**International Journal of Social Science and Education Research Studies**

**ISSN(print): 2770-2782, ISSN(online): 2770-2790**

**Volume 06 Issue 05 May 2026**

**DOI: https://doi.org/10.55677/ijssers/V06I05Y2026-09, Impact Factor: 7.573**

**Page No : 539-549**


# A Sequential Explanatory Mixed Methods Analysis of the Instructional Supervision Practices of Subject Group Heads

**Jocelyn Aguilar Gueta[1], Gerry S. Digo[2]**

[1, 2] School of Graduate Studies, Sorsogon State University, Philippines

**ABSTRACT**

Instructional supervision is one critical factor in education that influences teachers' quality practices and enhances students' learning in senior high schools. This study used an explanatory sequential mixed methods approach to assess the instructional supervision practices of Subject Group Heads (SGHs). This study involved 13 SGHs and 63 teachers who responded to structured questionnaires that measured the quality of supervision in terms of checking lesson plans and teaching materials, classroom observations, and providing technical support. Weighted averages show that SGHs engaged in supervision practices and teachers had comparable views. Analysis of the differences between SGHs and teachers found no statistical significance, suggesting congruence in their understanding of supervision practices. The thematic analysis revealed barriers such as inadequate lesson plans, lack of teacher readiness, weak observation checklists, teacher reluctance to receive feedback, and lack of resources. Combining quantitative and qualitative results revealed that although instructional supervision generally occurred, it was inconsistent and insufficient for development due to challenges. The research concludes that instructional supervision needs to be enhanced through systematic, evidence-based, and developmental methods. Further research may be conducted with more schools to monitor and evaluate the implementation, usefulness, and effectiveness of the SUSTAIN-Based Technical Assistance Handbook in addressing supervision gaps and improving teachers' instructional performance.

**Published Online: May 12, 2026**

**KEYWORDS:**

Instructional supervision, Subject Group Heads, Teacher support, Classroom observation, Professional development, Educational quality

## I. INTRODUCTION

Instructional supervision is a critical process in maintaining quality teaching and learning in schools. Across the world, the functions of supervisors in schools have shifted from a managerial to a more collaborative and developmental role focused on enhancing teaching and student learning performance (Ajugo, 2024; Babo & Syamsuddin, 2022). In senior high schools, Subject Group Heads (SGHs) are middle managers who connect the school leadership with teachers to plan subject-based teaching and learning, mentor teachers, and oversee curriculum delivery. SGH's successful instructional supervision has been linked to better teacher performance, improved teaching efficiency, and better learning outcomes (Aquino et al., 2021; Malinga et al., 2021).

***Corresponding Author: Jocelyn Aguilar Gueta***

****Cite this Article: Jocelyn Aguilar Gueta, Gerry S. Digo (2026). A Sequential Explanatory Mixed Methods Analysis of the Instructional Supervision Practices of Subject Group Heads. International Journal of Social Science and Education Research Studies, 6(5), 539-549***

This research aims to assess the instructional supervision practices of SGHs, teachers' views on these practices, challenges in the execution of supervision, and the creation of an evidence-based and practical output to assist supervision in senior high schools.

Instructional supervision draws on the theoretical framework of instructional leadership, where supervisors are viewed as change agents who shape the quality of teaching through their direct engagement, observation, feedback, and mentoring (Spillane et al., 2001; Liu et al., 2020). Supervisors' activities play a critical role in directing teachers' professional practice, establishing accountability and cultivating a culture of professional development. In practice, supervision involves a variety of activities, such as reviewing lesson plans, observing classroom teaching, and providing technical advice and feedback (Berhanu, 2024; Pineda et al., 2024). The supervision process is also affected by the congruence of supervisors' and teachers' perceptions; a mismatch could create inconsistencies in teaching and reduce

the developmental effects of supervision (Hoque et al., 2020; Galabo, 2025).

Contemporary research highlights that the best practice in instructional supervision is one that strikes a balance between administrative and developmental supervision (Cansoy et al., 2024; Mangadlao & Oropa, 2025). Supervisors are required not only to monitor the adherence to curriculum standards but also coach teachers in teaching strategies, assessment, and classroom management. This approach is in line with clinical and collegial forms of supervision, which recommend using observation, reflective feedback, and guided practice to support teacher learning (Babo & Syamsuddin, 2022; Syahputra et al., 2024; Wulandari et al., 2022). Clinical supervision has been demonstrated to enhance teacher skills, growth, and classroom performance, as it includes observation, post-observation meetings, and support based on individual needs (Ajugo, 2024; Waninga et al., 2025).

In the Philippines, supervision is implemented by school administrators, head teachers, master teachers, and SGHs, who perform both supervisory and instructional roles (DM # 89, s. 2025). In senior high schools, under DepEd Order No. 19, s. 2016, SGHs are designated to provide crucial middle-management support to teachers. SGHs play a crucial role in overseeing lesson plans, facilitating instructional practices, assessing classroom practice, and facilitating teacher professional learning (Locsin, 2025; Maisyaroh et al., 2021). These are critical roles, but studies have found that SGHs face barriers in carrying out supervisory tasks due to lack of time and resources, teacher resistance, and inconsistencies in observation (U-Sayee & Adomako, 2021; Mesfin, 2025; Tarimo & Lekule, 2024). These challenges can hinder the developmental potential of supervision, so it is crucial to explore the supervision practices and perceptions of supervisors and teachers to identify areas for improvement and intervention.

It has been well documented that supervision is effective when there is shared understanding between supervisors and teachers regarding its goals and expected outcomes. A supportive view of supervision from teachers can promote reflective practice and the implementation of recommended strategies (Berhanu, 2024; Pomentel, 2024). On the other hand, a lack of alignment between SGHs' and teachers' perceptions can lead to misunderstanding, demotivation, and inconsistent teaching practices (Hoque et al., 2020; Juma et al., 2021). Thus, it is important to understand the views of these two groups of stakeholders to inform strategies that improve the quality of instruction and build a culture of partnership and trust.

Issues in instructional supervision are often compounded by other factors, including school size, workload, strand-specific teaching requirements, as well as teaching materials (Cansoy et al., 2024; Maisyaroh et al., 2021). For instance, in senior high schools with multiple academic strands, SGHs need to ensure that their supervision approach aligns with the curricular and pedagogical requirements of each strand while also ensuring quality assurance is consistent across the board (Mangadlao & Oropa, 2025; Locsin, 2025). This calls for supervision instruments, observation checklists, and guidelines that cover the developmental and administrative aspects of supervision.

Relevant studies highlight the role of school heads in enhancing instructional supervision and teacher support. Montales and Digo (2024) noted that school heads are required not just to perform administrative tasks but also instructional leadership functions that impact teacher and student performance. This implies that school leaders' instructional supervision is a critical task, as it includes supervising teachers, observing their classroom practices and assisting in improving teaching and learning processes. Likewise, Buban and Digo (2021) observed that school heads often engaged in instructional leadership practices, particularly in setting and communicating school priorities, being visible, and managing change. These activities are linked to SGHs' supervisory tasks, particularly in evaluating teachers' lesson plans and teaching materials, observing classrooms, and giving teachers technical assistance. Moreover, Palacio and Digo (2024) highlighted the benefit of a developed handbook for coaching and mentoring teachers in instruction, which demonstrates the value of a structured resource for supervisors and teachers. These research studies suggest that for successful instructional supervision, it is important to have systematic guidance, structured tools, and developmental support to guide teachers to improve their teaching practices and resolve problems in lesson planning, classroom observation, feedback, and technical support.

The design of the practical outputs, is based in the empirical findings of supervision practices, perception alignment, and the challenges identified. Effective evidence-based tools and strategies can help SGHs to efficiently conduct lesson plan reviews, observing classrooms, providing feedback, and delivering technical assistance. Past researches had revealed that well-structured intervention programs based on supervision research can play a significant role in improving instructional performance, professional growth, and student outcomes (Aquino et al., 2021; Babo and Syamsuddin, 2022; Pineda et al., 2024; Waninga et al., 2025). The resulting handbook is tailored to the specific requirements of SGHs, the aim of which is to equip teachers with the means to enhance the overall consistency of supervision, close gaps, and support teachers' development.

Moreover, the emphasis on perception, challenges, and outputs adopted in the study is consistent with the global trends in the instructional supervision research. The literature in the international field highlights the significance of supervision as a process of development as well as evaluation, with mentorship, feedback, and resource support being noted as key mechanisms to improve the quality of

teaching (Ajugo, 2024; Anurat et al., 2024; Baecher et al., 2024). By putting the research in this larger framework, the study does not only add to the local educational practice but also provides information that can be relevant to other similar educational systems that are seeking to enhance middle-management supervision structures.

Besides reviewing performance measures and alignment of perceptions, this study explored the issues, including lack of instructional materials, observation procedures, and resistance of teachers to instructional supervision processes, which are typical barriers that have been reported from previous research, and underscores the significance of tailored interventions (Mesfin, 2025; Tarimo & Lekule, 2024; U-Sayee & Adomako, 2021). To overcome these challenges, a combination of professional growth, well-structured supervisory frameworks, and practical tools should be established to allow SGHs to deliver consistent, supportive, and effective guidance to teachers (Galabo, 2025; Pineda et al., 2024).

This study was designed to examine the instructional supervision practices of SGHs within public senior high schools and to use these findings to inform the development of a handbook. Specifically, the study aimed to (1) assess the extent of SGHs' instructional supervision practices in three key domains—checking of lesson plans and instructional materials, conducting classroom observations, and providing technical support to teachers; (2) compare the perceptions of SGHs and teachers to identify any significant differences; (3) identify the challenges encountered by SGHs and teachers in the implementation and reception of instructional supervision; and (4) describe the integration of the quantitative and qualitative data used as a basis for the development of the SUSTAIN-Based Technical Assistance Handbook.

## II. METHODOLOGY

*Research Design*

This study uses an explanatory sequential mixed-methods research design, which combines quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews, to gain a holistic view of SGHs' instructional supervision. The quantitative approach was applied to measure the frequency, quality, and fit of supervision practices, and the qualitative interviews examined the challenges and contextual factors and the lived experiences of SGHs and teachers. This approach provides a deep understanding of supervision and highlights strengths and weaknesses and how to improve supervision practices (Braun & Clarke, 2008; Syahputra et al., 2024). In the integration that incorporates numerical data with narrative information, this research aims to comprehend the complexities of instructional supervision and its influence on the instructional practices of teachers.

*Sources of Data*

There are two groups of participants in the study that correspond to the quantitative and the qualitative phases of the explanatory sequential mixed methods design. During the quantitative phase, the respondents were 13 SGHs and 63 teachers from the three technical vocational public senior high schools in the province of Sorsogon, representing various strands that include ABM, GAS, STEM, Home Economics, Industrial Arts, and Agri-Fishery. During the qualitative phase, the research involved the identified informants who were purposively selected to explain and enrich the quantitative findings and the challenges associated in the implementation of the supervisory functions as experienced by both SGHs and teachers.

*Research Ethics*

The study was conducted following the research ethical standards. Before the data collection, the consent of the identified school heads was obtained. Participants were informed of the purpose and the nature of the study. Additionally, their participation was all voluntary, and the responses and information that they provided were used solely for academic and research purposes. Anonymity and confidentiality were maintained by not presenting names or other identifying details during data presentation or reporting. The completed instruments were handled responsibly and all data were stored securely to protect the privacy and well-being of the participants.

*Research Instruments*

The study utilized researcher-made survey questionnaires administered to capture SGHs' self-assessment of their instructional supervision practices and teachers' evaluation of supervision practices by the SGH. Prior to the full administration of the instruments, the questionnaires were validated by experts, and revisions were made based on their comments and recommendations to ensure clarity, relevance, and content validity. Then, the questionnaires underwent pilot testing to determine their reliability. The overall Cronbach's alpha of 0.8844 indicated good reliability and strong internal consistency of the instrument. These results suggest that the survey questionnaires were sufficiently reliable for use in the study. In addition to the survey questionnaire, this study also used semi-structured interview questions to supplement and deepen the quantitative findings in the instructional supervision practices. Moreover, this instrument explored challenges in the implementation of instructional supervision as experienced by both SGHs and teachers.

*Data Collection*

Data collection was conducted in two phases. First, qualitative data were collected through the administration of survey questionnaires. The researcher started the data collection by securing permission from the DepEd Sorsogon Province Division and coordinated with the school heads to ensure proper scheduling without disrupting respondents'

classroom instructional activities. Respondents were then oriented about the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of their participation, and the confidentiality of their responses. The researcher later administered the questionnaires via Google Forms to obtain the self-assessment and the teachers' evaluation of SGHs' supervision practices, respectively.

The survey links were sent to the respondents, and responses were monitored to ensure an adequate retrieval rate. The overall retrieval rate of the questionnaire was 92.68%. 76 out of 82 respondents returned the questionnaires. After the data collection period, the online forms were closed, and responses were retrieved, verified for completeness, and organized according to respondent group and strand. The data were then prepared for statistical and descriptive analysis while maintaining confidentiality and anonymity

After the survey results were analyzed, semi-structured interviews were conducted with selected SGHs) and teachers to further explore and clarify the quantitative findings. The interviews were carried out individually using a guided interview protocol to ensure consistency while allowing participants to freely express their insights and experiences. The interview process was conducted in two phases. First, the interview guide was administered in written form to familiarize participants with the questions and enable them to provide detailed and reflective responses to the open-ended items. Participants were given sufficient time, typically one to two days, to complete the written responses, and then face-to-face interviews were conducted to validate, elaborate, and clarify their responses. Each face- to- face interview lasted approximately 30 to 45 minutes per participant. Responses were documented through notetaking and audio recording to ensure accuracy, with the participants' consent. The collected data were then organized and analyzed thematically to support and enrich the quantitative findings.

*Data Analysis*

To determine the extent of instructional supervision practices of SGHs as perceived by themselves and by teachers in terms of checking of lesson plans and instructional materials, classroom observations, and providing technical support to teachers, responses were analyzed using weighted means for each indicator and for each domain. The resulting means were interpreted using the following descriptors as follows: 4.21-5.00 – Done Always; 3.41-4.20 – Done Most of the Time; 2.61-3.40 – Done Sometimes; 1.81-2.60 – Rarely Done; and 1.00-1.80 – Never Done. While independent t-tests and Mann–Whitney U tests were used to determine differences of perceptions regarding instructional supervision between SGHs and teachers. The qualitative data were subjected to thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2008) six-step process by identifying recurrent themes and patterns, providing varied contexts and factors affecting supervision. The findings obtained from both quantitative and qualitative phases were then integrated using a joint display method. These integrated results served as the basis in the development of the SUSTAIN-Based Technical Assistance Handbook, ensuring that the proposed output was directly grounded in empirical evidence and responsive to the practical needs of SGHs and teachers.

## III. RESULTS

The research looked at SGHs' classroom-based supervision practices in three areas: review of lesson plans and learning resources, classroom observations, and technical support for teachers. Table 1: Performance Metrics Comparison demonstrates that SGHs rated supervisory practices as high with weighted means (WM) from 4.05 to 4.21, which could be interpreted as "done most of the time." Teacher perceptions were slightly lower (4.00-4.09) but still corresponded to "done most of the time." The highest ratings were for classroom observation (SGHs WM = 4.21; Teachers WM = 4.09), and the lowest were for provision of technical support (SGHs WM = 4.05; Teachers WM = 4.00). In general, the average of all aspects of supervision reflected a high performance, with SGHs and teachers reporting 4.13 and 4.05, respectively, which corresponds to "done most of the time."

**Table 1. Performance Metrics Comparison**

| Domain | Extent of Supervision | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **SGH WM** | **Description** | **Teachers WM** | **Description** |
| Checking of Lesson Plans & Instructional Materials | 4.14 | Done Most of the Time | 4.06 | Done Most of the Time |
| Classroom Observation | 4.20 | Done Most of the Time | 4.09 | Done Most of the Time |
| Provision of Technical Support | 4.05 | Done Most of the Time | 4.00 | Done Most of the Time |
| **Overall Average** | **4.13** | **Done Most of the Time** | **4.05** | **Done Most of the Time** |

A comparison of SGHs and teachers' perceptions of instructional practices is presented in Table 2: Statistical analyses using t-tests and Mann–Whitney U tests showed no significant differences across the three domains. The differences in weighted means were minimal—0.08 for lesson plan checking, 0.11 for classroom observation, and 0.05 for technical support—with corresponding p-values of 0.21, 0.17, and 0.32. These results indicate that both SGHs

and teachers shared a largely similar view of the frequency and quality of instructional supervision practices, regardless of strand or role.

**Table 2. Comparison of SGHs' and Teachers' Perceptions on Instructional Supervision Practices**

| Domain | SGHs WM | Teachers WM | Difference (WM) | Test Used | p-value | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4.14 | 4.06 | 0.08 | t-test / Mann–Whitney U | 0.21 | Not Significant |
| 2 | 4.20 | 4.09 | 0.11 | t-test / Mann–Whitney U | 0.17 | Not Significant |
| 3 | 4.05 | 4.00 | 0.05 | t-test / Mann–Whitney U | 0.32 | Not Significant |

The results indicate that SGHs consistently performed instructional supervision practices across all three domains, with both SGHs and teachers rating the practices as "done most of the time" (Table 1). Furthermore, no statistically significant differences were found between the perceptions of SGHs and teachers in any of the domains as reflected in Table 2, demonstrating a high level of agreement regarding the extent and quality of supervision. Despite generally satisfactory supervision, several operational and contextual challenges were identified in Table 3, including incomplete lesson plans, variable teacher readiness, limited observation protocols, and resource constraints.

Challenges faced in instructional supervision are outlined in Table 3. Lesson plan and material checking faced challenges such as incomplete or misaligned lesson plans (high), lack of teacher preparedness (medium), lack of time to review lesson plans (medium), and lack of teaching resources (medium). In classroom observations, challenges include teachers' inconsistent performance in class (high), lack of observation guidelines (medium), teachers' reluctance to accept feedback (medium), and lack of time or availability (medium). In terms of technical assistance, challenges commonly encountered were lack of coaching or mentoring opportunities (high), lack of strand-specific support (medium), lack of training in teaching methods (medium), and limited time or resources for professional support (medium). These results highlight that although supervision practice is quite good, efforts should be made to remove operational and contextual barriers to improve the quality of SGH-led instructional supervision.

**Table 3. Challenges Encountered by SGHs and Teachers in Instructional Supervision**

| Domain | Challenges Encountered | Frequency / Emphasis | Participant Group |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Checking of Lesson Plans & Instructional Materials** | Incomplete or misaligned lesson plans | High | SGHs & Teachers |
| | Teachers' lack of preparedness or readiness | Medium | SGHs |
| | Limited time for reviewing materials | Medium | SGHs |
| | Insufficient instructional resources or materials | Medium | SGHs & Teachers |
| **Classroom Observation** | Teachers' inconsistent performance in class | High | SGHs |
| | Lack of structured observation protocols | Medium | SGHs |
| | Teachers' resistance to feedback | Medium | SGHs & Teachers |
| | Scheduling conflicts / heavy workload | Medium | SGHs & Teachers |
| **Provision of Technical Support** | Limited opportunities for coaching or mentoring | High | SGHs & Teachers |
| | Lack of strand-specific guidance | Medium | SGHs |
| | Inadequate training in instructional strategies | Medium | SGHs & Teachers |

**Table 3. Challenges Encountered by SGHs and Teachers in Instructional Supervision**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Resource constraints for professional support | Medium | SGHs & Teachers |

Table 4 shows the Joint Display of quantitative and qualitative findings to show how the quantitative and qualitative results were integrated and how these findings informed the development of the SUSTAIN program. The joint display shows that lesson plan checking was highly practiced, yet the teachers still faced the difficulty in preparing lesson plans and in the alignment of instructional materials with expected standards and indicators. It also demonstrates that although the classroom observations and post-observation feedback were largely good, there were areas of concern that need to be strengthened, including observation-related pressure, scheduling issues, more explicit feedback, and better follow-through. In addition, technical support was viewed as highly practiced, yet workloads, time limitations, and contextual constrains affected the consistency of support.

**Table 4. Joint Display of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings**

| Quantitative Results | Qualitative Follow-up | Integrated Interpretation/ Meta-Inference | Implication to the Study |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lesson plan checking was highly implemented, with strong ratings in the completeness of daily lesson plans, sequencing of activities, curriculum alignment, feedback provision, integration of HOTS, and technology use. | Teachers still experienced difficulty in preparing lesson plans and aligning instructional materials with expected indicators. | Strong supervisory practice is evident in checking lesson plan structure and compliance; however, teachers still require deeper technical guidance in translating curriculum standards and indicators into actual classroom practice. | Sustaining strong lesson-planning supervision is necessary, but it should be complemented with more developmental coaching, guided assistance, and capacity-building support for teachers. |
| Review of instructional materials and the conduct of workshops or mentoring on material development received comparatively lower ratings. | Teachers reported challenges in preparing instructional materials and dealing with limited resources. | Although support for instructional materials is present, it is not yet sufficiently systematic, sustained, or adequately supported by available resources. | A more organized quality assurance process for instructional materials may be introduced, together with mentoring activities, resource-sharing, and the development of a common instructional materials bank. |
| Classroom observation practices were highly implemented and generally standards-based. | Teachers experienced pressure during observations, while Subject Group Heads reported scheduling conflicts and teacher readiness concerns. | Classroom observation procedures are already established; however, implementation is affected by issues related to timing, teacher readiness, and observation-related anxiety. | Observation procedures may be further strengthened through standardized pre-observation and post-observation conferencing to improve consistency and lessen teacher stress. |
| Post-observation feedback was generally strong, but follow-up scheduling, PMFC use, and monitoring | Teachers expressed the need for clearer, more specific feedback, immediate conferencing, and | Feedback mechanisms are present, but sustained coaching, structured follow-through, and systematic monitoring are | Follow-through mechanisms may be reinforced through written action agreements, scheduled |

**Table 4. Joint Display of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| of gaps received lower ratings. | stronger follow-up support. | not yet fully institutionalized. | monitoring sessions, and the consistent use of PMFC-based tracking tools. |
| Technical support was highly practiced, particularly in responsiveness and professional assistance. | Both teachers and Subject Group Heads cited workload, time limitations, and contextual constraints. | The supervisory environment is generally supportive, but structural and contextual barriers affect the consistency, depth, and continuity of technical assistance. | A more school-supported technical assistance system may be developed through shared expectations, collaborative mechanisms, and practical monitoring tools. |
| No significant differences were found between the perceptions of Subject Group Heads and teachers. | Both groups described similar issues and similar areas for improvement. | There is broad alignment between the perspectives of Subject Group Heads and teachers, suggesting a common understanding of supervision practices and priority needs. | A unified school-wide intervention framework may be implemented across strands to address common concerns and strengthen instructional supervision practices. |

With the used of the joint display process, the quantitative findings from the survey were related to the qualitative themes from the interviews in a combined presentation. This allowed the qualitative results to explain and enrich the quantitative patterns, which is consistent with the explanatory sequential mixed method design of the study. Collectively, these results provided a robust empirical basis for designing the SUSTAIN-Based Technical Assistance Handbook, ensuring that the output is both evidence-based and directly responsive to the needs identified in the study.

## IV. DISCUSSION

This study discovered that the practice of instructional supervision of SGHs is mostly done regularly and effectively in the areas of reviewing lesson plans and teaching materials, classroom observations, and technical assistance. The perceptions of SGHs and teachers regarding supervision practices are in the category of "done most of the time" with weighted means from 4.00 to 4.21. These findings indicate that SGHs have an organized system of checking teacher performance and teaching quality, confirming the claim that systematic supervision has a positive impact on teachers' practices and student achievement (Hoque et al., 2020; Locsin, 2025).

The results emphasized the need to strengthen instructional supervision by moving beyond routine compliance of checking lesson plans and instructional materials towards more developmental, responsive practices. This implies that SGHs need to consider instructional supervision not only as a monitoring activity but also as a continuous professional support mechanism for teachers. The effectiveness of supervision can only be achieved not by the number of times the SGHs check the lesson plans or conduct classroom observations but by the quality of interaction between SGHs and teachers. When supervision is conducted in a supportive and collegial manner, teachers are more likely to accept feedback positively and apply the suggestions given to them. Based on actual school experiences, teachers tend to become more confident and reflective when SGHs give them clear guidance in lesson plan preparation before observation and constructive feedback after observation. This means that pre-conference and post-conference sessions need to reinforce in a way that the supervision process is transformed into a meaningful process of mentoring, coaching, and professional development.

Additionally, SGHs must give more attention in identifying the mentioned gaps and challenges teachers encountered specifically in lesson preparation, teacher readiness for classroom observations, and feedback acceptance. Although the overall supervision practices were rated as “done most of the time,” the presence of these challenges shows that overall supervision practices need to be improved in terms of consistency, depth, and follow through. For example, the review of lesson plans must not only focus on its completeness of format but also the suitability of learning objectives and its alignment to Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELC), teaching pedagogies used, assessment tools, and alignment with learners’ needs. Moreover, classroom observations must not merely record teacher performance and compliance but must be able to assist teachers in helping to identify instructional concerns and challenges and the technical support that can be extended to them. By these approaches, the supervision can be more responsive to the actual needs of teachers. In turn, teachers

become reflective of their performance and can refine and enhance their teaching practices (Caballera & Digo, 2023).

Moreover, SGHs can enhance their instructional supervision process by preparing a concise supervisory plan, using standardized tools, and adhering to a regular schedule of lesson plan review, classroom observations, and consistently providing technical support to teachers. They can also implement mentoring sessions, peer coaching, facilitating learning action cell sessions, and collaboratively plan activities with other SGHs to assist teachers in enhancing their teaching practices.

Furthermore, supervision requires availability of time, materials, and logistical support to make it more effective. School heads and SGHs can collaborate with each other to make sure that teachers are exposed to instructional resources and updated teaching materials, and they are allowed to undergo trainings and seminars for professional development. Constant evaluation should also be undertaken to ascertain whether any technical assistance provided has led to any improvement in the classroom practices. By doing so, instructional supervision will be more than a normal supervisory task but will be an effective and lasting method of enhancing the quality of teaching, reinforcing the effectiveness of teachers, and eventually improving the student's learning outcomes.

The comparison of perceptions between SGHs and the teachers showed no significant difference in all areas. This consistency suggests that supervisors and teachers have consistent expectations and understandings of the frequency and quality of supervision, reinforcing prior studies that highlight the role of shared perceptions in improving teaching practices and student learning (Galabo, 2025; Pomentel, 2024). The lack of differences across strands also implies that supervisory strategies are uniformly implemented regardless of the strand of study, consistent with the notion that supervisory systems can enhance equity in teaching (Maisyaroh et al., 2021; Mangadlao & Oropa, 2025).

The findings also pointed out the importance of differentiating instructional supervision according to the specific needs, experience levels, and classroom realities of teachers. Although the findings indicate that the perceptions of the supervisory practices of SGHs were generally the same across strands. SGHs may still want to believe that teachers differ in terms of their instructional strengths, familiarity with the standards provided by the curriculum, classroom management, and the ability to create competent learner-centered lesson plans. Beginning teachers might need to engage in reflective dialogue, peer mentoring, or opportunities to share effective practice with colleagues. This implies that instructional supervision must be prepared to cater to individual teacher needs and adhere to a common school-based instructional supervision framework. In this way, SGHs can be able to make sure that supervision is fair, relevant, and supportive of continuous teacher development.

Although supervision is generally good, the qualitative insights reveal practical and contextual factors that potentially limit effective instructional support, as outlined in Table 3. These included inadequate lesson planning, teacher readiness, observation protocols, teacher receptivity to feedback, and logistics support. The findings are in line with studies that stress that the quality of instructional supervision is often limited by practical constraints, time, and resource constraints (Cansoy et al., 2024; Mesfin, 2025; Tarimo & Lekule, 2024). Overcoming these challenges is essential to ensure that supervision is not only conducted regularly but also has a positive impact on classroom instructional practices.

In addition, the study implied that instructional supervision should be supported by proper documentation, follow-through, and evidence-based decision-making. The outcomes of lesson plan reviews, classroom observations, and technical assistance should be systematically documented and analyzed to learn about prevailing issues in the teaching practices of teachers. The record may be used as a foundation of planning school-based trainings, LAC sessions, peer coaching activities, and other interventions on professional development. This also enables SGHs to know whether the help offered resulted in actual change in teaching practices over time. When supervision is treated merely by a compliance activity, rather than continuous improvement, instructional supervision is unsustainable and less meaningful. Therefore, documentation and follow-up procedures could be strengthened to help guarantee that instructional supervision is directly associated with improved teaching quality.

Overall, the results showed that while SGHs had generally good supervision practices, the effectiveness of instruction support could be further improved through systematic interventions and follow-up, as well as capacity building. Hence, the development of the SUSTAIN-Based Technical Assistance Handbook. This handbook was developed to address the gaps and strengthen the existing practice of instructional supervision. Through its inclusion of structured guides for reviewing lesson plans and other instructional materials, protocols for classroom observation, feedback, and technical assistance strategies, the handbook seeks to enhance supervision practices and teacher development in line with international standards in instructional supervision (Aquino et al., 2021; Babo & Syamsuddin, 2022; Waninga et al., 2025).

Moreover, the handbook translates research-based practices that enable SGHs to conduct uniform and developmental supervision. Finally, the handbook's incorporation of monitoring and follow-up strategies ensures that supervision is not a one-off event but an ongoing process focused on enhancing teacher effectiveness and quality of instruction. The structure of the handbook is in line with best practices in instructional leadership and supervision, which

prioritize standardization, contextual relevance, and practicality, thus contributing to a culture of ongoing professional development of SGHs and their teachers (Galabo, 2025; Pineda et al., 2024; Mangadlao & Oropa, 2025). In this way, the use of evidence-based practices makes the output a scalable approach for improving practices of instructional supervision in senior high schools, ensuring that supervisory strategies are holistic and contextually relevant.

## V. CONCLUSION

It was found that SGHs generally have effective practices in instructional supervision in areas that include reviewing lesson plans and teaching materials, classroom observations, and providing technical support, which were rated by SGHs and teachers as "done most of the time." But there were no statistically significant differences in self-perception of SGHs and perception of teachers on supervision practices, suggesting consensus among SGHs and teachers on the extent of their supervision practices. While these practices are generally satisfactory, gaps in current practices, including lesson plans not fully completed, teachers not well prepared for teaching, insufficient classroom observation protocols, reluctance to feedback, and lack of material resources, were identified and need to be addressed. These results suggest a need for structured, systematic, and responsive supervision to improve teachers' instruction and development, which formed the basis for the development of the SUSTAIN-Based Technical Assistance Handbook.

Drawing from the results, it is suggested that SGHs can adopt structured supervision approaches that include lesson plan checklists and classroom observations, feedback, and technical support guidelines, as outlined in the SUSTAIN-Based Technical Assistance Handbook. Similarly, SGHs must be provided with training and capacity-building to improve their coaching, mentoring, and follow-up skills. Additionally, schools should provide adequate time and resources for supervision activities and overcome implementation issues, such as teacher preparedness and workload. Institutionalizing instructional supervision and a structured technical assistance mechanism, with the active support of the school heads, is also recommended to ensure that supervision is sustained, systematic, collaborative, and aligned with teachers' professional developmental needs. These also enable SGHs to create a supportive supervision environment where teachers are encouraged to openly accept feedback and participate in collaborative professional learning. Further research may be conducted with more schools to monitor and evaluate the implementation, usefulness, and effectiveness of the SUSTAIN-based Technical Assistance Handbook in addressing supervision gaps and improving teachers' instructional performance.

## VI. DISCLOSURE

The authors report no conflicts of interest in the conduct or reporting of this work. No financial, personal, or professional relationships influenced the research, analysis, or presentation of the findings.

## REFERENCES


1. Ajugo, M. (2024). Clinical supervision for quality education delivery in public schools in Nigeria. *EJAHSS, 1*(2), 47–60. https://doi.org/10.59324/ejahss.2024.1(2). 05
2. Anurat, K., Thamyongkit, S., Pakakasama, S., & Sumrithe, S. (2024). Assessing the role of mentors in mitigating burnout and enhancing professional development in medical education. *International Journal of Medical Education, 15*, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.659b.d08c
3. Aquino, C., Afalla, B., & Fabelico, F. (2021). Managing educational institutions: School heads' leadership practices and teachers' performance. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education, 10*(4), 1325. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i4.21518
4. Babo, R., & Syamsuddin, A. (2022). Clinical supervision model to improve the quality of learning in elementary school. *Jurnal Ilmiah Sekolah Dasar, 6*(1), 85–94. https://doi.org/10.23887/jisd.v6i1.41303
5. Baecher, L., Copland, F., & Mann, S. (2024). Introduction to the special issue: Renewal and reconceptualization of supervision in TESOL. *TESOL Journal, 15*(3), Article e839. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.839
6. Berhanu, K. (2024). The mediating role of teachers' attitudes toward instructional supervision in the association between instructional supervisory practice and teachers' job performance. *Participatory Educational Research, 11*(2), 212–229. https://doi.org/10.17275/per.24.27.11.2
7. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2008). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
8. Buban, L. M., & Digo, G. S. (2021). Management beliefs and practices of elementary school heads on instructional leadership. *International Journal of Research-GRANTHAALAYAH, 9*(7), 170–178. https://doi.org/10.29121/granthaalayah.v9.i7.2021.4088
9. Caballera, R. A., & Digo, G. S. (2023). Empowering rural science teachers as reflective and action-oriented practitioners. *International Journal of Social Science and Education Research Studies,*

*03*(11), 2226-2234. https://doi.org/10.55677/ijssers/v03i11y2023-08

10. Cansoy, R., Gümüş, S., & Walker, A. (2024). Challenges in implementing instructional leadership: Insights from Turkish school principals. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *53*(5), 991-1015. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432241263915
11. Department of Education (06 April, 2016) DO 19, s. 2016 – Guidelines on the Organizational Structures and Staffing Patterns of Stand-alone and Integrated Public Senior High Schools (SHS).
12. Department of Education (01 October, 2025). DM 89, s. 2025: Guidelines on the Multi-Year Performance Management and Evaluation System for Teachers from School Years 2025–2026 to 2027–2028.
13. Galabo, N. (2025). Intensifying instructional supervision of teachers through school head's intentional mentoring strategy (SHIMS). *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, *IX*(IX), 106–111. https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.909000010
14. Hoque, K., Kenayathulla, H., Subramaniam, M., & Islam, R. (2020). Relationships between supervision and teachers' performance and attitude in secondary schools in Malaysia. *SAGE Open*, *10*(2), Article 2158244020925501. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020925501
15. Juma, J., Ndwiga, Z., & Nyaga, M. (2021). Instructional leadership as a controlling function in secondary schools in Rangwe Sub-County, Kenya: Influence on students' learning outcomes. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *51*(4), 791-808. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432211015228
16. Liu, Y., Bellibaş, M., & Gümüş, S. (2020). The effect of instructional leadership and distributed leadership on teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Mediating roles of supportive school culture and teacher collaboration. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *49*(3), 430-453. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220910438
17. Locsin, M. (2025). Subject group heads' instructional supervision and its effect on the performance of their teachers in Cardona Senior High School: Input for an instructional supervision enhancement program. *PEMJ*, *36*(10), 1116–1120. https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.361005
18. Maisyaroh, M., Wiyono, B., Hardika, H., Valdez, A., Mangorsi, S., & Canapi, S. (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), Article 1962232. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2021.1962232
19. Malinga, C., Jita, L., & Bada, A. (2021). Middle Management and Instructional Leadership: The Case of Natural Sciences' Heads of Departments in South Africa. Jetl (Journal of Education Teaching and Learning), 6(2), 119. https://doi.org/10.26737/jetl.v6i2.2425
20. Mangadlao, J., & Oropa, J. (2025). Enhancing Supervisory Programs through Instructional Practices of School Heads. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, *3*(3), 398–406. https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.052
21. Mesfin, S. (2025). Practices and challenges of school-based supervision. *Current Trends in Business Management*, *3*(1), 01–06. https://doi.org/10.33140/ctbm.03.01.04
22. Montales, J. C., & Digo, G. S. (2024). Correlational study on the performance of school heads and their instructional leadership practices. *International Journal of Social Science and Education Research Studies*, *4*(3), 199–206. https://doi.org/10.55677/ijssers/v04i3y2024-05
23. Palacio, H. G., & Digo, G. S. (2024). Development of handbook on instructional coaching and mentoring for master teachers. *International Journal of Social Science and Education Research Studies*, *4*(4), 326–337. https://doi.org/10.55677/ijssers/v04i4y2024-08
24. Pineda, S., Habagat, J., Lucido, J., & Obediente, A. (2024). Leveraging classroom observation tools (COT) for an enhanced instructional supervisory practice. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 13(6), 27-44.* https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2024.24040
25. Pomentel, L. (2024). Exploring the influence of school heads' instructional supervision on teachers' efficacy and performance. *International Journal of Research Publications*, *148*(1), 256-275. https://doi.org/10.47119/ijrp1001481520246420
26. Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2001b). Investigating School Leadership Practice: A Distributed Perspective. *Educational Researcher*, *30*, 23-28. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189X030003023
27. Syahputra, A., Sudadi, S., & Mufaizin, M. (2024). Implementation of Clinical Supervision to Enhance Teacher Professionalism at Madrasah. *Idarotuna Journal of Administrative Science*, *5*(2), 170-183. https://doi.org/10.54471/idarotuna.v5i2.110
28. Tarimo, P., & Lekule, C. (2024). Effect of instructional supervision on education quality in secondary schools in Kaham District, Tanzania.

*East African Journal of Education Studies, 7*(1), 216–230. https://doi.org/10.37284/eajes.7.1.1759

29. U-Sayee, C., & Adomako, E. (2021). Supervisory practices and challenges faced by senior high school principals in Greater Monrovia, Liberia: Implications for quality education. *Heliyon, 7*(4), Article e06895. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06895
30. Waninga, W., Musundi, B., Atabo, H., Nambogwe, E., Olinga, J., Ajuko, S., et al. (2025). Clinical supervision in science education: A reflective framework for supervisors and trainees. *Journal of Education and Practice, 9*(5), 47–62. https://doi.org/10.47941/jep.3074
31. Wulandari, D., Vivekanantharasa, R., & Fauzan, A. (2022). Clinical supervision's role in improving teachers' teaching skills in online learning. *PPSDP International Journal of Education, 1*(2), 211-218. https://doi.org/10.59175/pijed.v1i2.18