicators	W	χ^2	df	Printed threshold
Conducive environment	7	0.98	17.64	6	0.01
Mission and vision of DepEd	8	1.00	21	7	0.005
Curriculum	9	0.99	23.76	8	0.005
Appropriate strategies	7	1.00	18	6	0.005
Suitable materials	8	0.99	20.79	7	0.005
School improvement plan	9	0.97	23.28	8	0.005

Note. Figures and thresholds follow detailed Table 10; all six decisions are printed as accepting the alternative hypothesis. The item counts in the test differ from the questionnaire specification in several domains.

The three school-size groups ranked indicator means similarly in each role domain, with W close to 1.00. Concordance does not mean the 122 respondents agreed individually, and it does not test whether big schools implemented a role better. The test's number of cases is seven to nine indicators, while the instrument specification lists eight to ten items for the same domains. The exact indicator inclusion and tie treatment need confirmation before the high concordance is interpreted as a stable finding.

3.3 Initiatives for school conditions

Table 4. Summary of school initiatives

Domain	Big Wx	Medium Wx	Small Wx	Average Wx	Printed interpretation
Initiatives resources improvement	3.89	3.87	3.85	3.87	ME
Improvement of facilities	3.65	3.52	3.49	3.55	ME
Teacher welfare	3.31	3.28	3.24	3.28	E
Creating positive learning environment	4.20	4.17	4.16	4.18	ME
Collaborating with stakeholders	3.82	3.80	3.78	3.80	ME
Average weighted mean	3.77	3.73	3.70	3.73	ME

Note. Figures and labels follow detailed Table 16. ME = Much Evident; E = Evident.

The positive learning environment domain led the initiatives (4.18), but teacher welfare was only Evident (3.28), clearly lower than any other domain. Facility improvement was also relatively low (3.55). This contrast suggests that general climate practices and tangible support for teachers should be examined separately. It does not identify a budget cause, since the survey supplies neither expenditure data nor verified facility and staffing inventories.

Table 5. Kendall concordance of initiative indicator rankings

Domain	Indicators	W	χ^2	df	Printed threshold
Resources improvement	9	1.00	24	8	0.005
Facilities	10	1.00	27	9	0.005
Teacher welfare	11	1.00	30	10	0.001
Positive learning environment	8	1.00	21	7	0.005
Stakeholder collaboration	10	0.99	26.73	9	0.005

Note. Detailed Table 17 gives all five alternative-hypothesis decisions as accepted. The abstract gives W = 1.0 for resources, consistent with the detailed table; the findings narrative elsewhere gives 0.99.

Near-perfect agreement in the ordering of individual initiatives can coexist with moderate average levels of implementation. Teacher welfare illustrates the distinction: the groups ranked its component practices similarly, yet its overall mean was the lowest. The table cannot establish that any listed initiative improved a teaching condition. There were only three ranking groups, including a single medium school, and the item counts used for W again differ from the full questionnaire specification.

Table 6. Selected teacher-welfare indicators

Indicator from findings narrative	Overall Wx	Printed category
Encouraging participation in seminars, trainings, and graduate study scholarships	4.37	ME
Ensuring fair distribution of teaching loads and limiting ancillary tasks	4.24	ME
Monitoring and evaluating both faculty professional needs and development-program effectiveness	2.63	E
Providing time and funds for teachers to conduct action research	1.48	Not-At-All

Note. Selected values are from the teacher-welfare findings. The full item wording was condensed only for table width; the mean and category labels are as reported.

The selected items show why the 3.28 teacher-welfare mean deserves specific follow-up. Opportunities for training and load distribution rated higher than the monitoring of professional development and support for action research. The 1.48 rating for time and funds for research is particularly low. These are respondent judgments of practice, not audited allocations. A school review could compare professional-development plans, workload assignments, and available support against the survey appraisals.

3.4 Specific conditions behind the summary

Table 7. Selected facility-improvement indicators

Indicator from findings	Overall Wx	Printed category
Cleanup drives and improved school grounds and gardens	4.37	ME
Restroom upgrades and clean, safe water supply	4.26	ME
Repair of playgrounds and athletic fields	3.65	ME
Computers, connectivity, and dedicated computer labs	3.14	E
Surveillance cameras, alarms, and safe pedestrian access	2.43	FE
Smartboards, projectors, tablets, and laptops	2.37	FE

Note. Selected numerical values and labels follow the detailed facility findings. Wording is shortened for table width. ME = Much Evident; E = Evident; FE = Fairly Evident.

The facility indicators show a wider spread than the domain mean of 3.55 alone reveals. Cleanup and water and sanitation work were rated substantially more evident than digital equipment or safety technology. These differences should not be collapsed into a single conclusion that facilities were simply adequate or inadequate. They could reflect distinct procurement needs, costs, or the visibility of routine maintenance. The questionnaire did not quantify the number of functioning toilets, connected classrooms, or safe routes; those records would help confirm the priorities.

The two Fairly Evident indicators should also be interpreted with care. A low rating for smartboards does not necessarily indicate a deficiency if a school uses effective low-cost materials for its curriculum. By contrast, a low rating for alarms and safe routes may carry a different concern and requires a local risk assessment. The survey does not rank investments by learning benefit, safety urgency, or feasibility. Its value is in showing where respondents perceived less action, to be weighed against actual needs and school plans.

Table 8. Selected school-improvement-planning indicators

Indicator from findings	Overall Wx	Printed category
Needs assessment to identify school gaps and problems	4.23	ME
Outline the needs of the school	4.11	ME
Identify ways to address gaps and problems	4.08	ME
Measure SIP success and adjust as needed	4.07	ME
Involve stakeholders in vision, goals, and actions	4.05	ME
Allocate staff and technology budget for a specialized program	3.73	ME

Note. Values are from the detailed planning findings; wording is condensed. SIP = school improvement plan. The final item has an awkward combined ESL example in the questionnaire and should be reviewed.

Needs assessment led the selected planning practices, but involvement of stakeholders and specification of a specialized program budget rated lower. A plan may start with a good description of needs yet still lack a feasible sequence of activities, ownership, resourcing, and review. The close means in the middle should not be overinterpreted as meaningful rank differences; the questionnaire does not supply uncertainty intervals. A document review could determine whether a plan specifies measurable goals, the actions linked to those goals, and a date for checking progress.

The lowest selected item bundles staff, technology, after-school provision, and an ESL computer program into one sentence. Such a compound statement can be hard for respondents in this setting to rate consistently, particularly if the specialized program is not relevant to their school. The item should be separated and contextually checked before using its 3.73 score as a general measure of planning ability. The study does not provide an item validity analysis that resolves this concern.

4. Discussion

The first question concerns the extent of supervisory roles. The ordering in Table 2 suggests that formal alignment with DepEd's mission and vision was highly visible, while the operational tasks of materials and improvement planning were less so. PPSSH provides a framework for examining leadership practices in context (DepEd, 2020). The study did not map its questionnaire directly to a validated PPSSH assessment, so a policy framework should guide subsequent review rather than be treated as proof of compliance.

The second question asks about agreement across school categories. Tables 3 and 5 report concordance of indicator ranks, not a causal relation between supervision and school outcomes. A shared ranking may reflect common questionnaire wording or a small set of group-level means. The "correlational" designation is broader than the tests shown: no respondent-level relationship between a supervision score and a teacher or pupil outcome was estimated. A future study could report the raw group ranks, tie corrections, exact analytic unit, and sensitivity to excluding the single medium school.

The third question centers on initiatives. The gap between positive climate (4.18) and teacher welfare (3.28) calls for distinguishing supportive relationships from concrete conditions. The selected welfare indicators suggest support for professional learning is uneven: participation in training received a favorable rating, whereas time and funds for action research were reported as nearly absent. Hargreaves and O'Connor (2018) describe collaboration as intentional joint work; a school could test whether available planning time, mentoring, and follow-up allow teachers to use professional learning. That proposal was not itself evaluated in the study.

The consistently lower scores for planning and materials are plausible operational priorities, but the survey does not identify their causes. Resource allocation, procurement lead times, teacher participation, and the quality of school improvement plans require documentary and observational evidence. A practical audit would inspect a sample of plans, trace a stated priority to an action and budget line, and check whether teachers received and used the intended material. Such a sequence would establish what actually happened before linking leadership practice to pupil learning.

Several limits should temper interpretation. The study was confined to one district and eight schools; group sizes and school counts were unequal. The respondent composition by role was not analyzed, interviews were mentioned but not reported, and no learner outcomes or observed lesson conditions were scored. The reported KR-21 reliability coefficient is difficult to assess for five-category items, while the high W values use fewer cases than the stated questionnaire domain counts. The printed supervisory average repeats the lowest domain mean. These issues must be resolved for journal-level reproducibility and preclude a claim that the rated roles caused improvement.

A stronger follow-up would define independently observable school conditions, collect baseline and follow-up measures, and preserve the nesting of teachers within schools. It could compare role-specific reports with plan documents, facility records, teacher workloads, and pupil work or attendance. For the present study, the defensible contribution is a local prioritization of perceived supervisory activity and initiatives, with teacher welfare and school improvement planning as areas meriting verification.

Taken together, the facility and planning details imply an implementation sequence for local verification. A school could document a need, identify the person and resource responsible, record delivery, and evaluate whether the condition changed. The survey shows that respondents rated some visible maintenance work higher than digital provision, and some needs assessment work higher than stakeholder planning. It does not show the sequence from decision to actual change. An audit of completed actions across the eight schools could link the ratings to observable records.

The near-perfect rank-concordance values should be checked especially carefully because they are calculated from three category profiles and a handful of indicators. If item means were rounded before ranking, ties could influence W and the chi-square approximation. Reproducing the results from unrounded data would make the inferential claims transparent. A future study could distinguish perceptions of heads and teachers and compare the same school before and after a specified improvement action. That design would address the title's improvement claim more directly than a single survey.

The respondent structure in Table 1 limits how far a district-level average can be generalized. Big schools account for 94 of 122 respondents, whereas a single medium school supplies 11. The three size profiles describe these schools, but a difference between profiles could reflect one school's personnel, infrastructure, or local circumstances. The study offers no school-level variance, uncertainty intervals, or raw item responses. A subsequent analysis could present each school separately and ask whether a size pattern persists across several schools in a category. Teacher and head responses should also be shown separately, because the two roles observe supervision from different positions.

Tables 2 and 3 answer different questions. The means indicate perceived extent, while Kendall W captures concordance in the ordering of indicators across groups. A perfectly aligned rank order can arise when all groups rate the same weaknesses lowest, even if implementation is uneven. This is relevant to the improvement plan: its 4.06 average was lowest among six domains, yet W of 0.97 was still reported significant. The result identifies shared ordering within that domain, rather than validation of the plan or its impact. Its item count differs between the instrument description and test, requiring a transparent list of ranked statements and handling of tied means.

Tables 4, 6, and 7 show distinctions within the broad category of improving school conditions. A favorable learning-environment mean can reflect routines, relationships, or school climate, whereas material provision and welfare require different resources. The welfare rating of 1.48 for action-research support stands beside 4.37 for training opportunities, but the study does not say how often either was actually funded or used. Lower facility technology ratings likewise do not quantify functionality or access. A local improvement cycle could verify observable conditions and document which planned actions were completed before judging progress.

The planning indicators in Table 8 suggest that naming needs and identifying responses were rated more highly than a specific budgeted program. A plan review could look for a baseline, responsible staff, a budget line, a timetable, and an observable outcome for each action. That review would avoid assuming every school needs identical equipment or a specialized program. It would test whether plans connect local needs to feasible implementation. Repeating the questionnaire after documented changes might detect shifts in perceptions, but direct classroom and learner measures would remain necessary to substantiate improvements in teaching and learning.

The defensible conclusion is that respondents reported supervisory practices and initiatives and three group profiles displayed similar indicator rankings. Neither result demonstrates a causal path from leadership to classroom instruction or learner achievement. The title expresses an improvement aim, but no pre-intervention measurement or comparison group establishes improvement. Future work could pair independent observations, administrative records, and learner outcomes with timed leadership actions. The inconsistent average and respondent count should be reconciled first, because these errors affect the credibility of the descriptive summary.

5. Conclusion

Respondents rated adopting the DepEd mission and vision highest among supervisory roles (4.51), while school improvement planning was lowest (4.06). Positive learning environment led the initiative domains (4.18), and teacher welfare trailed (3.28). The study reported strong rank concordance across three school-size groups for all domains. The printed supervisory average, case counts in concordance tests, and a participant narrative require reconciliation. The evidence supports local review of planning, materials, and welfare; it does not establish improved teaching or learning outcomes.

References

[1] 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

[2] Hargreaves, A., & O'Connor, M. T. (2018). Collaborative professionalism: When teaching together means learning for all. Corwin.