
MASTER TEACHERS' INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION APPROACHES AND EFFECTIVENESS: THEIR INFLUENCE TO TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE

***Jocelyn E. Remonte and Geoffrey P. Basilio**

Guimaras State University.

Article Received: 17 July 2026

***Corresponding Author: Jocelyn E. Remonte**

Article Revised: 06 August 2026

Guimaras State University.

Published on: 26 August 2026

DOI: <https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijrpa.2083>

ABSTRACT

This study determined the master teachers' instructional supervision approaches and effectiveness and their influence on teachers' performance in public secondary schools in the Schools Division of Antique, Philippines, for School Year 2025–2026. The research was conducted from March to April 2026 and involved 326 randomly selected teachers. It employed a descriptive-correlational research design. The independent variables included age, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, school size, and school location, while the dependent variables were master teachers' instructional supervision approaches, effectiveness, and teachers' performance. A researcher-made questionnaire based from the study of Podador (2023) and Baldera (2025) was used to gather data on instructional supervision approaches and effectiveness. Teachers' performance data were obtained from Classroom Observation Tool (COT) ratings for the first and second quarters of School Year 2025–2026. Descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, and mean were used, while t-test, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and Linear Regression Analysis were applied as inferential tools. All statistical tests were set at .05 level of significance using SPSS software. Findings revealed that the mostly employed instructional supervision approaches were classroom observation without disrupting instruction, conducting post-observation conferences to discuss strengths and areas for improvement, and encouraging teachers to try new teaching strategies. The level of master teachers' effectiveness was "Very High," while teachers' performance was "Outstanding." Significant differences in instructional supervision approaches and effectiveness were observed when respondents were grouped according to age, but no significant differences were found when classified by highest educational

attainment, length of teaching experience, school size, and school location. Likewise, teachers' performance showed no significant differences across all grouping variables. Furthermore, master teachers' instructional supervision approaches and effectiveness had no significant influence on teachers' performance.

KEYWORDS: Master Teachers' Instructional Supervision Approaches, Effectiveness, Teachers' Performance.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the role of instructional supervision has gained renewed prominence in educational research as schools strive to improve teacher quality and learner outcomes. Instructional supervision involves structured observation, feedback, mentoring, and coaching designed to help teachers refine their pedagogical practices (Daigon & Alcopra, 2024). Empirical evidence suggests that when done effectively, supervision can enhance teachers' self-efficacy and instructional competence. In many educational contexts, school heads traditionally assume the supervisory role; however, growing interest has shifted toward more peer-led or master teacher-led supervision as a complementary model (Quilala & Tantiado, 2025).

Master teachers play a unique dual role: they are experienced practitioners who also serve as mentors, coaches, or instructional leaders for their colleagues. A recent study by Reyes and Oropa (2025) examined the manifestation of master teachers' supervision across key result areas (KRAs) and found high ratings, particularly in domains related to professional engagement and professional development. This suggests that master teachers are deeply committed to building professional capacity among their peers (Reyes & Oropa, 2025).

The effectiveness of master teachers' supervision is critical because it could directly influence teacher performance, which in turn affects learner learning. For instance, a recent correlational study reported a statistically significant, though modest, association between master teachers' supervisory approaches and their peers' performance (Concepcion & Labitad, 2024).

In the Schools Division of Antique, educational leaders continue to emphasize the importance of instructional supervision as a means of improving teaching quality and learner achievement. Recent studies conducted within the division have shown that instructional leadership, supervisory practices, and instructional competence are important factors associated with teacher effectiveness and learner performance. Kalon (2026) reported that

instructional supervisory practices significantly influence teachers' teaching strategies and learners' academic performance in the Schools Division of Antique. Likewise, Ysulat (2026) found that supervisory skills are positively related to teachers' instructional competence and learners' performance. Agting (2026) further revealed that instructional leadership contributes to the enhancement of teachers' pedagogical competence and learner outcomes. Despite these findings, limited studies have specifically examined the instructional supervision approaches of master teachers and their influence on teachers' performance in the Schools Division of Antique, thereby creating a gap in the existing body of knowledge.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to determine the master teachers' instructional supervision approaches and effectiveness and their influence to teachers' performance in public secondary schools in the Schools Division of Antique, Philippines for school year 2025-2026.

Specifically, this study sought answers to the following questions:

1. What are the master teachers' instructional supervision approaches as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole and when classified according to age, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, school size and school location?
2. What is the level of master teachers' effectiveness as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole and when classified according to age, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, school size and school location?
3. What is the teachers' performance when taken as a whole and when classified according to age, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, school size and school location?
4. Are there significant differences in the master teachers' instructional supervision approaches as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, school size and school location?
5. Are there significant differences in the level of master teachers' effectiveness as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, school size and school location?
6. Are there significant differences in the teachers' performance when classified according to age, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, school size and school location?
7. Do master teachers' instructional supervision approaches and effectiveness significantly influence teachers' performance?

METHODOLOGY

The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to determine master teachers' instructional supervision approaches and effectiveness and their influence on teachers' performance in public secondary schools in the Schools Division of Antique, Philippines, for School Year 2025–2026. The respondents were 326 randomly selected public secondary school teachers from three clusters. Stratified proportionate random sampling was used, with the clusters serving as strata and a fishbowl technique used to select respondents from participating schools. Data were gathered through a four-part questionnaire. Part I obtained respondents' age, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, school size, and school location. Part II contained 15 items on master teachers' instructional supervision approaches based on Podador (2023) and rated on a three-point scale. Part III contained 15 items on master teachers' effectiveness based on Baldera (2025) and rated on a five-point scale. Part IV obtained teachers' Classroom Observation Tool ratings for the first and second quarters of School Year 2025–2026 as the measure of performance. Five experts evaluated the instrument for content validity. Pilot testing among 30 teachers outside the final sample yielded Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .931 for instructional supervision approaches and .952 for effectiveness, indicating high reliability. After permission was obtained from the Schools Division Superintendent and the concerned school authorities, the questionnaires were personally distributed and retrieved. The data were tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted using SPSS. Frequency and percentage described the respondents' profile; mean determined instructional supervision approaches, effectiveness, and teachers' performance; t-test examined differences for variables with two categories; analysis of variance examined differences according to highest educational attainment and school size; and linear regression analysis tested the influence of instructional supervision approaches and effectiveness on teachers' performance. All inferential tests used a .05 level of significance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter presents the findings of the study. It presents the descriptive and inferential data including their respective analyses and interpretations.

Master Teachers' Instructional Supervision Approaches as Assessed by the Respondents When Taken as a Whole

The master teachers' instructional supervision approaches as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole were determined by computing the mean scores.

The mostly employed master teachers' instructional supervision approaches as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole are the following: Observes teaching in class, without disrupting the lesson flow ($M=2.86$), Holds post-observation meetings to discuss strengths and areas for improvement after observations ($M=2.83$) and Helps them feel more confident in trying new teaching strategies ($M=2.83$).

This result means that all master teachers employed the structured methods, strategies, or techniques to observe, guide, and support teachers in improving their instructional practices. This is indicated by observing teaching in class, without disrupting the lesson flow, holding post-observation meetings to discuss strengths and areas for improvement after observations and helping teachers feel more confident in trying new teaching strategies.

This is consistent with the findings of Dagsa and Alegre (2024) and Podador (2023) that master teachers use mentoring, coaching, and action research to both support others and build their own capacities, making supervision a two-way process of growth.

Table 1 below presents the data.

Table 1. Master Teachers' Instructional Supervision Approaches as Assessed by the Respondents When Taken as a Whole.

Instructional Supervision Approaches	Mean	Description
Conducts pre-observation conferences before attending their class.	2.70	Mostly Employed
Observes teaching in class, without disrupting the lesson flow.	2.86	Mostly Employed
Holds post-observation meetings to discuss strengths and areas for improvement after observations.	2.83	Mostly Employed
Uses a collaborative approach, inviting them to co-teach or co-plan lessons with them.	2.65	Mostly Employed
Mentors them by setting long-term professional goals and supporting them over time.	2.72	Mostly Employed
Uses reflective supervision, guiding them to reflect on their instructional decisions.	2.76	Mostly Employed
Gives directive feedback when necessary, specifying exactly what to change in their teaching.	2.79	Mostly Employed
Encourages them to conduct action research in their class and supports them through the process.	2.50	Mostly Employed
Involves them in peer-coaching cycles (observation, feedback, and goal-setting).	2.68	Mostly Employed

Instructional Supervision Approaches	Mean	Description
Adapts his her supervisory style to their experience level (novice vs. Experienced).	2.68	Mostly Employed
Promotes the use of professional portfolios to document their growth.	2.73	Mostly Employed
Supports them in developing their technological competence (e.g., integrating digital tools).	2.74	Mostly Employed
Provides ongoing coaching mentoring sessions rather than only occasional check-ins.	2.70	Mostly Employed
Encourages them to set their own instructional development targets and reflects with them on him her.	2.80	Mostly Employed
Helps them feel more confident in trying new teaching strategies.	2.83	Mostly Employed
Overall Mean	2.73	Mostly Employed

Scale of Means: 2.34–3.00 Mostly Employed; 1.67 – 2.33 Employed; 1.00 – 1.66 Least Employed.

Level of Master Teachers' Effectiveness as Assessed by the Respondents When Taken as a Whole

The level of master teachers' effectiveness as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole was determined by computing the mean scores.

When taken as a whole, the level of master teachers' effectiveness as assessed by the respondents is "Very High" with obtained overall mean score of 4.64. A scrutiny of the means in the same table reveals that teachers obtained a highest mean score in the indicators "Fosters collaboration and shared learning among teachers" (M=4.69), "Provides constructive feedback that helps improve instructional practices" (M=4.68), and "Effectively balances teaching duties with leadership/mentorship responsibilities" (M=4.68) described as "Very High" while they obtained the lowest mean score in the indicators "Facilitates action research or classroom-based inquiry by the teachers" (M=4.39), "Models exemplary classroom management strategies" (M=4.60) and "Contributes to curriculum development and alignment with learning standards" (M=4.63) described also as "Very High."

This result means that all master teachers have successfully carried out their roles as instructional leaders, mentors, and supervisors, resulting in improved teaching practices and enhanced professional growth among the teachers they support. This is indicated by fostering

collaboration and sharing learning among teachers, providing constructive feedback that helps improve instructional practices, and effectively balancing teaching duties with leadership/mentorship responsibilities.

This finding support the study of Sunico and Dela Rosa (2025) who found master teachers rated themselves very high in their effectiveness in curriculum implementation.

Table 2 presents the data.

Table 2. Level of Master Teachers' Effectiveness as Assessed by the Respondents When Taken as a Whole.

Category	Mean	Description
Demonstrates strong subject-matter expertise and effectively supports other teachers' content knowledge.	4.66	Very High
Uses effective teaching strategies that other teachers can learn from.	4.66	Very High
Provides constructive feedback that helps improve instructional practices.	4.68	Very High
Mentors peers in goal-setting for professional growth.	4.65	Very High
Actively coaches teachers through observation, discussion, and follow-up.	4.67	Very High
Facilitates action research or classroom-based inquiry by the teachers.	4.39	Very High
Models exemplary classroom management strategies.	4.60	Very High
Contributes to curriculum development and alignment with learning standards.	4.63	Very High
Fosters collaboration and shared learning among teachers.	4.69	Very High
Helps less-experienced teachers gain confidence and improve performance.	4.67	Very High
Exhibits high leadership efficacy in instructional matters.	4.67	Very High
Supports peer reflection and professional dialogue (e.g., in professional learning communities).	4.64	Very High
Demonstrates strong competence in mentoring coaching evaluation and assessment practices.	4.66	Very High
Effectively balances teaching duties with leadership mentorship responsibilities.	4.68	Very High
Shares updated educational trends and policies.	4.67	Very High
Overall Mean	4.64	Very High

Scale of Means: 4.21–5.00 Very High; 3.41 – 4.20 High; 2.61 – 3.40 Moderate; 1.81-2.60 Low; 1.00 – 1.80 Very Low

Level of Master Teachers' Effectiveness as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Teaching Experience, School Size and School Location

The level of master teachers' effectiveness as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, highest educational attainment, length teaching experience, school size and school location was determined by computing the mean scores.

When classified according to age, both young (M= 4.70) and old (M=4.56) respondents assessed the level of master teachers' effectiveness as "Very High".

When classified according to highest educational attainment, respondents who are holder of bachelor's degree (M=4.66), master's degree (M=4.58) and doctorate degree (M=4.60) assessed the level of master teachers' effectiveness as "Very High".

When classified according to length of teaching experience, both respondents with short (M= 4.66) and long (M=4.61) length of teaching experience assessed the level of master teachers' effectiveness as "Very High".

When classified according to school size, respondents who came from small (M=4.58), medium (M=4.57) and large (M=4.65) schools assessed the level of master teachers' effectiveness as "Very High".

When classified according to school location, both respondents who came from upland (M= 4.67) and lowland (M=4.64) schools assessed the level of master teachers' effectiveness as "Very High".

This result means that regardless of age, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, school size and school location, respondents of this study believe that all master teachers have successfully carried out their roles as instructional leaders, mentors, and supervisors, resulting in improved teaching practices and enhanced professional growth among the teachers they support.

The study of Sunico and Dela Rosa (2025) aligns with the above findings who found that master teachers rated themselves very high in their effectiveness in curriculum implementation.

Table 3 presents the data.

Table 3. Level of Master Teachers' Effectiveness as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Teaching Experience, School Size and School Location.

Variables	Mean	Description
Age		
Young	4.70	Very High
Old	4.56	Very High
Highest Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	4.66	Very High
Master's Degree	4.58	Very High
Doctorate Degree	4.60	Very High
Length of Teaching Experience		
Short	4.66	Very High
Long	4.61	Very High
School Size		
Small	4.58	Very High
Medium	4.57	Very High
Large	4.65	Very High
School Location		
Upland	4.67	Very High
Lowland	4.64	Very High

Scale of Means: 4.21–5.00 Very High; 3.41 – 4.20 High; 2.61 – 3.40 Moderate; 1.81-2.60 Low; 1.00 – 1.80 Very Low

Teachers' Performance When Taken as a Whole and When Classified According to Age, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Teaching Experience, School Size and School Location

The teachers' performance when taken as a whole and when classified according to age, highest educational attainment, length teaching experience, school size and school location was determined by computing the mean scores.

When taken as a whole, the teachers' performance is "Outstanding" with an obtained overall mean score of 4.96.

When classified according to age, both young ($M=4.97$) and old ($M=4.95$) teachers have "Outstanding" performance.

When classified according to highest educational attainment, teachers who are holder of bachelor's degree ($M=4.96$), master's degree ($M=4.96$) and doctorate degree ($M=4.94$) have "Outstanding" performance.

When classified according to length of teaching experience, both teachers with short ($M=4.97$) and long ($M=4.95$) length of teaching experience have "Outstanding" performance.

When classified according to school size, teachers who came from small ($M=4.92$), medium ($M=4.96$) and large ($M=4.96$) schools have "Outstanding" performance.

When classified according to school location, both teachers who came from upland ($M=4.99$) and lowland ($M=4.96$) schools have "Outstanding" performance.

This result means that regardless of age, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, school size and school location, teachers in this study consistently demonstrated exemplary instructional practices that exceeded performance standards. They effectively engaged learners, utilized appropriate pedagogical strategies, and created a highly conducive learning environment.

The study of Concepcion and Labitad (2024) supports the above findings who revealed that teachers rated themselves as outstanding in performance.

Table 4 presents the data.

Table 4. Teachers' Performance When Taken as a Whole and When Classified According to Age, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Teaching Experience, School Size and School Location.

Variables	Mean	Description
As a Whole	4.96	Outstanding
Age		
Young	4.97	Outstanding
Old	4.95	Outstanding
Highest Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	4.96	Outstanding
Master's Degree	4.96	Outstanding
Doctorate Degree	4.94	Outstanding
Length of Teaching Experience		
Short	4.97	Outstanding
Long	4.95	Outstanding
School Size		
Small	4.92	Outstanding
Medium	4.96	Outstanding
Large	4.96	Outstanding
School Location		
Upland	4.99	Outstanding
Lowland	4.96	Outstanding

Scale of Means: 4.50–5.00 Outstanding; 3.50 – 4.49 Very Satisfactory; 2.50 – 3.49 Satisfactory; 1.50–2.49 Unsatisfactory; 1.00 – 1.49 Poor

Differences in the Master Teachers' Instructional Supervision Approaches as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Length of teaching experience and School Location

As reflected in Table 5, significant differences existed in the master teachers' instructional supervision approaches as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, $t = 2.506$, $p < .05$. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the master teachers' instructional supervision approaches as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age was rejected.

The above findings indicate that respondents differ in their assessment of master teachers' instructional supervision approaches when their age is considered. In the case of this study, young respondents ($M = 2.86$) have better assessment of master teachers' instructional supervision approaches as compared to old respondents ($M = 2.74$). This is because younger teachers are generally more receptive to guidance, mentoring, and professional support from experienced educators. Being relatively new in the profession, they may view instructional supervision as an opportunity for learning, skill enhancement, and career development. As a result, they tend to appreciate classroom observations, coaching sessions, feedback mechanisms, and technical assistance provided by master teachers.

This affirms the findings of Carreon and Cabual (2025) who reported that socio-demographic profiles, including age, can be associated with variations in instructional supervision practices.

On the other hand, no significant differences existed in the master teachers' instructional supervision approaches as assessed by the respondents when classified according to length of teaching experience, $t = 1.513$, $p > .05$ and school location, $t = .232$, $p > .05$. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the master teachers' instructional supervision approaches as assessed by the respondents when classified according to length of teaching experience and school location was not rejected.

The above findings indicate that respondents have similar assessment of the master teachers' instructional supervision approaches regardless of their length of teaching experience and school location.

This finding means that the instructional supervision approaches employed by master teachers are perceived consistently by teachers across different levels of professional experience and in various school settings. Whether the teachers are novice or veteran educators, and whether they are assigned in upland or lowland schools, they generally share similar views regarding the instructional supervision approaches applied by master teachers.

This consistency means that master teachers apply standardized supervisory approaches, provide equitable professional support, and maintain similar expectations for all teachers regardless of their background or work environment. Furthermore, the finding indicates that factors such as length of teaching experience and school location do not significantly differ how teachers perceive instructional supervision, indicating that the approaches used by master teachers are broadly accepted and recognized as relevant and beneficial across diverse educational contexts.

This is consistent with the findings of Bendanillo and Guanzon (2026) that when the respondents were grouped according to profile variables such as length of service, no significant differences were found in most areas of instructional supervision.

Table 5. Significant Differences in the Master Teachers' Instructional Supervision Approaches as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Length of Teaching Experience and School Location.

Variables	Mean	t-test value	p-value	Remarks
Age				
Young	2.77	2.506	.013	Significant
Old	2.67			
Length of Teaching Experience	Length of Teaching Experience	Length of Teaching Experience		
Short	2.76	1.513	.131	Not Significant
Long	2.69			
School Location	School Location	School Location		
Upland	2.74	.232	.816	Not Significant
Lowland	2.73			

$p < .05$, Significant

$p > .05$, Not Significant

Differences in the Master Teachers' Instructional Supervision Approaches as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Highest Educational Attainment and School Size

Table 6 shows that no significant differences existed in the master teachers' instructional supervision approaches as assessed by the respondents when classified according to highest educational attainment, $F = .589$, $p > .05$ and school size, $F = 1.155$, $p > .05$. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the master teachers' instructional supervision approaches as assessed by the respondents when classified according to highest educational attainment and school size was not rejected.

The above findings indicate that respondents have similar assessment of the master teachers' instructional supervision approaches regardless of their highest educational attainment and school size.

This finding indicates that teachers, whether they hold a bachelor's degree, master's degree, or higher academic qualifications, generally perceive the instructional supervision approaches of master teachers in the same manner. Likewise, teachers assigned to small, medium, or large schools share comparable views regarding the instructional supervision approaches employed by master teachers. This result further means that the instructional supervision approaches employed by master teachers are consistently experienced by teachers across different educational backgrounds and school contexts. It further indicates that advanced academic qualifications do not necessarily shape teachers' perceptions of instructional supervision, nor does the size of the school significantly affect how supervisory support is received and evaluated. Consequently, the finding indicates that master teachers are able to maintain a standardized and inclusive approach to instructional supervision that is perceived positively and similarly by teachers across diverse professional and organizational settings.

This aligns with the findings of Ruelan and Patiño (2025) who found that highest educational attainment was not a significant factor influencing supervision.

Table 6. Significant Differences in the Master Teachers' Instructional Supervision Approaches as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Highest Educational Attainment and School Size.

Variables	Sum of Squares	F-value	p-value
Highest Educational Attainment			
Between Groups	.151	.589	.556
Within Groups	41.285		
Total	41.436		
School Size			
Between Groups	.294	1.155	.316
Within Groups	41.142		
Total	41.436		

$p > .05$, Not Significant

Differences in the Level of Master Teachers' Effectiveness as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Length of teaching experience and School Location

As reflected in Table 7, significant differences existed in the level of master teachers' effectiveness as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, $t = 2.328$, $p < .05$. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the level of master teachers' effectiveness as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age was rejected.

The above findings indicate that respondents differ in their assessment of the level of master teachers' effectiveness when their age is considered. In the case of this study, young respondents ($M = 4.70$) have better assessment of master teachers' effectiveness as compared to old respondents ($M = 4.56$). This is because younger teachers are generally more dependent on the guidance, mentoring, and support provided by master teachers as they navigate the early stages of their careers. Because they are still developing their instructional competencies, classroom management skills, and professional confidence, they may perceive the assistance and expertise of master teachers as highly valuable, leading to more favorable evaluations of their effectiveness.

This corroborates the findings of Demecino and Hermosura (2026) who found significant differences in master teachers' supervisory effectiveness when respondents were classified according to age.

On the other hand, no significant differences existed in the level of master teachers' effectiveness as assessed by the respondents when classified according to length of teaching experience, $t = .784$, $p > .05$ and school location, $t = .259$, $p > .05$. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the level of master teachers' effectiveness as assessed by the respondents when classified according to length of teaching experience and school location was not rejected.

The above findings indicate that respondents have similar assessment of the level of master teachers' effectiveness regardless of their length of teaching experience and school location.

This finding means that teachers, whether they are beginning educators or highly experienced practitioners, generally perceive the effectiveness of master teachers in a comparable manner. Similarly, teachers assigned in different school locations, such as upland or lowland, share similar views regarding the ability of master teachers to provide instructional leadership, professional guidance, mentoring, and support. The result indicates that master teachers demonstrate a consistent level of effectiveness across diverse teaching contexts and are able to meet the professional needs of teachers regardless of their length of teaching experience and school size. Furthermore, the finding indicates that length of teaching experience and school location do not significantly shape teachers' perceptions of master teachers' effectiveness, reflecting the uniform implementation of their roles and responsibilities within the educational system.

This is consistent with the findings of Demecino and Hermosura (2026) who found that master teachers' effectiveness did not significantly differ when classified according to length of service.

Table 7. Significant Differences in the Level of Master Teachers' Effectiveness as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Length of Teaching Experience and School Location.

Variables	Mean	t-test value	p-value	Remarks
Age				
Young	4.70	2.328	.021	Significant
Old	4.56			

Variables	Mean	t-test value	p-value	Remarks
Length of Teaching Experience				
Short	4.66	.784	.433	Not Significant
Long	4.61			
School Location				
Upland	4.67	.259	.795	Not Significant
Lowland	4.64			

$p > .05$, Not Significant

Differences in the Level of Master Teachers' Effectiveness as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Highest Educational Attainment and School Size

Table 8 shows that no significant differences existed in the level of master teachers' effectiveness as assessed by the respondents when classified according to highest educational attainment, $F = .582$, $p > .05$ and school size, $F = .480$, $p > .05$. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the level of master teachers' effectiveness as assessed by the respondents when classified according to highest educational attainment and school size was not rejected.

The above findings indicate that respondents have similar assessment of the level of master teachers' effectiveness regardless of their highest educational attainment and school size.

This finding indicates that teachers, whether they possess a bachelor's degree, master's degree, or doctoral-level qualifications, generally perceive the effectiveness of master teachers in the same way. Likewise, teachers working in small, medium, or large schools share comparable views regarding the ability of master teachers to provide instructional leadership, mentoring, coaching, and professional support. The result means that highest educational attainment and school size do not significantly shape how teachers evaluate the effectiveness of master teachers. This consistency means that master teachers perform their duties and responsibilities in a manner that is equitable, relevant, and responsive to the needs of teachers across different academic backgrounds and school contexts.

This aligns with the findings of Bendanillo and Guanzon (2026) that when respondents were grouped according to highest educational attainment, no significant differences were observed in their effectiveness.

Likewise, it affirms the findings of Demecino and Hermosura (2026) who reported that master teachers' supervisory effectiveness did not significantly differ when classified according to educational attainment.

Table 8. Significant Differences in the Level of Master Teachers' Effectiveness as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Highest Educational Attainment and School Size.

Variables	Sum of Squares	F-value	p-value	Remarks
Highest Educational Attainment				
Between Groups	.379	.582	.559	Not Significant
Within Groups	105.295			
Total	105.675			
School Size				
Between Groups	.313	.480	.619	Not Significant
Within Groups	105.362			
Total	105.675			

$p > .05$, Not Significant

Differences in the Teachers' Performance as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Length of teaching experience and School Location

As reflected in Table 9, no significant differences existed in the teachers' performance when classified according to age, $t = 1.409$, $p > .05$; length of teaching experience, $t = 1.317$, $p > .05$ and school location, $t = 1.196$, $p > .05$. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the teachers' performance when classified according to age, length of teaching experience and school location was not rejected.

The above findings indicate that teachers have similar performance regardless of their age, length of teaching experience and school location.

This finding means that differences in age, whether teachers are young or old, do not significantly differ their ability to perform their professional duties and responsibilities effectively. Likewise, teachers with varying years of teaching experience demonstrate comparable performance, implying that both novice and veteran teachers are capable of meeting the expected standards of teaching. The finding also shows that school location does not create substantial differences in teachers' performance, as educators working in different

settings share similar levels of effectiveness in carrying out instructional tasks. Furthermore, the result indicates that teachers' performance is shaped more by professional commitment, instructional skills, and access to support systems than by demographic characteristics or workplace location, leading to a relatively uniform performance across diverse groups of teachers.

Top of Form

Bottom of Form

This corroborates the findings of Tuquib et al. (2026) who found that teachers' performance, as measured through official IPCRF ratings, showed no significant difference with demographic variables such as age and years of service.

Likewise, it affirms the findings of Lee (2025) who reported that teachers' performance did not significantly differ when grouped according to age, length of service, or educational attainment.

Table 9. Significant Differences in the Teachers' Performance When Classified According to Age, Length of Teaching Experience and School Location.

Variables	Mean	t-test value	p-value	Remarks
Age				
Young	4.97	1.409	.160	Not Significant
Old	4.95			
Length of Teaching Experience				
Short	4.97	1.317	.189	Not Significant
Long	4.95			
School Location				
Upland	4.99	1.196	.233	Not Significant
Lowland	4.96			

$p > .05$, Not Significant

Differences in the Teachers' Performance When Classified According to Highest Educational Attainment and School Size

Table 10 shows that no significant differences existed in the teachers' performance when classified according to highest educational attainment, $F = .062$, $p > .05$ and school size, $F = .479$, $p > .05$. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the teachers' performance when classified according to highest educational attainment and school size was not rejected.

The above findings indicate that teachers have similar performance regardless of their highest educational attainment and school size.

This finding indicates that teachers perform their professional duties and responsibilities at comparable levels whether they hold a bachelor's degree, master's degree, or higher academic qualifications. Likewise, teachers assigned to small, medium, or large schools demonstrate similar levels of effectiveness in carrying out instructional tasks and achieving performance standards. The result further indicates that differences in educational attainment and school size do not significantly shape teacher performance. This means that teachers, regardless of their academic credentials, are able to apply the necessary knowledge, skills, and competencies required for effective teaching. Similarly, the size of the school may not substantially affect teachers' ability to deliver quality instruction, manage classrooms, and fulfill their professional responsibilities. The finding further indicates that factors such as commitment to teaching, professional competence, continuous professional development, and adherence to educational standards may play a more important role in shaping teacher performance than educational attainment or school size.

This aligns with the findings of Oplas (2024) found that teachers' performance showed no significant differences when grouped according to socio-demographic characteristics such as educational attainment.

Moreover, the study of Estorninos (2024) finds support the above findings who reported that significant differences were not consistently observed across profile variables, including educational attainment in most performance domains.

Table 10. Significant Differences in the Teachers' Performance When Classified According to Highest Educational Attainment and School Size.

Variables	Sum of Squares	F-value	p-value	Remarks
Highest Educational Attainment				
Between Groups	.002	.062	.940	Not Significant
Within Groups	5.921			
Total	5.924			
School Size				
Between Groups	.018	.479	.620	Not Significant
Within Groups	5.906			
Total	5.924			

$p > .05$, Not Significant

Influence of Master Teachers' Instructional Supervision Approaches and Effectiveness on Teachers' Performance

The Linear Regression Analysis ($\alpha = .05$) was utilized to determine the influence of master teachers' instructional supervision approaches and effectiveness on teachers' performance.

As shown in Table 11, master teachers' instructional supervision approaches have no significant influence on teachers' performance with obtained R value of .111 and R^2 value of .012. This explains that only 11.10% of the variances in teachers' performance is attributed by master teachers' instructional supervision approaches ($F = 4.041$, $p < .05$) while 88.90% attributed by factors other than master teachers' instructional supervision approaches.

This result indicates that master teachers' instructional supervision approaches have no significant influence on teachers' performance.

This finding means that instructional supervision approaches employed by master teachers do not substantially influence the teachers' performance in teaching. This indicates that variations in instructional supervision approaches are not associated with corresponding changes in teachers' performance ratings. One possible interpretation is that teachers are able to maintain satisfactory performance regardless of the type or extent of supervision they receive, as they may already possess the necessary knowledge, skills, experience, and professional commitment to effectively carry out their responsibilities. Additionally, teachers' performance may be influenced more strongly by other factors such as personal motivation, professional competence, teaching experience, access to resources, school

leadership, organizational support, and opportunities for professional development. The finding also indicates that while instructional supervision remains important for providing guidance, mentoring, and instructional improvement, its direct impact on measurable teacher performance may be limited. Consequently, improving teacher performance may require a more comprehensive approach that considers multiple factors beyond instructional supervision approaches alone.

This corroborates the findings of Reyes and Oropa (2025) who revealed that instructional supervision, while highly practiced, did not show a significant relationship with teachers' performance or learners' outcomes.

Likewise, master teachers' effectiveness has no significant influence on teachers' performance with obtained R value of .079 and R² value of .006. This explains that 7.9% of the variances in teachers' performance is attributed by master teachers' effectiveness ($F = 2.010$, $p > .05$) while only 92.10% is attributed by factors other than master teachers' effectiveness.

This result indicates that master teachers' effectiveness has no significant influence on teachers' performance.

This finding means that effectiveness of master teachers does not directly translate into measurable differences in teachers' performance. This indicates that regardless of how effective master teachers are viewed in terms of instructional leadership, mentoring, coaching, and professional support, teachers tend to perform at relatively similar levels. One possible explanation is that teachers' performance is influenced by a variety of factors beyond the effectiveness of master teachers, including individual competence, professional experience, motivation, commitment to teaching, availability of instructional resources, school culture, and administrative support. It may also mean that teachers have already developed the necessary skills and expertise to carry out their duties effectively, making their performance less dependent on the assistance provided by master teachers. Furthermore, the finding suggests that while master teachers play an important role in fostering professional growth, enhancing instructional practices, and providing guidance, their effectiveness alone may not be sufficient to significantly affect performance outcomes. Therefore, improving teacher performance may require a multifaceted approach that addresses both individual and organizational factors, rather than relying solely on the effectiveness of master teachers.

This corroborates the findings of Demecino and Hermosura (2026) who found no significant relationship between master teachers' effectiveness and teachers' performance.

Table 11 presents the data.

Table 11. Summary of the Linear Regression Analysis on the Influence of Master Teachers' Instructional Supervision Approaches and Effectiveness on Teachers' Performance.

Predictor	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	p	SE B	Beta	t	p (coefficient)
Instructional Supervision Approaches	.111	.012	.009	4.041	.045	.042	.021	2.010	.045
Effectiveness	.079	.006	.003	2.010	.157	.019	.079	1.418	.157

CONCLUSIONS

- 1.All master teachers in the Schools Division of Antique have employed the structured methods, strategies, or techniques to observe, guide, and support teachers in improving their instructional practices.
- 2.All master teachers in the Schools Division of Antique have successfully carry out their roles as instructional leaders, mentors, and supervisors, resulting in improved teaching practices and enhanced professional growth among the teachers they support.
- 3.Teachers in the Schools Division of Antique consistently demonstrated exemplary instructional practices that exceeded performance standards through effectively engaging learners, utilizing appropriate pedagogical strategies, and creating a highly conducive learning environment.
- 4.Teachers in this study differ in their assessment of master teachers' instructional supervision approaches when their age is considered while they have similar assessment regardless of their highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, school size and school location.
- 5.Teachers in this study differ in their assessment of master teachers' effectiveness when their age is considered while they have similar assessment regardless of their highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, school size and school location.
6. Teachers in this study have similar performance regardless of their age, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, school size and school location.
- 7.Performance of teachers is not significantly influenced by master teachers' instructional supervision approaches and effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Higher officials of the Department of Education may provide comprehensive and sustained professional development programs that are aligned with current educational reforms and

classroom realities to further strengthen the instructional supervision approaches and effectiveness of master teachers. These programs may focus on enhancing competencies in instructional coaching, mentoring, classroom observation, feedback delivery, curriculum implementation, and data-informed decision-making ensure that their supervision remains relevant, responsive, and impactful.

2.School heads may provide consistent support, guidance, and a conducive working environment to master teachers to enable them to perform their supervisory functions efficiently. They may do this by fostering a culture of collaboration and professional learning within the school, where master teachers are actively involved in planning, mentoring, and instructional decision-making processes. Regular coordination meetings and instructional planning sessions may be conducted to help align supervisory activities with school goals and ensure that master teachers are well-informed about teachers' needs and performance gaps. School heads may also provide constructive feedback and coaching to master teachers, helping them refine their instructional supervision approaches and improve their ability to support classroom instruction effectively.

3. School heads may provide continuous instructional leadership, supportive supervision, and a positive school climate that encourages professional growth and performance among teachers. They may conduct regular classroom observations followed by constructive feedback and coaching sessions to help teachers refine their instructional practices and maintain high standards of teaching. They may also establish a culture of open communication and trust to allow teachers to express challenges and receive timely support, which contributes to consistent performance. School heads may further support teachers by ensuring that instructional goals are clearly communicated and aligned with school improvement plans, thereby guiding teachers in maintaining focus on learning outcomes and performance expectations.

4.Master teachers may continuously engage in professional development activities that strengthen their competencies in coaching, mentoring, and instructional leadership. They may participate in trainings, seminars, and learning action cells focused on contemporary pedagogical strategies, classroom observation techniques, and data-driven instruction can help them remain updated with current educational trends and best practices. They may also refine their instructional supervision approaches by adopting more reflective and collaborative practices, such as engaging teachers in professional dialogues, conducting post-observation conferences that emphasize constructive feedback, and encouraging self-assessment and peer collaboration among teachers.

5. Master teachers may continuously engage in professional growth and reflective practice to ensure that their instructional supervision remains relevant and responsive to the evolving needs of teachers and learners to sustain their present level of effectiveness.

6. Teachers may continuously engage in professional development and lifelong learning to strengthen their instructional knowledge, pedagogical skills, and classroom management strategies to sustain their present performance. They may participate in trainings, seminars, workshops, and learning action cells to stay updated with current teaching methodologies, curriculum changes, and innovative assessment practices.

7. Future researchers may use the findings of this study as a baseline reference for further investigations on instructional supervision, master teachers' effectiveness, and teacher performance in different educational contexts. They may replicate the study in other divisions, regions, or school settings to determine whether similar results will be obtained, thereby enhancing the generalizability of the findings. Future studies may be conducted to explore additional variables not covered in the present research, such as leadership style, organizational climate, teacher motivation, workload, or availability of instructional resources, to gain a more comprehensive understanding of factors influencing teacher performance.

REFERENCES

1. Agting, L. M. (2026). School heads' instructional leadership skills, teachers' pedagogical competence, and learners' academic performance. *International Journal on Science and Technology*, 17(1).
2. Alog, J. D., & Oco, R. M. (2025). Teachers' Professional Development and Teaching Performance: Basis for an Intervention Plan. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*.
3. Antonsen, Y. (2024). Research approaches in master-based teacher education: Finnish and Norwegian perspectives on inquiry and practice. *Frontiers in Education*.
4. Aquino, M. U., & Bautista, R. G. (2023). Impact of Lesson Study practice on the teaching practices of teachers in a schools-district of Quirino, Philippines. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 11(11), 746–751.
5. Bagulaya, A.E. (2024). Instructional supervision skills of school heads and master teachers. *IJAMS-BBP*.

6. Baldera, P. R. (2025). Instructional leadership in practice: A qualitative exploration of public elementary master teachers' identity formation and influence in the Philippines. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 18, Article e2025482.
7. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
8. Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2022). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.
9. Belbestre, S. M. M., & Chieng, M. L. P. (2024). Looking into the instructional leadership of master teachers during the in-person classes: A phenomenology. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, IJMR*.
10. Bendanillo, M. M., & Guanzon, R. S. (2026). Master teachers' instructional supervision skills and teachers' performance. *Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields*, 2(4), 177–194.
11. Bjørndal, C., et al. (2024). Challenges of the supervision process in the teacher ... *Teaching and Teacher Education*.
12. Calansingin, J. E., Azucena, V. B., & Legaspi, M. J. B. (2022). Work Engagement and Teaching Performance of Public-school Physics Teachers in the New Normal. *Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports*, 16(11), 97–108.
13. Canuto, P. P., Choycawen, M., & Pagdawan, R. (2024). The influence of teaching competencies on teachers' performance and students' academic achievement in primary science education. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 82(1), 29–47.
14. Carreon, K. M. C., & Cabual, R. A. (2025). Instructional supervision of educational leaders: Basis for leadership enhancement plan. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 11(5).
15. Concepcion, R. D., & Labitad, G. F. (2024). Master teachers' instructional supervisory skills and teachers' performance: Basis for school supervisory plan. ICCEPH.
16. Dagsa, B., & Alegre, E. (2024). Assessing the instructional supervisory strategies among master teachers for enhancing research productivity towards supervision skills development framework in the Department of Education. *East Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(5), 1943–1954.
17. Daigon, M. E., & Alcopra, A. R. (2024). Instructional supervision practices and efficacy of teachers. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 7(8).

18. Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(2), 97–140.
19. de Hoyos, R., Lavy, V., & Zárate, P. (2024). The impact of combining performance-management tools with training: implications for teacher performance in low-principal capacity contexts. *Educational Research Review*. Advance online publication.
20. Demecino, M. D., & Hermosura, W. O. (2026). Master teachers' instructional supervisory skills and teachers' performance. *GEO Academic Journal*, 7(1).
21. Elamparo, M. R., & Rafanan, L. E. (2023). Perspectives of Public Secondary School Teachers on the Effectiveness of Performance Review, Training, and Development in a District. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research*, 7(6), 135–154.
22. Espinosa, M. P., Reomero, J. I., Deguito, P., Lugatiman, R., & Bantilan, J. (2023). Performance Appraisal of Teachers in Public Secondary Schools: A Systematic Review. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation*.
23. Estorninos, A. (2024). Assessing performance and competencies of public secondary school teachers. *Asia Pacific Journal of Advanced Education and Technology*.
24. Fayó, C. L., & Hilario, C. R. (2023). Effectiveness of Classroom Observation on Teachers' Performance. *Industry and Academic Research Review*, 4(1), 472–478.
25. Gamuza, R. A., Lachica, R. L., & Bautista, M. (2025). Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Performance. *Zenodo*.
26. Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R. H., & Krajewski, R. J. (2021). *Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
27. Hermida Diaz, M. (2025). Nurturing excellence: An inquiry into the dynamics of mentoring, coaching and supervision of master teachers in educational setting. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)*, 7(1), 1–14.
28. Honculada, S. F. (2024). Teachers' perceptions on the instructional supervisory practices of master teachers and instructional leaders (Unpublished manuscript). Tanguib City Division.
29. International Journal of Science and Management Studies (IJSMS). (2024). Research methodology. *IJSMS*, 7(3).
30. IvyPanda. (2025). Data presentation: Descriptive and correlational designs. Retrieved from <https://ivypanda.com/essays/data-presentation-descriptive-and-correlational-designs/>

31. Kalon, S. A. (2026). School heads' instructional supervisory practices, teachers' teaching strategies, and learners' academic performance. *International Journal on Science and Technology*, 17(1).
32. Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2015). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (8th ed.). Routledge.
33. Lee, R. (2025). Professionalism, commitment, and teaching performance: Basis for teaching development plan. *Philippine EJournals*.
34. Lumidao, E. B. (2025). Master Teacher's mentoring capacity and supervisory skills on the mentees' instructional and teaching-related skills. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications*, 7(12), 40–52.
35. Margarse, R. T. (2021). Master teachers' mentorship quality and instructional effectiveness as related to their supervisory and administrative competence: Inputs to the development of a professional learning community program. *West Visayas State University Repository*.
36. Matias, S. V. (2023). The instructional supervisory competencies of master teachers in the Division of Rizal: Inputs for an enhanced professional development program. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 14(4).
37. Moon, O. (2023). Teachers' Readiness and Teaching Performance in Inclusive Education: Their Relationship to the Implementation of Inclusive Education Program. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 6(1).
38. Niculescu, A. I., Ehnen, J., Yi, C., Jiawei, D., Chiat Pin, T., Tianyi Zhou, J., Subbaraju, V., Kah Kuan, T., Huy Dat, T., Komar, J., & Chee, G. S. (2025). On the development of an AI performance and behavioural measures for teaching and classroom management.
39. Oliva, A. E., & Bautista, S. C. (2025). Master teachers' instructional leadership, teachers' pedagogical skills, and students' learning engagement. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, 6(2), 1396–1405.
40. Open Text KU. (2024). Non-experimental descriptive designs. In *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education: A Practical Guide*. University of Kansas.
41. Oplas, S. B. (2024). Socio-demographic characteristics and behavioral competence of public elementary school teachers in relation to school performance. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(8), 3213–3227.
42. Oxford University Press. (2023). *Quantitative descriptive and correlational research*. In *Music Education Research: An Introduction*.

43. Palacio, H. G. (2024). Development of Handbook on Instructional Coaching and Mentoring. *International Social Science Educational Research*.
44. Podador, F. L. (2023). Instructional supervision and leadership skills of master teachers in the Division of Manila: Input for an enhancement training program. *GEO Academic Journal*, 4(1).
45. Quilala, R. L., & Tantiado, R. C. (2025). Instructional supervision and teachers' efficacy. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 8(3).
46. Quisquino, J. M. F. (2022). Master teachers as instructional leaders in public elementary schools in the Division of Rizal. *IJRASET – International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology*.
47. Reyes, M. III B., & Oropa, J. C. (2025). Instructional supervision of master teachers: Its critical role in advancing teachers' and learners' performance. *American Journal of Education and Technology*, 4(2), 17–33.
48. Ruelan, J. M. B., & Patiño, E. M. S. (2025). Instructional supervision and teachers' professional practices in Pio V. Corpus District, Masbate Province Division. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation in Social Science*.
49. San Roque, J. O., & Valle, A. M. (2025). School Heads' instructional supervision: Its impact to teachers' self-efficacy. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 8(4).
50. Sejuela, B., & Roa-Bagtas, L. (2025). Performance of Teachers Utilizing Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS): Basis for Faculty Enhancement Plan. *Journal of Tertiary Education and Learning*, 3(2), 73–80.
51. Silva, R. D., & Bautista, M. (2025). Master teachers' instructional competence, leadership skills, and teachers' performance. *RISE Journals*.
52. Sunico, M. C., & Dela Rosa, R. M. (2025). Master teachers' mentoring practices, effectiveness of curriculum implementation and instructional leadership in the First District City Schools Division of Laguna. *Asian Research Journal of Education*, 2(2).
53. Susanto, R., Agustina, N., & Mujaži, M. (2025). Teacher performance evaluation: A holistic approach to improving the quality of education in elementary schools. *Mimbar Sekolah Dasar*, 12(2), 289–306.
54. Talavera-Mendoza, F., Cayani Caceres, K. S., Urdanivia Alarcon, D. A., Miranda, S. A. G., & Paucar, F. H. R. (2024). Teacher performance level to guide students in inquiry-based scientific learning. *Education Sciences*, 14(8), Article 805.

55. Toremocha, E. R., & Tan, M. R. S. (2024). Holistic school leadership and professional development initiatives towards teacher's performance in the workplace: A model. *International Journal of Innovation Scientific Research and Review*, 6(5), 6368–6379.
56. Tuquib, M. D., Damiles, R., Jayme, C., Fernandez, J. A., Gastador, J. A., Lleses, P., Nery, R. T., & Sareno, Z. G. (2026). Profiling teacher performance: Relationship between demographics and IPCRF ratings. *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research*, 10(2), 318–322.
57. Villar-Guevara, M., Livia-Segovia, J. H., García-Salirrosas, E. E., & Fernández-Mallma, I. (2024). Student Evaluation of Teachers' Effectiveness (SETE) scale: Translation, cross-cultural adaptation and psychometric properties in a Latin American sample. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1401718.
58. Yap, M. (2024). Master teachers' lived experiences on instructional supervision: A qualitative study. *Southeast Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*.
59. Ysulat, L. S. (2026). School heads' supervisory skill, teachers' instructional competence, and learners' performance. *International Journal on Science and Technology*, 17(1).