Teacher-In-Charge Supervision Practices as a Catalyst for Teacher Efficacy and Student Outcomes

Joann S. Defante., Maria Lady Sol A. Suazo, PhD

North Eastern Mindanao State University, Tandag City, Surigao del Sur, Philippines

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100600619

Received: 12 June 2026; Accepted: 17 June 2026; Published: 30 June 2026

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between academic supervision practices employed by Teachers-in-Charge (TICs) and teacher efficacy, and how this relationship influences student outcomes in public elementary schools. Employing an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design, the study surveyed 54 respondents (11 TICs and 43 teachers) from 11 elementary schools in Cantilan District, Surigao del Sur, during SY 2025-2026. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics, while qualitative data from semi-structured interviews underwent thematic analysis. Findings revealed that while TICs possessed greater experience and seniority, they lacked formal supervisory training compared to teachers, implying that tenure alone does not substitute for structured preparation in instructional leadership. Collaborative supervisory practices were rated highly practiced, whereas directive practices received lower ratings, suggesting that teachers respond more positively to participative supervision. Teacher efficacy was strongest in learning environment management but weakest in curriculum and planning. Six major challenges were identified: workload burden, resource constraints, leadership gaps, professional development limitations, psychosocial pressures, and student-centered challenges. The study concludes that effective supervision serves as a catalyst for teacher efficacy when it integrates structured guidance, collaborative development, and transformational leadership. The proposed SCOPE Framework provides a comprehensive model aligning PPSSH and PPST standards to enhance teacher efficacy and student outcomes.

Keywords: academic supervision, teacher efficacy, teacher-in-charge, student outcomes, SCOPE Framework, mixed-methods research

INTRODUCTION

Public school supervision is critical to enhancing teacher effectiveness and, ultimately, student outcomes. Educators have long recognized academic supervision as a crucial factor in enhancing teaching effectiveness and professional development. However, the knowledge landscape exhibits a sharp void in contextually grounded understanding of the specific processes through which particular supervisory approaches impact teachers' perceptions of their competence and capability.

Oghuvbu (2023) and Israel and Baguio (2025) established the importance of developing positive supervisory climates for teachers to enhance their pedagogical competencies. However, these studies took supervision as a generic concept and did not engage in the specific mechanisms of how supervision works. Similarly, Sari, Widodo, and Supriyanto (2025) found that integrative supervision improved pedagogical competence but did not identify which aspects of the supervision process were more closely related to gains in teacher self-efficacy. Hence, this study was performed.

The study is anchored on Supervision Theory (Goldhammer, 1969; Cogan, 1973), conceptualizing supervision as a structured clinical cycle consisting of pre-observation conferences, classroom observations, analysis, and post-observation feedback. Drawing on Zepeda's (2025) adaptation to contemporary contexts incorporating virtual observation protocols and trauma-informed coaching strategies, this study also integrates Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory, explaining that supervisors serve as role models, create opportunities for mastery experiences, and provide verbal persuasion through specific, authentic feedback.

The study is premised on Department of Education issuances including DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2025 (Expanded Career Progression System), DepEd Order No. 010, s. 2024 (MATATAG Curriculum), DepEd Order No. 042, s. 2017 (PPST), and DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020 (PPSSH). These create a policy environment where competencies of school leaders directly impact teacher effectiveness and student outcomes.

This study aimed to investigate the intricate relationships between profiles of TICs and teachers, levels of supervision, teaching efficacy, and student outcomes. Specifically, it sought to determine demographic characteristics, levels of PPSSH implementation, supervisory practices employed, teacher efficacy levels, student outcome extents, relationships between variables, effective supervisory practices, challenges faced, and strategies to enhance supervisory capacity.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

An explanatory sequential mixed-methods design combining qualitative and quantitative research methods was employed to gain comprehensive understanding of complex educational issues (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2021). Qualitative data were gathered through interviews with TICs, while quantitative data were collected through surveys assessing teaching efficacy and student performance metrics.

Research Locale and Respondents

The study was conducted in Cantilan District, Surigao del Sur, comprising 11 elementary schools during SY 2025-2026. Respondents included 11 TICs (complete enumeration) and 43 teachers (purposive sampling) from schools including Agsam PS, Batoto PS, Cabitoonan PS, Sibayoto PS, Ayoke ES, Domoyog ES, Isla General IS, SNAMES, Tigabong ES, Lobo ES, and ANAS. Inclusion required current employment and minimum one-year tenure.

Research Instrument and Data Analysis

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with TICs, and structured Likert-scale surveys were administered to both groups. Quantitative data were analyzed using frequency counts, weighted means, Pearson's correlation, and independent t-tests. Qualitative data underwent thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006) framework. Ethical principles of beneficence and nonmaleficence were strictly observed.

RESULTS

Demographic and Professional Characteristics

Table 1 presents comparative profiles of teachers and TICs. TICs possessed notably more years in service (predominantly 16+ years) compared to teachers distributed across lower experience brackets. TICs held higher academic degrees (Master's units/degrees), while most teachers held only Bachelor's degrees. TICs occupied senior academic ranks (Master Teacher I/II), whereas teachers concentrated in entry-level Teacher I-II positions. Performance ratings were uniformly Very Satisfactory/Outstanding. Critically, TICs received minimal or no formal supervisory training, contrasting with teachers where majority reported some supervisory training. This inversion suggests TICs lack proportional formal preparation despite greater experience.

Table 1. Demographic Profile and Professional Characteristics

Indicator	Teachers (n=43)	Teacher-in-Charge (n=11)
Years of Experience	Mixed (1-15+ years)	Mostly 16+ years
Education	Mostly Bachelor's	Master's units/degree

Academic Rank	Teacher I-II	Master Teacher I/II
Training in Supervision	Minimal to Extensive	Minimal to None

Level of Implementation of PPSSH Roles

Table 2 shows TICs rated themselves highly across all five PPSSH domains (grand mean = 3.42, "Highly Implemented"). Teachers perceived implementation slightly lower (grand mean = 3.36). "Focusing on Teaching and Learning" received highest ratings from both groups, while "Building Connections" received lowest. This implies TICs excel in instructional leadership but need strengthening in community engagement and stakeholder relations.

Table 2. Level of Implementation of PPSSH Roles

Domain	TIC Mean	Teachers Mean	Interpretation
Leading Strategically	3.38	3.32	Highly Implemented
Managing School Operations	3.45	3.40	Highly Implemented
Focusing on Teaching & Learning	3.52	3.48	Highly Implemented
Developing Self & Others	3.40	3.34	Highly Implemented
Building Connections	3.35	3.28	Highly Implemented
Grand Mean	**3.42**	**3.36**	Highly Implemented

Level of Supervisory Practices

Table 3 indicates collaborative style was highest rated (grand mean = 3.58, "Highly Practiced"), while directive style was lowest (grand mean = 2.95, "Moderately Practiced"). A perceptual gap emerged: teachers rated directive as "Highly Practiced" (3.14) while TICs rated it "Moderately Practiced" (2.76), implying teachers perceive over-direction even when TICs believe they are balanced. This disconnect risks teacher frustration and reduced autonomy.

Table 3. Level of Supervisory Practices

Practice	TIC Mean	Teachers Mean	Grand Mean	Interpretation
Directive	2.76	3.14	2.95	Moderately Practiced
Collaborative	3.62	3.54	3.58	Highly Practiced
Nondirective	3.45	3.38	3.41	Highly Practiced

Teacher Efficacy Levels (PPST)

Table 4 reveals "Learning Environment" received highest rating (grand mean = 3.45, "Highly Efficient") from both groups, implying strong mutual recognition of safe, engaging classroom conditions. "Curriculum and Planning" was lowest (grand mean = 3.26), with teachers rating "Highly Efficient" (3.34) while TICs rated only "Efficient" (3.18). This perceptual gap implies TICs identify room for improvement in instructional design competencies.

Table 4. Level of Teacher Efficacy (PPST)

Domain	TIC Mean	Teachers Mean	Grand Mean	Interpretation
Content Knowledge & Pedagogy	3.35	3.40	3.37	Highly Efficient
Learning Environment	3.42	3.48	3.45	Highly Efficient
Curriculum & Planning	3.18	3.34	3.26	Efficient
Assessment & Reporting	3.38	3.36	3.37	Highly Efficient
Community Linkages	3.28	3.30	3.29	Highly Efficient
Personal Growth	3.40	3.38	3.39	Highly Efficient

Student Outcomes

Table 5 shows "Behavioral Indicators" highest (grand mean = 3.62, "Demonstrated"), implying clear behavioral expectations are consistently enforced. "Social Skills Development" lowest (grand mean = 3.21), with teachers rating considerably lower (3.14) than TICs (3.28). This perceptual gap implies teachers witness more peer interaction difficulties, necessitating calibrated observation frameworks.

Table 5. Extent of Student Outcomes

Indicator	TIC Mean	Teachers Mean	Grand Mean	Interpretation
Academic Performance	3.35	3.38	3.36	Demonstrated
Behavioral Indicators	3.58	3.66	3.62	Demonstrated
Social Skills Development	3.28	3.14	3.21	Demonstrated
Emotional Well-being	3.32	3.30	3.31	Demonstrated
Holistic Measures	3.30	3.26	3.28	Demonstrated

Relationships Between Variables

Hypothesis testing revealed no significant relationships between respondent profiles (years of service, education, rank, training) and PPSSH implementation levels ($p > .05$). For TICs, the highest correlations involved academic rank and years in service (r approaching .40-.50), though not statistically significant, suggesting practical tendencies. For teachers, training showed strongest positive relationships with leadership indicators ($r = .18$-$.29$). All null hypotheses (Ho1-Ho4) were accepted, implying supervision functions as an equitable mechanism unaffected by demographic differences.

Effective Supervisory Practices

Qualitative analysis identified six themes of effective practices: (1) Structured Guidance and Feedback (pre-observation planning, classroom observation with constructive feedback, post-conference reflection); (2) Collaborative Professional Development (peer mentoring, team-based planning, continuous dialogue); (3) Empowerment and Autonomy (nondirective supervision, innovation opportunities, recognition of strengths); (4) Transformational Leadership Support (inspirational leadership, modeling best practices); (5) Capacity Building and Resource Management (access to resources, PPST-aligned training, supportive operations); (6) Focus on Student-Centered Outcomes (aligning supervision with engagement, holistic monitoring). As one teacher

stated: *"When my supervisor sits with me before the observation to review lesson objectives, I feel less nervous. That clarity allows me to teach more naturally."*

Challenges in Implementing Supervisory Practices

Six major challenges emerged: (1) Workload and Administrative Burden—excessive paperwork consuming instructional time; *"I became a teacher to work with children, not to sit at a computer filling out spreadsheets"* (P16); (2) Resource Constraints—inadequate materials and technology; *"We're asked to innovate, but we don't even have enough resources"* (P17); (3) Leadership and Communication Gaps—inconsistent feedback and limited transparency; *"Feedback comes late, and I don't know if I'm improving"* (P3); (4) Professional Development Limitations—training not tailored to classroom realities with no follow-up; (5) Psychosocial and Cultural Pressures—fear of judgment during observations; *"I get nervous when someone observes me. It feels more like criticism than support"* (P19); (6) Student-Centered Challenges—diverse needs straining capacity; *"Managing different learning levels in one class is exhausting"* (P1).

DISCUSSION

The finding that TICs lacked formal supervisory training despite greater experience and seniority aligns with Eugenio (2025), who underscored that when supervisors lack necessary preparation, the system risks undermining its objectives. Daigon and Alcopra (2024) similarly highlighted that advanced academic preparation and supervisory training strongly correlate with effective teacher guidance.

The highest ratings for collaborative supervisory practices and lowest for directive practices corroborate Park and Ham (2016), who confirmed that principal-teacher disagreement on instructional leadership can negatively affect teacher collaboration. Hsieh, Chen, and Li (2024) support that collaborative leadership positively influences professional collaboration and collective innovativeness.

The perceptual gap in curriculum and planning where teachers rated themselves highly efficient while TICs rated only efficient aligns with Obuta et al. (2023), who found supervisory responsibilities can reduce engagement in instructional design, highlighting tension between managerial duties and pedagogical leadership. Guamos and Jalos (2023) argued supervisors need to model lifelong learning to sustain influence on teacher performance.

The absence of significant correlations between demographic factors and leadership practices aligns with Chen, Vorawattanachai, and Yang (2025), who reported years of teaching experience showed no significant relationship with leadership effectiveness, and Wahing (2025), who found neither years of service nor educational attainment significantly influenced leadership potential. This reinforces growing consensus that tenure and formal credentials alone do not reliably predict leadership capacity.

Qualitative findings on workload and administrative burden correspond with Pressley et al. (2025), who identified unsustainable workloads as primary driver of teacher attrition. Resource constraint findings align with Garcia and Hernandez (2021), who found lack of resources undermines confidence and makes teachers feel isolated. Psychosocial pressures support Santos and Reyes (2020), underscoring need for empathetic, non-judgmental supervisory approaches prioritizing teacher well-being.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

This study affirms that supervision in public schools is a transformative process directly shaping teacher efficacy and student outcomes. When supervisory practices balance directive clarity with collaborative and nondirective support, teachers feel empowered, valued, and motivated to refine instructional strategies. Collaborative leadership rooted in trust and professional dialogue is the most effective catalyst for teacher growth. Teacher efficacy mediates the supervision-outcome relationship, with efficacious teachers demonstrating persistence, adaptability, and positive influence on student achievement. Effective supervision is a catalyst for educational transformation when aligned with PPSSH and PPST standards.

Recommendations

For Teacher-in-Charge: Approach supervision as a dynamic process blending clarity with collaboration and support. Institutionalize pre-observation planning as non-negotiable, ensure focused evidence-based observations, and structure post-conference dialogues around collaborative action planning.

For Teachers: Actively engage in supervisory processes as professional development opportunities, embrace feedback, collaborate with supervisors, and reflect on practices to strengthen efficacy.

For Policymakers: Institutionalize training programs for TICs emphasizing transformational leadership, collaborative supervision, and continuous professional development aligned with PPSSH and PPST standards.

For Future Researchers: Explore qualitative dimensions of supervision including teacher narratives and student perspectives to enrich understanding beyond quantitative measures.

The SCOPE Framework

The proposed SCOPE Framework (Supervisory Capacity for Outcomes, Professional Growth, and Efficacy) integrates structured guidance, collaborative development, empowerment, transformational leadership, resource management, and student-centered supervision into a coherent model. This framework provides a comprehensive solution addressing workload burdens through streamlined processes, mitigating resource constraints through targeted support, bridging leadership gaps with transparent communication, and reducing psychosocial pressures through empathetic supervision.

REFERENCES

1. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77-101.
2. Chen, H., Vorawattanachai, P., & Yang, F. (2025). A study of trait leaders and leadership effectiveness. African Educational Research Journal, 13(2), 157-168.
3. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2021). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). Sage.
4. Daigon, M. E., & Alcopra, A. R. (2024). Instructional supervision practices and efficacy of teachers. IJMRA, 7(8), 103-113.
5. Eugenio, K. B. F. (2025). Instructional supervision on teaching practices, performance and learning outcomes. WJARR, 28(1), 227-244.
6. Garcia, M. D., & Hernandez, M. P. (2021). Empowered to lead: Leadership practices, teacher burnout, and work performance. Psychology and Education, 53(4), 392-409.
7. Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical supervision. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
8. Guamos, R. C., & Jalos, J. M. (2023). Instructional supervision and professional development. IJER, 11(6), 145-158.
9. Hsieh, C. C., Chen, Y. R., & Li, H. C. (2024). Impact of school leadership on teacher professional collaboration. JPCC, 9(1), 1-18.
10. Israel, L. O., & Baguio, J. B. (2025). Conversion supervision practices and supportive classroom management. AJCR, 10(3), 67-77.
11. Obuta, S. M., Salva, C. R., & Ferenal, E. S. (2023). School heads' instructional supervisory skills and teachers' performance. PGSJRT, 3(1), 1-16.
12. Oghuvbu, E. P. (2023). Academic supervision and teachers' pedagogical skills development. JEAP, 14(2), 45-59.
13. Park, J. H., & Ham, S. H. (2016). Whose perception of principal instructional leadership? APJE, 36(3), 450-469.
14. Pressley, T., Marshall, D. T., Walter, H. L., & Ganey, K. (2025). Why teachers leave. Teaching and Teacher Education, 157, 104887.

15. Santos, J. R., & Reyes, L. P. (2020). Empathetic leadership and supervisory approaches. IJER, 8(5), 101-115.
16. Sari, D. P., Widodo, W., & Supriyanto, S. (2025). The effect of integrative academic supervision. IJEMDS, 6(1), 112-128.
17. Wahing, L. B. (2025). Potential of educational leadership. IJAMS, 5(7).
18. Zepeda, S. J. (2025). Instructional supervision (5th ed.). Routledge.