Extent and Effectiveness of Differentiated Supervision Among Junior High Schools in Llanera District

Kevin G. Corpuz[1] and Christian C. Halili, Ph.D.[2]

Core Gateway College, Inc. San Jose City, Nueva Ecija, Philippines[1]
Department of Education, Division of San Jose City, Philippines[2]

Corresponding author's email: **kgcorpuz18@gmail.com** and cchalili@cgci.edu.ph

---

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the extent and effectiveness of differentiated supervision in the junior high schools of Llanera District about teachers' socio-demographic characteristics and teaching performance. The quantitative research method was used in this study. Total population sampling was employed with 84 junior high school teachers as respondents. The researchers employed a descriptive-correlational design to determine the significant relationship between variables. The outcome of the study revealed that most of the respondents were middle-aged and could still do much improvement in their teaching; dominated by females, married after securing a permanent position, Teacher III, which implies that they were already promoted to higher positions with Master's degree units which help them in their promotion, and with an average of 6 years in the service which means that more than half were experienced. School heads actively employ evaluations to provide meaningful feedback to teachers based on their individual needs and level of expertise. The teachers also perceived the four approaches as moderately effective, which indicates that they truly helped them in their role as teachers. The majority had outstanding performance ratings, meaning they performed their duties and responsibilities satisfactorily. Teachers' positions and years in service were significantly

related to their teaching performance, which means that the higher the position and the longer the years in service, the better the teaching performance. The extent of implementation of collaborative and non-directive differentiated supervision among schools was significantly related to the performance of teachers, which implies that when mentors and mentees employ collaborative and non-directive approaches more frequently, their performance improves. The effectiveness of the directive approach was also found to be significantly related to the performance of teachers, which connotes that the performance of teachers will be enhanced when supervisors actively direct, coach, and set an example for them.

Keywords: differentiated supervision, effectiveness, extent, Teacher's performance

INTRODUCTION

All countries are concerned with raising the quality of education, especially at the primary school level, because it is a crucial factor in national growth (Esia-Donkoh & Baffoe, 2018). This is supported by Kotirde and Yunos (2014) research, which shows that the pursuit of quality has been a driving force behind educational changes and that developing countries' strategic improvement plans increasingly depend on it. Among these changes are the Education 2030 Agenda, the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), Education for All (EFA), and other programs (De Grauwe, 2016). Because of this, ensuring the quality of education is a matter of responsibility and national importance (McLoughlin & Visser, 2003).

In the Philippines, the K-12 Program marked a significant shift in the curriculum, necessitating the demand for excellent education. As a framework for measuring teacher quality, the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), originally the National Competency-Based Teacher Standards (NCBTS) (D. O. No. 32, 2009), was created. Given this, what educators, including teachers and school administrators, should be able to do to meet the 21st-century requirement for high-quality education is still being determined. Teachers need to advance professionally to meet the reforms and demands of the students. One strategy to help teachers accomplish the goal of improving their instruction is supervision.

Teachers are essential inputs in education delivery; therefore, how they are trained and supervised impacts the quality of education (Glanz et al., 2007). Supervision is concerned with students' progress and development. In addition, several researchers assert that by enhancing teachers' professional development and job performance, supervision can improve classroom practices and result in student achievement (Baffour-Awuah, 2011; Kholid & Rohmatika, 2019).

According to DepEd (2018), teacher supervision is a professional, continuous, and cooperative process for improving instruction. It is characterized by guidance, assistance, sharing of ideas, facilitation, or creation to help teachers improve the learning situation and quality of school learning. Supervision, also defined as improving a mentoring approach using the linkage of cooperative activities and democratic relationships among those involved in teaching and learning, is essential to achieving a successful education system (Oyewole & Ehinola, 2014).

However, traditional supervision of teachers as part of this responsibility is believed to be more focused on evaluation than professional development. An alternate perspective is that schools require a supervisory system focusing more on empowerment and help models than an evaluation approach. There is growing consensus that alternative instructional supervision systems are needed to support teacher renewal, professional development, and classroom improvement approaches (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007).

Some supervision theorists have advocated using the supervision process to combine individual teachers' professional growth with school improvement goals. Teachers and administrators who participate in effective programs—including those that employ some differentiated supervision—work together and independently to achieve the same career improvement goals. Glatthorn's model contends that tenured and non-tenured teachers require different levels of supervision. The existing generalized "one size fits all" supervision techniques must be changed. Glatthorn's model is fundamentally a democratic concept of supervision that values individuals and provides flexibility. It recommends using expert methods and interpersonal connections to help teachers become more productive. This paradigm could be seen as a part of the "new supervision," which shifts from regulating teachers to empowering them by providing them with various options, continuing support networks, and opportunities for professional growth. It also accepts the notion of metamorphosis as natural (Glickman et al., 2010).

Differentiated supervision is any formally adopted way of supervising teachers that gives them a choice in the kind of supervision

they get. Cooperative professional development and self-directed professional development are typically available options. Few studies have been conducted in the Philippines that address differentiated teacher supervision. The said gap was the basis of this study, which was conducted to determine the extent and effectiveness of differentiated supervision in improving the teaching performance of junior high school teachers in the Llanera District.

This study aimed to determine the relationship between the extent and effectiveness of differentiated supervision in the junior high school of Llanera District and the Teacher's performance based on their IPCRF rating during the SY 2021-2022.

METHODOLOGY

This study used a quantitative research design. Specifically, the study utilized descriptive design to describe the socio-demographic characteristics of junior high school teachers, the extent and effectiveness of implementing differentiated supervision in the junior high school, and the teachers' performance. Also, it utilized correlational design to establish possible relationships between and among the said variables. Eighty-four (84) junior high school teachers, with Teacher I to III and Master Teacher I to II positions, from the District of Llanera served as the study's respondents. The school heads are currently implementing differentiated supervision in their respective schools. The researcher employed total population sampling in this study since the total population of junior high school teachers of Llanera District is manageable. The researcher adapted a survey questionnaire from the study of Hoque et al. (2020).

The instrument was reviewed and revalidated by six selected experts in the field of education to ensure that items were applicable, scientifically accurate, and relevant. First was the school head, second was the department head, and the master teachers. The final evaluation of the instrument was also facilitated by two more experts and experienced educators with professional degrees in education and a Doctor of Philosophy. Their corrections, recommendations, and suggestions were combined and incorporated into the final structure of the instrument. The said research instrument, the Differentiated Supervision Survey Form (DSSF), was divided into four parts. The first part of the instrument gathers the respondent's age, sex, civil status, teaching position, years in service, and highest educational attainment. The second part of the DSSF elicited information on the extent of the

implementation of differentiated supervision in the sampled school as perceived by the teachers. The third part of the questionnaire looks into the perceived effectiveness of implementing differentiated supervision in the sampled school. Teachers' most recent performance ratings during the School Year 2021 – 2022 were also asked in the fourth part of the survey. Data were gathered from the junior high school teachers by having them complete the survey questionnaire. The collected data were then examined and interpreted using the necessary statistical techniques. The socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents were analyzed descriptively. In describing the teachers' perceptions of the extent and effectiveness of implementing differentiated supervision in their respective schools, the weighted means were computed using the range of values with corresponding descriptive interpretation. Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation was used to determine the relationship between the socio-demographic characteristics of the teachers, their perceived extent and effectiveness of the differentiated supervision being implemented in their schools, and their teaching performance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Results showed that the teacher respondents were middle-aged. Fewer than half (28.60%) were aged between 25 and 30. The majority (71.40%) were females, and 28.60% were males. The majority (69.00%) were married. Results also revealed that over half (56.00%) were Teacher III. The majority (66.70%) had 4 to 7 years of teaching experience. More than half (57.10%) had acquired Master's degree units.

Table 1. Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

CHARACTERISTICS	FREQUENCY n = 84	PERCENTAGE
Age		
24 and below	2	2.40
25 – 30	24	28.60
31 – 35	16	19.00
36 – 40	10	11.90
41 – 45	19	22.60
46 – 50	0	0.00
51 – 55	9	10.70
55 and above	4	4.80
Mean = 37.33		
SD = 9.53		

Sex		
Male	24	28.60
Female	60	71.40
Civil Status		
Single	24	28.60
Married	58	69.00
Widowed	2	2.40
Teaching Position	21	25.00
Teacher I	16	19.00
Teacher II	47	56.00
Teacher III		
Years in Service		
0 – 3	8	9.50
4 – 7	56	66.70
Eight and above	20	23.80
Mean = 6.07		
SD = 4.38		
Highest Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	8	9.50
With MA units	48	57.10
Master's Degree	28	33.40

The extent of Implementation of Differentiated Supervision

Table 2 presents the extent of implementation of differentiated supervision as perceived by the teacher-respondents. It obtained an overall mean of 3.07, described as 'high.' From among the differentiated supervision approaches, non-directive supervision got the highest mean (3.15), followed by directive supervision (3.06), collaborative supervision (3.05), and directive-informational supervision (3.03), all of which were described as 'high.'

Table 2. The extent of Implementation of Differentiated Supervision

STATEMENTS	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
Directive Supervision		
My mentor provides suggestions to improve teaching and ensure they follow us	3.21	High
During the discussion with my mentor, they make the final decision on what needs to be improved	3.13	High
My mentor finds the solutions for me to solve the problem	2.90	High
My mentor tells me what I have to do to improve my teaching.	3.04	High

My mentor applies this approach to supervise new teachers and those seeking help for improvement.	3.01	High
Pooled Mean	**3.06**	**High**
Directive-Informational Supervision		
My mentor is more open to my suggestions for improving my teaching.	2.93	High
My mentor provides guidance and technical assistance when I am assigned to new roles with which I must familiarize myself.	2.95	High
My mentor needs to give more adequate supervision on the tasks I am already familiar with.	3.04	High
I am given more freedom to choose appropriate teaching strategies in my classes.	3.20	High
My mentor provides little directive guidance in classroom instruction and pedagogy, with which I need to familiarize myself.	3.01	High
Pooled Mean	**3.03**	**High**
Collaborative Supervision		
My mentor listens and accepts my suggestions for improvement.	3.10	High
My mentor accepts my disagreements while we are discussing things.	3.04	High
My mentor shares my responsibility for decision-making to select the best teaching practices.	3.10	High
My mentor and I work as a team to overcome issues in classroom teaching	2.98	High
My mentor uses this approach to teachers who suggest solutions to improve their classroom teaching.	3.07	High
Pooled Mean	**3.05**	**High**
Directive Supervision		
My mentor allows me to find the best practice to solve the problems in my classroom teaching.	3.29	Very High
My mentor lets me explore and generate a variety of alternatives and choose the most appropriate plan for my classes.	3.25	Very High
My mentor encourages me to be creative and innovative in my classroom teaching.	3.06	High
My mentor supports my suggestions to improve classroom teaching.	3.11	High
My mentor uses this approach to teachers who can solve problems independently	3.05	High
Pooled Mean	**3.15**	**High**
Overall Mean	**3.07**	**High**

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Very High
2.50 – 3.24 High
1.75 – 2.49 Medium
1.00 – 1.74 Low

Directive Supervision. Results showed that directive supervision had a pooled mean of 3.06, described as 'high.' This supports the findings of Rettig et al. (2000), who found that the supervisor is perceived to have more knowledge or expertise than the new or struggling faculty member; thus, the supervisor adopts a directive approach of differentiated supervision. In the study of Ibrahim (2018), faculty members believed that the supervisor knows everything and everything he or she says is correct, so they prefer following directions literally. In addition, directive supervision places intellectual responsibility on the supervisor.

Directive-Informational Supervision. The directive-informational supervision obtained a pooled mean of 3.03, described as 'high.' This supports Appiah and Donkoh's (2018) claim that the directive-informational supervision approach guides new teachers as they become popular and competent in the adopted teaching methods. It is generally used when teachers are at relatively low developmental levels or need clarification about what to try in their classrooms. The supervisor still retains the expert role in providing choices. In addition, directive-informational supervision gives teachers more control of their evaluation process (Sullivan & Glanz, 2009).

Collaborative Supervision. The collaborative supervision approach obtained a pooled mean of 3.05, described as 'high.' This is consistent with the study of Rettig et al. (2000), which states that the supervisor is asked for suggestions and to assist the faculty member in thinking through the issue at hand. The supervisor assists in replicating or reflecting the faculty member's ideas. Furthermore, Coimbra et al. (2020) explained that supervisors and teachers value teamwork, particularly in sectoral meetings and peer observation of classes, and value feedback, reflection, action research, and improving pedagogical intervention in the classroom.

Non-Directive Supervision. The extent of the non-directive approach among junior high schools obtained a pooled mean of 3.15, described as 'high.' According to Ibrahim (2018), non-directive supervision is employed when the supervisor assists the Teacher in developing their plans. This strategy includes listening, reflecting, clarifying, encouraging, and problem-solving. The goal is to act as a sounding board for intelligent engagement. Furthermore, Dawursk (2011) indicated that teachers create their plans under non-directive supervision since they can self-analyze, self-critique, and implement

viable solutions independently.

Effectiveness of Implementation of Differentiated Supervision

Table 3 shows the effectiveness of implementing differentiated supervision as perceived by the teacher-respondents. It obtained an overall mean of 3.15, described as 'moderately effective.' From among the differentiated supervision approaches, directive-informational supervision got the highest mean of (3.19), followed by collaborative supervision (3.16), directive supervision (3.13), and non-directive supervision (3.11), all of which were described as 'moderately effective.'

Table 3. Effectiveness of Implementation of Differentiated Supervision

STATEMENTS	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
Directive		
My mentor provides suggestions to improve teaching and ensure they follow us	3.14	Moderately Effective
During the discussion with my mentor, they make the final decision on what needs to be improved	3.17	Moderately Effective
My mentor finds the solutions for me to solve the problem	3.11	Moderately Effective
My mentor tells me what I have to do to improve my teaching.	3.18	Moderately Effective
My mentor applies this approach to supervise new teachers, and those seek help for improvement	3.07	Moderately Effective
Pooled Mean	**3.13**	**Moderately Effective**
Directive-Informational		
My mentor is more open to my suggestions for improving my teaching.	3.13	Moderately Effective
My mentor provides guidance and technical assistance when I am assigned to unfamiliar roles.	3.17	Moderately Effective

My mentor needs to give more adequate supervision on the tasks I am already familiar with.	3.24	Moderately Effective
I am given more freedom to choose appropriate teaching strategies in my classes.	3.38	Highly Effective
My mentor provides little directive guidance in classroom instruction and pedagogy, with which I need to be familiar	ize my self 3.01	Moderately Effective
Pooled Mean	**3.19**	**Moderately Effective**
Collaborative		
My mentor listens and accepts my suggestions for improvement.	3.05	Moderately Effective
My mentor accepts my disagreements while we are discussing things.	2.98	Moderately Effective
My mentor shares my responsibility for decision-making to select the best teaching practices.	3.04	Moderately Effective
My mentor and I work as a team to overcome issues in classroom teaching	3.01	Moderately Effective
My mentor uses this approach to teachers who suggest solutions to improve their classroom teaching.	3.73	Highly Effective
Pooled Mean	**3.16**	**Moderately Effective**
Non-Directive		
My mentor allows me to find the best practice to solve the problem in my classroom teaching.	3.21	Moderately Effective
My mentor lets me explore and generate a variety of alternatives and choose the most appropriate plan for my classes.	3.20	Moderately Effective

My mentor encourages me to be creative and innovative in my classroom teaching.	3.13	Moderately Effective
My mentor supports my suggestions to improve classroom teaching.	3.05	Moderately Effective
My mentor uses this approach to teachers who can solve problems independently	2.96	Moderately Effective
Pooled Mean	**3.11**	**Moderately Effective**
Overall Mean	**3.15**	**Moderately Effective**

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Highly Effective
2.50 – 3.24 Moderately Effective
1.75 – 2.49 Less Effective
1.00 – 1.74 Not Effective

Directive Supervision. The directive supervision approach obtained a pooled mean of 3.13, described as 'moderately effective.' This confirmed the findings of Hoque et al. (2020) and Ibrahim (2018) that directive supervision is most effective when teachers have little expertise, involvement, or interest in instructional problems. It is also effective in supervising new teachers.

Directive-Informational Supervision. Directive-informational supervision obtained the highest pooled mean of 3.19, described as 'moderately effective.' This confirms the study of Ozyildirim and Aksu (2016) that if a teacher who was at a low developmental level and aware of the problem he or she experienced but did not know how it could be solved, teachers and supervisors preferred directive-informational supervision as the practical approach in this kind of situation.

Collaborative Supervision. The respondents rated the collaborative supervision approach with a pooled mean of 3.16, described as 'moderately effective.' The success of multi-disciplinary strategies is being discussed in the study of Turan et al. (2012), who found that the school administrators might have chosen a cooperative rather than a directive approach in this study owing to their desire to protect a positive climate in the school. Furthermore, Hoque et al. (2020)

found that the collaborative approach was practical for teachers who can suggest solutions to problems. Teachers' involvement in decision-making was essential for adequate supervision. (Pierce & Rowell, 2006).

Non-Directive Supervision. The respondents rated the non-directive supervision approach with a pooled mean of 3.11, described as 'moderately effective.' This supports the study of Thobega and Miller (2007), which indicated that supervisors most frequently used the non-directive style as the most effective approach compared to directive, directive-informational, and collaborative supervision. In addition, Hoque et al. (2020) found that the non-directive approach was practical for teachers who could solve problems independently.

Teaching Performance

The respondents' Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) rating through the Individual Performance Commitment Record Form (IPCRF) is conducted yearly to determine a teacher's performance. Data are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Teaching Performance

RATING	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
4.50 – 5.00 (Outstanding)	50	59.50
3.50 – 4.49 (Very Satisfactory)	34	40.50
		Mean = 4.51
		SD = 0.138

Results show that the mean teaching performance of the respondents was 4.51, described as 'outstanding' with a standard deviation of 0.138, which means that the teaching performance of the respondents is very close to the mean and not widely spread. Most respondents (59.50%) had a performance rating of 4.50 – 5.00, described as 'outstanding,' while 40.50 percent had a rating of 3.50 – 4.49, described as 'very satisfactory.' This result indicated that most of the respondents in the District of Llanera performed their duties and responsibilities excellently. The results of the study contradicted the findings of Cinense (2019), Parocha (2020), and Dayap (2020), wherein the majority of the respondents obtained a rating of 'very satisfactory' in their performance rating. According to Lagrisora (2019), in the world of teaching, several factors significantly affect teaching performance, and

one factor she found out was the kind of management that a school head implements to guide the Teacher toward the attainment of their goals.

Correlation between Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents and Teaching Performance

Table 5 shows the correlation between the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents and their teaching performance.

Table 5. Relationship between Socio-Demographic Characteristics and Teaching Performance

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS	TEACHING PERFORMANCE
	R
Age	-0.079
Sex	-0.037
Civil Status	-0.007
Teaching Position	0.265*
Years in Service	0.289**
Highest Educational Attainment	0.017

**significant at 0.01 level (2 – tailed)
*significant at 0.05 level (2 – 2-tailed)

Results show that the respondents' years in service (r = 0.289) were highly correlated to their teaching performance. This implies that the longer the respondents' years in service, the better their teaching performance. The experience they acquired in teaching made them perform well, which affected their performance rating.

This is similar to the findings of Dayap (2020) and San Juan (2019), who found that years in teaching were correlated to performance rating.

Likewise, teaching position (r = 0.265) was significantly correlated to their teaching performance. This means that the higher the position of a teacher, the better their performance. This contradicts the study of Corpuz (2021), which revealed that teaching position and teaching performance were not correlated.

Relationship between Extent of Implementation of Differentiated Supervision and Teaching Performance

Findings revealed the significant relationship between the extent

to which differentiated supervision is implemented and teaching performance in collaborative and non-directive categories.

Table 6. Relationship between the Extent of Implementation of the Differentiated Supervision and Teaching Performance

PARAMETERS	TEACHING PERFORMANCE *R*
Directive	0.184
Directive-Informational	0.182
Collaborative	0.213*
Non-Directive	0.244*

*significant at 0.05 level (2 – tailed)

Only the collaborative (r = 0.213) and non-directive (r = 0.244) approaches were significantly related to teaching performance. This implies that teachers' overall teaching performance improves when mentors and mentees employ collaborative and non-directive approaches more frequently.

The results of this study concur with the findings of Appiah and Donkoh (2018) and Strieker et al. (2016), which show that the implementation of collaborative and non-directive supervision approaches plays a significant role in improving teachers' teaching performance. Moreover, based on several studies, Williams et al. (2017) hypothesized that a collaborative approach could enhance teachers' performance toward collaboration, reflection, inquiry, and student-centered learning.

Relationship between Effectiveness of Implementation of Differentiated Supervision and Teaching Performance

Table 7 shows that differentiated supervision regarding a directive approach (r = 0.260) significantly correlates to teaching performance. This implies that teachers' performance will be enhanced when supervisors or mentors actively direct, coach, and set an example for them. Teachers' effectiveness is increased because supervised teachers are more likely to adhere to the supervisor's guidelines and because the supervisors give the teachers a lot of guidance and suggestions.

Table 7. Relationship between the Effectiveness of Implementation of the Differentiated Supervision and Teaching Performance

PARAMETERS	TEACHING PERFORMANCE *R*
Directive	0.260*
Directive-Informational	0.177
Collaborative	0.118
Non-Directive	0.189

*significant at 0.05 level (2 – tailed)

The study of Wiyono and Rasyad (2021) found that a relationship between directive supervision approaches and teaching performance supports this. It demonstrates that the supervisory approach that focuses on the similarity of roles between supervisees and supervisors is more effective at enhancing teaching performance. Additionally, according to Glickman et al. (2014), directive supervision can benefit any teacher required to take on a new job, adopt a new curriculum, or employ new technology. This strategy encourages teachers to become more independent and need less close monitoring in the future, improving their teaching performance.

Furthermore, Appiah and Donkoh's (2018) study revealed that directive supervision has a direct impact on improving teaching performance.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn: Majority of the respondents were middle-aged, females, married, Teacher III, with Master's degree units with an average of 6 years in service. There is a high extent of implementation of differentiated supervision among schools in the program's four approaches: directive, directive-informational, collaborative, and non-directive. The four approaches of differentiated supervision, namely directive, directive-informational, cooperative, and non-directive, are perceived to be moderately effective by the teachers. Most teachers have incurred an outstanding performance rating based on their IPCRF rating during the School Year 2021 – 2022. Teachers' positions and years in service were significantly related to their teaching performance. The extent of implementation of collaborative and non-directive differentiated supervision among schools was significantly related to the teaching performance. The effectiveness of the directive approach of differentiated supervision was also significantly related to teaching performance.

Based on the conclusions given, the following recommendations were drawn: The school administration must motivate the teachers to pursue and finish their graduate studies and establish a support system in order for them to be encouraged to acquire their master's or doctorate degrees. Implementing differentiated supervision among schools, particularly the program's directive-informational, collaborative, and non-directive approaches, must be widely conducted in the different schools in the division. Regular interventions or training must be conducted at the school and division levels to properly implement the four approaches of differentiated supervision: directive, directive-informational, collaborative, and non-directive. School administrators should provide technical assistance to teachers in carrying out their school-related tasks and accomplishing their portfolio to maintain and improve their annual teaching performance rating based on their IPCRF. Schools must have an effective retention policy so that newly hired and tenured teachers stay in the organization. Also, through effective differentiated supervision programs, teachers can improve their teaching skills and performance in school. Collaborative and non-directive supervision approaches must be applied to the supervision program to achieve adequate supervision, especially for experienced teachers.

Similarly, directive and directive-informational supervision

techniques should be emphasized, especially in assisting newly hired or struggling teachers so their respective mentors can guide and direct them. Teachers and mentors should work collaboratively in the implementation of differentiated supervision. Proper coordination and agreement on the task and monitoring and evaluation of teachers' performance should be established. Lastly, similar or different studies can be done to evaluate the teachers' differentiated supervisory and working conditions. It is suggested that this study be conducted with public school heads and master teachers who serve as mentors to assess their perceptions regarding differentiated supervision further.

REFERENCES

Appiah, A., & Donkoh, K. (2018). Teacher Job Performance: The Role of Head Teachers' Supervisory Styles in Public Basic Schools in Mankessim Circuit. Research Journal of Education, 218.

Baffour-Awuah, P. (2011). Supervision of instruction in public primary schools in Ghana: Teachers' and head teachers' perspectives. Murdock University.

Cinense, S. (2019). Instructional Leadership Behavior of School Heads and Teachers' Efficacy in the Division of Science City of Munoz, Nueva Ecija. San Jose City: Master's Thesis, Core Gateway College, Inc.

Coimbra, M.N., Pereira, A.V., Martins, A.M., & Baptista, C.M. (2020). Pedagogical Supervision and Change: Dynamics of Collaboration and Teacher Development. International Journal of Management Science and Business Administration. DOI: 10.18775/ijmsba.1849-5664-5419.2014.64.1005

Corpuz, S. S. (2021). School Climate and Leadership Behavior Relationship to Teaching Performance. San Jose City, Nueva Ecija: Master's Thesis, Core Gateway College, Inc.

Dawursk, G. (2011). Media's influence on youth. http://www.yuthguy.com/Literature%20 Review.htm

Dayap, C. L. (2020). Impact of Self-Efficacy to the Performance Rating of Junior High School Mathematics Teachers in the Division of San Jose City. San Jose City: Master's Thesis, Core Gateway College, Inc.

De Grauwe, A. (2016). Educational planning for the 2030 agenda. International Institute for Educational Planning Letter, 32(2): 1-3.

Department of Education. (2018). Instructional Supervision: Standards, Procedures, and Tools. https://www.scribd.com/doc/293130496/instructional-supervisionhandbook

-pdf

D. O. No. 32. (2009). National Adoption and Implementation of NCBTS-TSNA and IPPD for Teachers and Integration of its System Operations in the Overall Program forContinuing Teacher Capacity Building. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2009/04/07

Esia-Donkoh, K. & Baffoe, S. (2018). Instructional Supervisory Practices of Headteachers and Teacher Motivation in Public Basic Schools in Anomabo Education Circuit. Journal of Education and e-Learning Research, 5(1): 43-50.

Glanz, K., Sallis, J. F., Saelens, B. E., & Frank, L. D. (2007). Nutrition environment measure survey in stores (NEMS-S): Development and evaluation. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 32(4), 282–289.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2014). The essential guide to supervision and instructional leadership. (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Glickman, C., Gordon, S., & Ross-Gordon, J. (2010). SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach. (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Helpline PH. (2022). From Teacher III to Master Teacher I, will promotion still apply to the improved program, Career Progression? https://helplineph.com/opinion/ teacher-iii-to-master-teacher-i/

Hoque, K., Kenayathulla, H., Subramanian, M., & Islam, R. (2020). Relationships Between Supervision and Teachers' Performance and Attitude in Secondary Schools in Malaysia. SAGE Publication.

Ibrahim, A. (2018). Directive, collaborative, or non-directive? Thesis supervision approaches in the United Arab Emirates. Issues in Educational Research, 28(3). http://www.iier.org.au/iier28/ibrahim.pdf

Kholid, I., & Rohmatika, R. V. (2019). Integrated clinical supervision

model: Efforts to increase Teacher's performance of Madrasah Aliyah. Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1155, 012091.

Kotirde, I.Y. & Yunos, J.M. (2014). The supervisor's role in improving the quality of teaching and learning in the Nigerian secondary school education system. International Journal of Education and Research, 2(8): 53-60.

Lagrisora, V. (2019). Implication of Action Research and Individual Performance Commitment Review Form (IPCRF) on the Performance Rating of Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the Division of Laguna. Ascendens Asia Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Abstracts. https://ojs.aaresearchindex.
com/index.php/AAJMRA/article/view/8060

McLoughlin, C. & Visser, T. (2003). Global perspectives on quality in online higher education. World Conference on Educational Multimedia, Hypermedia and Telecommunications, 1: pp. 253–256.

Oyewole, B.K. & Ehinola, G.B. (2014). Relevance of instructional supervision in the achievement of effective learning in Nigerian secondary schools. Global Journal of Commerce and Management Perspective, 3(3): 88–92.

Ozyildirim, G., & Aksu, M. (2016). An Investigation on Developmental Supervision Model: Supervisors' and Administrators' Opinions and Teachers' Expectations. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 18.

Parocha, E. (2020). Teachers Induction Program Relationship to Attitude and Performance of Teachers in the Division of San Jose City, Nueva Ecija. San Jose City: Master's Thesis, Core Gateway College, Inc.

Pierce, R. A., & Rowell, J. S. (2006). The ten keys to adequate supervision. A developmental approach. Rising Sun Consultants, pp. 1–4.

Rettig, P., Lampe, S., & Garcia, P. (2000). Supervising Your Faculty with a Differentiated Model. The Department Chair, 11(2).

San Juan, H. G. (2019). Working Conditions and Teaching Performance Among Grade 4 Teachers in the Division of San Jose City. San Jose City, Nueva Ecija: Master's Thesis, Core Gateway College, Inc.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2007). Supervision: A redefinition. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Strieker T., Adams M., Cone N., Hubbard D., & Lim W. (2016). Supervision matters: Collegial, developmental and reflective approaches to supervision of teacher candidates. Cogent Education, 3(1), 1251075. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2016.1251075.

Sullivan, S. & Glanz, J. (2009). Supervision that improves teaching: Strategies and techniques. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Corwin Press.

Thobega, M., & Miller, G. (2007). Supervisory behaviors of cooperating agricultural education teachers. Journal of Agricultural Education, 48(1): 64-74.

Turan, S., Yildirim, M., & Aydogdu, E. (2012). Supervisory and Evaluationary Styles of School Administrators in Turkish State and Primary Schools. Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi.

Willegems, V., Consuegra, E., Struyven, K., & Engels, N. (2017). Teachers and pre-service teachers as partners in collaborative teacher research: A systematic literature review. Teaching and Teacher Education, 64, 230–245. Crossref.

Wiyono, B. B., & Rasyad, A. (2021). The Effect of Collaborative Supervision Approaches and Collegial Supervision Techniques on Teacher Intensity Using Performance-Based Learning. SAGE Open, 11(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211013779