

# GROW Model Instructional Supervision: The Lived Experiences of Instructional Leaders and Teachers on Their Performance and Professional Growth

Jade Mark C. Abapo., Hermit D. Belano., Quimby Q. Clavicillas., Mae Jean M. Matulac., Lariza T. Ebeo

Ph.D Student, Faculty, Northwestern Mindanao State College of Science and Technology, Labuyo, Tanguib City, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.10100462>

Received: 24 January 2026; Accepted: 29 January 2026; Published: 13 February 2026

## ABSTRACT

Instructional supervision has become more developmentally oriented, and coaching focuses on supporting teacher professional growth and instructional improvement. This qualitative study explored the lived experiences of instructional leaders and teachers in implementing the GROW Model (Goal, Reality, Options, Way Forward) as a framework for instructional supervision. Anchored in Moustakas' transcendental phenomenological approach, the study investigated how participants perceived and experienced GROW Model based supervision in relation to professional growth, reflective practice, instructional performance and implementation challenges. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with purposively selected instructional leaders and teachers from public schools of Division of Tanguib City implementing GROW-based supervision. Phenomenological data analysis involved epoche, horizontalization, thematic clustering, and the development of textural, structural, and composite descriptions. Findings revealed that the GROW Model was experienced as (a) a structured and systematic supervisory process, (b) a shift from evaluative to reflective and collaborative dialogue, (c) a catalyst for professional growth and teacher empowerment, (d) a mechanism for evidence-based instructional decision-making, and (e) a driver of instructional improvement with perceived positive learner engagement. Despite challenges related to time constraints, workload demands, and initial resistance, participants employed adaptive strategies such as flexible scheduling, trust-building, and integration of supervision into existing school structures. These strategies informed the development of transformative Action Plan aimed at sustaining reflective and context-responsive instructional supervision. The study concludes that the GROW Model offers a viable and meaningful framework for strengthening reflective supervision and continuous professional learning across diverse school contexts.

**Keywords:** instructional supervision, GROW Model, instructional leadership, teacher professional development, reflective practice.

## INTRODUCTION

Instructional supervision has become a highly accepted aspect of the modern education system, as it is seen as an important tool of improving teacher performance and professional development (Francisco & Macayan, 2025). Instructional leaders (principals, supervisors, and master teachers) play a central role in building the conditions of the appreciation and systemic implementation of continuous professional development (He, Guo, & Abazie, 2024). Instructional supervision is positively related to instructional improvement, teacher reflective practice, and the formation of professional learning communities, which, in turn, help to maintain the pedagogical improvement (Francisco & Macayan, 2025; Sanchez & Lugo, 2025). The studies show that systemic leadership practices are directly linked with the teacher development outcomes, which support the overall educational goals of institutional performance and the quality of learning of students (He et al., 2024; Vahidov, 2024).

In line with the world educational agenda, the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4) requires equitable, inclusive quality education and encouragement of lifelong learning opportunities to

everyone. A skilled educator advances human rights, justice, and peace in society by raising learners' consciousness, values, and knowledge (Akter, 2025). The enhancement of teacher preparation and continuous professional development is central to SDG 4, as it provides the basis of the realization of the relevant and effective learning outcomes (United Nation, 2025). Teacher empowering and professionally strengthening instructional supervision models that support teaching delivery therefore are direct contributors of this international need.

Although many recognize the significance of instructional supervision, the literature has gaps regarding how well-organized coaching models have a certain impact on instructional results and professional development based on the experiences lived by both instructional leaders and classroom educators. Even though the literature demonstrates the usefulness of such instructional leadership practices as the predictors of professional development (He et al., 2024), empirical research on models that can be used to design supervisory interactions around teacher-oriented professional growth remains scarce. In order to address these educational concern, coaching models such as the GROW framework provide organized procedures that successfully direct instructional supervision toward improved instructional outcomes and teacher growth.

A popular coaching model that offers strategies to boost the chances of success is the GROW model (Whitmore, 2009). More fundamentally, the GROW Model, which is an acronym of Goal, Reality, Options, and Way Forward, provides a methodical coaching process that may be utilized to establish objectives, ask questions, consider potential strategies, and organize focused actions (Main, 2023). One popular strategy for improving student performance in the classroom is coaching. With coaching and creative thinking, teachers can become more introspective, increase their job happiness and productivity, and further their careers (Othman & Yee, 2015). A person can perform at their peak when their potential is unlocked through coaching (Whitmore, 2010). According to Panchal and Riddell (2020), the GROW Model is a process that helps coachees transition from a desire to change to an action or acts that lead to a change in behavior and to simultaneously increase knowledge, skills, and growth while also improving her/his comprehension, proficiency, and knowledge (Lyons & Bandura, 2021) to teachers under supervision in order to increase instructional effectiveness.

This study is designed to fill this gap by qualitatively exploring lived experiences of the instructional leaders and teachers during work with the GROW Model in the environment of instructional supervision. It examines the role of this model in professional development, teacher performance, and teacher reflective practice. This research is aimed at contextualizing instructional supervision by foregrounding the narratives of the participants in the form of structured coaching theory which does not only describe administrative evaluation but also developmental facilitation.

In such a manner, the study will contribute to the practical and theoretical discourse encompassing the professional development of teachers and instructional leadership and enhance the educational desires of SDG 4 in the world specifically the objectives addressing equal opportunity of quality teaching and learning, and the empowered policies and practices of teacher training and development. Such emphasis goes in line with international demands of differentiated and responsive professional development mechanisms, which are collaborative and reflective (UN SDG 4, 2025).

## Research Questions

This study aimed to explore the lived experiences of instructional leaders and teachers in the implementation of the GROW Model in instructional supervision, particularly focusing on its influence on professional growth, reflective practice, and instructional performance. The study sought to understand how participants perceived, experienced, and interpreted the GROW Model as a tool for professional development and performance enhancement within the context of educational supervision. Guided by the qualitative phenomenological design, the following research questions were formulated:

1. How did instructional leaders and teachers experience the implementation of the GROW Model in instructional supervision?

2. How did participants describe the GROW Model's role in enhancing reflective practice and decision-making in teaching and supervision?
3. How did the GROW Model influence participants' professional growth and instructional performance, as perceived by both teachers and instructional leaders?
4. What challenges and barriers did participants encounter in applying the GROW Model within instructional supervision, and how did they address them?

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND STUDIES

### Historical Development of GROW Model in Education

Originally designed as a coaching model for use in a corporate setting, the GROW Model It has previously been used in the classroom to promote leadership practice and teacher development (Hancock, 2025). Consequently, the GROW Model's efficacy as a methodical approach to assisting educators in developing and enhance instructional leadership was demonstrated by the educational sector's historical trajectory. Goal, reality, option, and will (GROW) is the foundation of this coaching paradigm, which also incorporates action, monitoring, and reflection components based on integrated learning. The analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation (ADDIE) study is used in the creation of this coaching paradigm & development concept, which consists of three primary phases: design, development, and analysis (Sadewo et al., 2025). Additionally, the beneficial GROUP (Goal, Reality, Options, Understanding others, Perform) coaching approach incorporates the renowned GROW coaching framework utilizing double loop learning, Scharma's U process for group discussion, and other theoretically based methods (Brown & Grant, 2010). According to Rahman (2023), GROW coaching is an effective strategy of professional development that allows teachers to rapidly improve their skills. Academic qualifications give leaders a fundamental understanding of their emotional intelligence and practical skills are really refined by coaching (Tsarkos, 2024). Lastly, the GROW Model is a validated, flexible framework that connects theoretical underpinnings with real-world leadership development in education.

### Instructional Supervision as a Driver of Teacher Development

Because it directly affects teachers' performance, instructional supervision is essential to educational leadership (Castillo, 2025; Quilala & Tantiado, 2025). It has been recognized as one of the key methods for improving professional growth and teacher performance and reflective practices (Francisco and Macayan, 2025; Oluwakemi et al., 2023). In such a scenario, educational supervision serves a strategic purpose that goes beyond simple administrative control but also as expert advice to help educators recognize their strengths and shortcomings and make plans for continued development (Siagian et al., 2025).

School principals can better comprehend real-time data on teachers' circumstances through coaching-based supervision and skills, enabling focused follow-up initiatives created by the principal of the school (Mubinan, 2024). Instructional monitoring was found to have an impact on classroom performance, teacher efficacy, and the development of reflective professional identities greatly. Under active observation, educators were able to get a better understanding of the curriculum objectives and teaching strategies, and evaluation techniques, which eventually improved the quality of teaching (He, Guo, and Abazie, 2024; Francisco and Macayan, 2025).

A cooperative, trust-based approach to supervision was required. Regularity, continuity, and supervisory quality, along with a provision for sufficient finance and capacity building (Basilio & Bueno, 2022). Essentially, instructional monitoring becomes a crucial motivator It encourages long-term excellence in teaching and learning by converting oversight into significant growth.

### Coaching Models in Instructional Leadership.

Coaching has gained popularity as a method for developing leaders. and transformation in intricate settings. The relationship between the coach and the coachee, goal-setting and problem-solving, and the transformative

process are essential elements of coaching models, The methods via which the model produces results (Carey et al., 2011). The cooperative process of coaching is results-driven, methodical, and solution-focused, where the coach helps the coachee develop their skills. Instead of instructing or resolving issues, coaching methods increase their self-awareness of learning (Musta'in et al., 2020). Although the coach's position depended on a number of factors: the situation's dynamics, the coach's leadership style, and the environment in which the coach worked (Brown et al., 2017). In order to improve teachers' professional competence, supervisors might employ coaching approaches (Mubinan et al., 2024). The GROW coaching approach model's use of academic supervision enhanced teachers' capacity for competence (Musta'in, et al., 2020).

The coaching protocol's ability to help principals become more self-aware and critically reflect on their leadership, including how principals' fundamental beliefs about leadership and instruction influenced the results of their approaches to problem-solving (Houchens et al., 2017). School leaders are developed through the collaborative approach of educational leadership coaching, and teacher leaders into thoughtful, metacognitive professionals (Ray, 2018). According to Abdullah et al. (2020), there was a correlation between instructional leadership and instructional coaching, both of which made a substantial contribution to teacher development. In the end, coaching becomes a dynamic force that fosters reflective leadership and long-term teacher development in changing educational environments.

### **Reflective Practice as a Professional Development Mechanism**

It was a well-established notion that reflective practice is a critical element of teacher development, enabling educators to break down their teaching choices, modify interventions, and introduce ongoing change into the classroom practice (Reflective Practice Guides, 2025; Francisco and Macayan, 2025). Research showed that the GROW Model played a positive role in strengthening reflective supervision by offering a structured model where teachers evaluated existing realities, examined alternatives, and developed specific action plans to improve the situation (Albano and Qunito, 2025; Reflective Practice Guides, 2025). The study also showed that reflective supervision by teachers also resulted in greater metacognitive awareness, better lesson planning, and greater flexibility to varying learning needs (Francisco & Macayan, 2025; American Journal of Education and Evaluation Studies, 2025). Together with all these works, it was evident that guided reflection through coaching model had always played a role in professional learning and long-term instructional growth.

### **Teachers' Lived Experiences with Instructional Supervision**

In order to promote teacher development and raise educational standards, instructional supervision was essential (Cailing et al., 2025). Classroom observation, another name for instructional supervision, was frequently utilized for professional development, instructional coaching, and teacher evaluation (Serenas & Siat, 2025). A general definition of instructional supervision is an organized procedure in which supervisors (such as principals or senior teachers) to enhance education and student learning, give teachers direction, observation, and feedback (Serenas & Siat, 2025). Activities related to instructional supervision (IS) include, but are not restricted to, class visits, observations, and instructional leaders activities related to instructional supervision (IS) include, but are not restricted to, class visits, observations and/or enhancing the process of instruction and learning (RM# 1332s. 2024 October 22, 2024, Region VIII).

Everyone agrees that classroom observations are an essential tool for raising educational standards. Nonetheless, a lot of educators find it difficult to do the extra work required to meet observation criteria (Pantoja & Villocino, 2025). Teachers encounter several obstacles when it comes to instructional supervision: flexibility and adaptability, congruence with more general educational objectives, and vision realization through supervision. These difficulties highlight how dynamic learning settings are and how teachers must be adaptable and creative in their methods (Yap, 2024).

Principals observed classroom instruction, have conversations with instructors, and take part in the educational process, and engaging conversations with educators when analyzing student data. They take the initiative to assist educators in their teaching endeavors (Fedillaga & Despi, 2023). Honculada (2022) asserted that identifying instructors' requirements during supervision promotes their development. Professional development was a key component of effective instructional supervision empowering educators to present

lessons that have a greater effect and raise students' test scores. Furthermore, institutionalizing peer monitoring and mentoring, guaranteeing access to necessary resources, thus it is essential to incorporate emotional support into supervision procedures. In the end, redefining instructional supervision as a developmental process as opposed to a strictly evaluative one turns lived experiences into chances for significant progress, and improved methods of instruction (Penados & Doronio, 2025). Therefore, rethinking instructional supervision as a helpful developmental tool has the potential to significantly improve both educational excellence and teachers' career paths.

### **Instructional Leadership and Teacher Performance**

Instructional leadership had always been associated with the teacher professional development because the leaders who applied coaching and supportive supervision had a positive impact on teacher performance and the quality of instructions (He et al., 2024; Francisco and Macayan, 2025). Research found out that leaders involved in coaching discussions, observation, and constructive feedback encouraged reflective practice, instructional innovation, and teacher confidence (He et al., 2024; American Journal of Education and Evaluation Studies, 2025). Similar findings were also enhanced by empirical evidence that effective instructional leadership had a positive impact on classroom performance, professional fulfillment, and teacher growth over time specifically on supervision that was consistent with developmental and collaborative practices (He et al., 2024; Ubas, 2025). Therefore, instructional leadership was significant in the development of teacher behavior, professional identity and instructional effectiveness in general.

### **Digital Coaching and Supervision**

The studies showed that online platforms and technology helped facilitate coaching models, such as GROW Model, through feedback, reflection, and teamwork among educators and instructional leaders (Prakasvudhisarn et al., 2025; Albano and Quinito, 2025). Research indicated that supervision through technology enabled teachers to record progress, to exchange insights and solve problems, which were more flexible even in resource-intensive environments (Prakasvudhisarn et al., 2025; Structural-Learning, 2023). It was also indicated that digital integration led to a higher sense of professionalism among teachers, collaborative learning, and accountability thus making the process of instructional supervision more effective (Albano and Quinito, 2025; Prakasvudhisarn et al., 2025).

### **Challenges in Implementing GROW-Based Supervision**

Multiple studies also reported difficulties with GROW-based supervision implementation, such as a lack of instructional leader training, reflective coaching lack of time, and a unwillingness to change among teachers accustomed to more evaluative methods (He et al., 2024; Ubas, 2025). It was found that to overcome these issues, supervisors needed specialized professional development, systematic coaching guidelines, and an organizational culture, which focused on teacher development (Francisco, and Macayan, 2025; Prakasvudhisarn et al., 2025). Research also showed that, in cases when these issues were solved, the teachers demonstrated increased professional confidence, better teaching practices, and collaboration with leaders (He et al., 2024; Albano and Quinito, 2025).

### **Empirical Evidence on the Effectiveness of Coaching Supervision**

Research has consistently demonstrated that coaching-based supervision, particularly when utilizing the GROW Model, the field of coaching supervision is still in its early stages, even when compared to the field of coaching (Bachkirova et al., 2020). It has been shown that traditional methods of evaluative supervision are inadequate for promoting long-term teacher development. The coaching method changed the nature of supervision relationships from one of evaluation to one of development, fostering teacher's independent motivation and capacity for self-directed learning while also establishing psychological safety (Kustamaji & Herdiana Abdurrahman, 2026).

In order to improve their theoretical knowledge of coaching methods and their practical skills, coaches seek professional certifications. Building coaching confidence is essential to coaches' professional and personal

growth (Msimango-Galawe & Mashele, 2025). Without corresponding coursework on targeted practices, coaching alone was less successful (Cohen et al., 2023). The associations between performance feedback and supervisory coaching and turnover intention are mediated by work engagement (Lee et al., 2019). It is common for leaders to be required to use coaching concepts at work., These developmental programs do not always concentrate on certain coaching abilities, and many of them indicate a need for additional training (Peláez Zuberbuhler, 2020). The superiority of coaching supervision over conventional techniques was supported by empirical data, lowering turnover, mediating engagement, and improving confidence, but emphasizes its early phases and the requirement for specialized instruction outside of general leadership courses (Bachkirova et al., 2020; Kustamaji & Herdiana Abdurrahman, 2026; Lee et al., 2019).

The empirical data highlights the transformative power of coaching supervision in fostering long-term teacher motivation and professional development, especially when using models like GROW.

### **Synthesis and Implications for the Proposed Study**

The literature evaluation consistently emphasized the value of the GROW Model as a systematic coaching program that could increase instructional supervision, teacher self-reflection, and professional development (Albano and Quinito, 2025; Prakasvudhisarn et al., 2025). One important factor that develops is instructional supervision, improved by coaching methods that go from evaluative supervision to cooperative development addressing the real-world difficulties faced by educators, such as heavy workloads, while promoting efficacy, self-awareness, and performance through LAC sessions and principle leadership (Castillo, 2025; Mubinan, 2024; Juanite & Ardiente, 2025). These were enhanced by reflective practice, which encourages critical self-evaluation in the face of conceptual complexity, although e-coaching and technology-integrated models of digital coaching increase access, implementation faces challenges related to trust, resources and obstacles related to role-shifting (Maliha et al., 2024; Prakasvudhisarn et al., 2025; Mawarni & Ilyas, 2025). GROW-integrated supervision model, filling in the gaps in school head capability and digital adaptation and using teacher experiences to produce frameworks that are context-specific and improve instructional leadership, & ongoing career development. The results confirmed the need to look at the real-world experiences of educators and instructional leaders who use the GROW Model since the study's scope was restricted to the theoretical knowledge gap and the model's actual application in the process of improving teaching and professional development.

### **Theoretical Framework**

This study is grounded on the intersection between coaching theory, instructional leadership theory, and professional growth theories, and the GROW Model was placed as a guiding paradigm to comprehend the effects of the organized coaching in the context of instructional supervision on the development of teachers and leaders. More fundamentally, the GROW Model, which is an acronym of Goal, Reality, Options, and Way Forward, offers a structured coaching process that can be used to set the goals, inquire, explore possible approaches, and plan dedicated actions (Main, 2023). Based on coaching practice in organizations, the GROW Model has been applied more to the educational environment to facilitate reflective dialogue and the achievement of professional improvement (Albano and Quinito, 2025). In terms of academic application, this model is a practicalization of the theory of coaching that focuses on interactive and learner-directed relationships in which the coach assists people in expressing and striving to reach their growth goals in a conducive setting (Eleck, 2024).

For many years, coaching has been developing as a professional development tool for educators and school administrators and currently takes many different shapes. This implies that coaching is appropriate for assisting people with real-world difficulties and career interests, The challenges encountered in intricate learning environments (Lofthouse, 2018) Terms such as "mentoring" and "coaching" provide important tactics and theoretical frameworks, with guidelines for phase-specific development at every step and explore how these tactics may be applied to support educators as they continue to grow into self-assured classroom practitioners and potential leaders (Oberholzer & Boyle, 2023). Teachers, students, and other members of the educational community are directly using coaching (Campbell, 2015).

In the instructional context, the theory of instructional leadership emphasizes the role that school leaders play in affecting instructional practice and professional learning. According to research, instructional leadership has a positive predictive aspect of teacher professional development and growth based on instructional practices, which involve observation, feedback, and reflective assistance (He, Guo, and Abazie, 2024). When coaches are used as supervising structure models like GROW, instructional leaders can transform into developmental facilitators and instructors rather than the evaluative overseers in line with the concept of developmental supervision that emphasize teacher self-efficacy, autonomy, and continuous improvement (Prakasvudhisarn, Wiriyanon, and Kamtab, 2025). This connection places coaching not only as an appendaged strategy but as a mechanism that is part of the instructional leadership to create adaptive and reflective professional identities.

Furthermore, the concept of professional development theories appeals to the GROW Model in its focus on routinely reflected action. Educators and instructional leaders who are involved in systematic coaching discussions will always report increased ability to recognize their own professional aspirations, gauge the existent teaching realities, consider viable options, and build viable courses of action—all dimensions of growth that feature prominently in the personal and professional development literatures. Such observation is supported by empirical research that coaching models have the potential to remarkably enhance teacher performance outcomes and reflective practice in terms of systematic implementation in learning institutions (Albano & Quinito, 2025). In that way, the theoretical framework conceptualizes the construction of professional growth as a role played by coaching-mediated reflection and goal-based action, which is maintained by cyclical interactions between supervisors and supervisees.

In synthesizing these theoretical strands, the framework assumes that the GROW Model would be a mediating construct in the context of teaching in the field of instructional supervision, which would improve teacher and leader professional development. As coaches, instructional leaders draw teachers into systematic dialogue, the focus of which is goal clarity, reflective practice, solution generation, and planned implementation, which have been theorized to improve the level of instructional performance and encourage continuous professional learning. Such theoretical synthesis highlights the role of coaching theory and instructional leadership in the synergetic facilitation of reflective professional development, as to make the GROW Model more of a practical and explanatory framework of data of lived experiences of the process of supervision and its effects on educational performance and development.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Research Design

This study employed a qualitative research design using Moustakas' transcendental phenomenology to explore the lived experiences of instructional leaders and teachers engaged in GROW Model-based instructional supervision. Phenomenology was selected to capture the essence of participants' experiences as they perceived and lived the phenomenon, instead of theoretical constructs that are pre-conceived (Creswell & Poth, 2024; Moustakas, 2021). The focus on the subjective experiences of the participants allowed the study to discover the impact of the GROW Model on the professional growth and reflective practice as well as the instructional performance. This method enabled the researcher to elicit rich and detailed data on the dynamics of instructional supervision and meanings that teachers and leaders attached to it both personally and professionally.

### Research Locale

This study was conducted in selected public schools in the Division of Tangub City that had implemented GROW Model-based instructional supervision. The school was chosen purposely to have diversity regarding the context, such as urban, semi-urban, and rural lives, which offers a broad range of experiences. The chosen school had organized supervisory programs, which involved coaching, reflective, and professional development programs. The option of conducting the study in such a wide range of settings was a chance to investigate the impact of the contextual differences, school culture, and institutional support on the experiences of the participants with the GROW Model.

---

## Research Participants

Participants were selected through purposive sampling, targeting those people who had personal experience with GROW Model-based supervision and could explain its implications in detail (Palinkas et al., 2023; Creswell and Poth, 2024). The sample consisted both of instructional leaders, including Head Teacher and Master Teachers who actively supervised using GROW-based supervision and teachers who had been involved in at least one academic year of such supervision. A sample size of 10 was considered adequate to reach data saturation and obtain rich narratives, which is in line with the guidelines of phenomenological research (Moustakas, 2021; Palinkas et al., 2023). To contextualize the narratives of the participants, demographic data about their teaching experience, the focus area, and duration in which they were exposed to GROW-based supervision was also sought. In this study, instructional performance refers to teachers enacted classroom practices as described by participants, including instructional planning, teaching strategies, formative assessment use, and perceived student engagement. Data were drawn from reflective accounts grounded in classroom observations, instructional artifacts, and supervisory conversations rather than standardized test scores.

## Research Instrument

The primary research instrument used in this study was a researcher-developed semi-structured interview guide anchored on the GROW Model (Goal, Reality, Options, and Way Forward) and aligned with the phenomenological research design. The instruments contained open-ended questions that were to elicit the lived experiences of instructional leaders and teachers relating to the application of the GROW Model in instructional supervision with a specific emphasis on the areas of professional growth, reflective practice, instructional performance, and the challenges faced. The questions were also carefully arranged in the four stages of the GROW Model to provide theoretical alignment but also give the participants the freedom to give in-depth answers and personal meanings. Probing questions were also used in following it up to get clear responses and add to data. The interview guide was also expertly validated by educational leadership and qualitative research professionals to determine content validity, relevance and clarity.

## Data Collection Methods

Semi-structured, in-depth interviews were the central source of data collection to enable participants to narrate their experiences without being restricted by a predetermined questionnaire but still staying within the research objectives (Creswell and Poth, 2024; Moustakas, 2021). Interview questions were used to address how participants perceived GROW Model-based supervision, its influence on professional growth, reflective practice, instructional performance, and some of the challenges encountered when implementing the model. All the interviews took about 45 to 60 minutes and were audio-taped with permission to facilitate proper transcription. Document analysis was used to supplement interviews and investigated the supervision reports, coaching logs, reflective journals, and professional development documentation. These records were used to add contextual information and evidence to triangulate the interview data, making the findings even more profound and trustworthy (Creswell and Poth, 2024; Yin, 2023). The observation was recorded with optional collection of notes in the coaching sessions to observe the real-time interactions and supervisory practices.

## Data Analysis

Data analysis was based on the transcendental phenomenological method of Moustakas, which focuses on the discovery of themes that can embody the experiences of participants. The initial phase, epoche or bracketing, entailed the bracketing of researcher interests to only concentrate on narratives of the participants. The researcher then used horizontalization, where major statements and key phrases were pointed out which were pertinent to experiences involving the GROW Model. Such statements were put in pairs of meanings which were then synthesized into emergent themes. The second stage was textural descriptions where the participants described the experience they were having, whereas structural descriptions were explanations of how the participants experienced the phenomenon considering situational and contextual factors. Lastly, composite descriptions combined textural and structural information to describe the nature of the experiences of the



participants. Data was managed using manual coding to reveal patterns and make sure that the analysis is systematic (Creswell and Poth, 2024; Moustakas, 2021).

### Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to strict ethical standards to protect the rights of the participants and ensure research integrity. Participants received information about the purpose of the study and procedures involved in the research, risks that they might face and their right to withdraw without any penalties. Prior to interviews, informed consent was given and anonymity of participants (their identities and school affiliations) was ensured to protect confidentiality. To avoid the possibility of unauthorized access, audio recordings, transcripts, and documents were stored safely. The study made sure that data collection did not interfere with the professional work or subject the participants to any psychological or social harm (Creswell and Poth, 2024; Yin, 2023).

### Trustworthiness and Rigor

To ensure credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability, the study employed Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) trustworthiness criteria. The credibility was achieved by conducting member checking whereby results were discussed by the participants to authenticate interpretations. The transferability was facilitated by the fact that the contextual description of participants, setting, and supervision processes was comprehensive. The reliability was ensured using audit trails that recorded research processes, coding choices, and the steps taken to analyze the data. Interview, document, and observational note triangulation helped to confirm the findings as they were based on the lived experiences of the study participants and not on the researcher (Creswell and Poth, 2024; Moustakas, 2021).

### Data Presentation

Findings were presented in narrative form, highlighting themes that emerged from participants’ experiences. Direct quotes were also used to explain themes with direct quotes of participants to make their voices have an authentic representation. Themes were sorted by major points of the GROW Model Goal, Reality, Options, Way Forward, and other emerging ones, including reflective practice, professional growth, instruction performance, and implementation challenges.

### Limitations of the Study

While phenomenology offered profound knowledge about the experiences of life, the study had limitations. The findings had context-effect and could not be applicable to every learning environment. Moreover, self-reported experiences of the participants might have been affected by the recall bias or social desirability. Sampling limitations were also a potential problem due to the use of voluntary participants. Nevertheless, these limitations were overcome by the triangulation approach, member checking, and the strict phenomenological approaches that guaranteed content, plausible, and reliable data.

## RESULTS

### Epoche

Table 1: Epoche: Identification and Bracketing of Researcher Preunderstandings

Identified Preunderstanding	Researcher	Source of Preunderstanding	Bracketing Strategy Employed
Instructional supervision is commonly evaluative and compliance-driven		Prior professional experience in instructional leadership and supervision	Explicit acknowledgment through reflexive journaling prior to and during data analysis
The GROW Model is an effective		Familiarity with coaching models and application in professional	Conscious suspension of outcome expectations during coding and theme

coaching framework	practice	development
Coaching improves teacher motivation and instructional performance	Professional beliefs shaped by supervisory and mentoring roles	Reliance on verbatim participant accounts rather than inferred or assumed impact
Evidence-based reflection leads to better instructional decisions	Training and professional development background	Focus on participants' lived descriptions of practice, avoiding evaluative researcher judgments

Prior to the data analysis, the researchers had performed in epoché or phenomenological reduction, which involves conscious recognition and bracketing of previous experiences, beliefs, and assumptions in regards to instructional supervision and the GROW Model. These wrong assumptions were founded on the fact that the researchers were a professional in the field of instructional leadership, coaching, and supervising practice. To ensure that these views do not influence the interpretation of the narrations of participants, the researchers recorded them systematically using reflexive journaling before the data was coded and during the analysis process.

Epoché process was the intentional withholding of assumptions, which included the conceptualization of instructional supervision as focused more on evaluation, the unquestioned effectiveness of the GROW Model, and the assumed inevitability of the link between coaching and teacher motivation and subsequent improvement. The researchers were aware of returning to verbatim statements of the participants during coding and theme development, where meanings were created based on the description of the participants, but not on the expectations of the profession or theoretical obligations.

Phenomenological reduction was also sustained through constant reflection on possible biases and re-bracketing assumptions each time they appeared during analysis. This rigorous methodology made sure that the developed themes were based on the lived experiences of teachers and instructional leaders, rather than what the researchers thought. The sense of integrity of the phenomenological inquiry was maintained through the constant use of epoché which enabled the voices of the participants to be the focus in the meaning construction process.

### Horizontalization of Significant Statements

Table 2: Horizontalization of Significant Statements Related to Instructional Supervision Through the GROW Model

<i>Participant</i>	<i>Significant Statement (Horizons)</i>
HT1	“It helped make supervision more collaborative rather than evaluative.”
T4	“It finally made post-observation meetings feel useful... It shifted the dynamic from evaluation to partnership.”
MT3	“I became more reflective and fairer in providing feedback... anchored on data rather than assumptions.”
T4	“Critically evaluating my own teaching was challenging, but it helped me recognize areas for growth.”
MT3	“I learned to facilitate reflective conversations and empower teachers to generate their own solutions.”
T4	“It made me feel like a problem-solver, not just a recipient of feedback.”

MT3	“My feedback became clearer and more actionable.”
T4	“I walked out with a clear action to try the very next day.”
MT3	“Integrating GROW into LAC sessions helped manage time constraints.”

All the statements pertinent to the experiences of the participants under instructional supervision with the GROW Model were initially given equal importance through horizontalization. Every statement of importance was taken separately and then no reduction and clustering took place.

**Reduction and Clustering of Invariant Constituents into Themes**

Table 3: Reduction of Significant Statements into Invariant Constituents and Themes

Significant Statement	Invariant Constituent	Theme
“Supervision became collaborative rather than evaluative.”	Shift from judgment to collaboration	Structured and Systematic Supervision
“Post-observation meetings felt useful and reflective.”	Purposeful supervisory dialogue	Collaborative and Reflective Dialogue
“Reflection was anchored on data rather than assumptions.”	Evidence-based reflection	Evidence-Based Decision-Making
“I recognized areas for growth through self-evaluation.”	Heightened professional awareness	Professional Growth and Empowerment
“Teachers generated their own solutions.”	Teacher agency and ownership	Professional Growth and Empowerment
“Feedback became clearer and actionable.”	Action-oriented supervision	Instructional Improvement and Learner Impact
“I had a clear action to try the next day.”	Translation of reflection into practice	Instructional Improvement and Learner Impact
“Time constraints required integrating GROW into LAC sessions.”	Adaptive implementation strategies	Challenges and Adaptive Strategies

**Reduction and Elimination of Horizons**

Following initial horizontalization, all notable statements were considered with the Moustakas criteria: (1) Does the statement have a moment of the experience that is necessary and sufficient to understand the phenomenon and (2) Is the statement abstractable and labelable? Redundant, indistinct and irrelevant statements were removed. The overlapping horizons were combined, creating a group of constituents that are invariant and reflect the essence of the experience of the participants with the GROW Model.

Those horizons that were reduced provided uniform meanings among participants such as structured supervision, reflective dialogue, collaborative goal setting, evidence-based feedback, professional growth, instructional improvement, and resistance and time issues.

---

## Clustering Invariant Constituents into Themes

The themes into which the invariant constituents were grouped were as follows:

### 1. *Structured and Systematic Supervision*

The participants perceived the GROW Model as a structured, step-by-step supervision system that facilitated the establishment of goals to action planning.

### 2. *Collaborative and Reflective Dialogue*

Supervision was seen as open and non-evaluative, conversational and reflective, and contributing to openness and mutual understanding.

### 3. *Professional Growth and Empowerment*

The GROW Model improved confidence, reflective practice, leadership skills, and professional identity in teachers and instructional leaders.

### 4. *Evidence-Based Decision-Making*

The participants focused on the classroom observations, learner data, and teaching artifacts as the means of informing reflective discussions and decisions.

### 5. *Instructional Improvement and Learner Impact*

The model helped to enhance lesson planning, classroom management, teaching strategies and indirect student engagement and learning gains.

### 6. *Challenges and Adaptive Strategies*

Challenges included time constraints, workload and initial resistance, which were dealt with by building trust, flexibility in scheduling and incorporating into the existing school structures.

## Individual Textural and Structural Descriptions by Themes

Individual textural and structural descriptions were first developed for each participant based on their respective interview transcripts. These individual descriptions were then combined to make composite textual and structural descriptions that reflected universal meanings and nature of the phenomenon among the participants.

### Theme 1: Structured and Systematic Supervision

#### Individual Textural Description

Participants experienced instructional supervision through the GROW Model as structured and systematically arranged giving a clear and orderly framework under which the supervisory conversations were organized beginning with goal setting and culminating in reflection and action planning. Supervision was seen as a shift away at the usual evaluative practices to the collaborative one. Descriptions of post-observation conferences included the participants describing them as intentional and aimed conferences that enabled them to freely discuss the instructional outcomes and classroom realities.

*A Head Teacher described this experience as follows:*

*“It helped make supervision more collaborative rather than evaluative. It encouraged open dialogue and mutual understanding between supervisors and teachers.” (HT1)*

*Teachers similarly experienced a shift in supervisory dynamics:*

*“It finally made post-observation meetings feel useful... It shifted the dynamic from evaluation to partnership.” (T4)*

#### Individual Structural Description

This experience took place in the systematic stages of the GROW Model which brought clarity, predictability but flexibility to dialogue. The systematic process of supervision minimized the element of uncertainty and created psychological safety so that teachers could freely interact and reflect without the fear of being judged.

### **Theme 2: Collaborative and Reflective Dialogue**

#### Individual Textural Description

Participants experienced instructional supervision as collaborative and reflective especially in the Reality phase of GROW Model. The process of reflection was perceived to be systematic and based on data observable in classrooms, instead of assumptions. Through reflective conversation, participants reported being more aware of instructional practices and areas of development.

One Master Teacher shared:

*“I became more reflective and fairer in providing feedback... practicing professional judgment anchored on data rather than assumptions.” (MT3)*

Teachers reported similar experiences of self-awareness:

*“Critically evaluating my own teaching was challenging, but it helped me recognize areas for growth.” (T4)*

#### Individual Structural Description

This experience was based on evidence-based supervisory dialogues that used classroom observations, learner products, assessment data, and guided questioning. Separating coaching and evaluation coupled with trust and openness enhanced reflective conversation and enabled fruitful dialogue with instructional practice.

### **Theme 3: Professional Growth and Empowerment**

#### Individual Textural Description

Participants experienced professional growth and empowerment throughout the Options stage of the GROW Model. The teachers reported that they felt encouraged to come up with their own context-sensitive teaching plans instead of being prescribed solutions. This also helped to develop a feeling of agency, confidence, and professional learning ownership.

A Master Teacher explained:

*“I learned to facilitate reflective conversations and empower teachers to generate their own solutions.” (MT3)*

Teachers described this experience as increased ownership of improvement:

*“It made me feel like a problem-solver, not just a recipient of feedback.” (T4)*

#### Individual Structural Description

This has been experienced in the form of non-directive coaching which involves open ended questioning, brainstorming and joint option exploration. The agency and professional identity were promoted through affirmation of professional expertise and contextual knowledge of teachers.

## **Theme 4: Evidence-Based Decision-Making**

### Individual Textural Description

Participants experienced instructional supervision as grounded in evidence-based decision-making. Each supervisory session was supported by classroom observations, data of learner performance, and teaching artifacts, which enabled participants to make decisions and reflections based on actual evidence, as opposed to assumptions.

The participants described supervisory conversations as being aimed at interpreting instructional evidence to drive reflexive thinking and instruction planning.

### Individual Structural Description

This had been experienced in a systematic application of sources of data in the process of supervisory conferences. Informed decision-making and allusion to visible evidence were facilitated by guided questioning and enhanced the validity and justice of the supervisory process.

## **Theme 5: Instructional Improvement and Learner Impact**

### Individual Textural Description

Within this study, improvements in instructional performance were described through changes in teachers' classroom practices, reflective decision-making, and perceived learner engagement, as articulated by participants during supervisory and reflective dialogues.

Instructional supervision contributed by providing instructional improvement and indirect learner impact on the participants through the GROW Model. Reflective and action-oriented supervision led to teachers describing improvements in lesson planning, classroom management, and strategies to be used in teaching. Perceived improvement in student engagement and learning was also observed among the participants because instructional practices became more deliberate and responsive.

A Master Teacher noted:

“My feedback became clearer and more actionable... ensuring that professional development translated into improved classroom practices.” (MT3)

Teachers described immediate application in the classroom:

“I walked out with a clear action to try the very next day.” (T4)

### Individual Structural Description

This experience occurred during the Way Forward stage of the GROW Model where reflective knowledge was converted into action plans with explicit goals, schedules, and activities. Instead of imposing unrealistic objectives, constant monitoring, and positive follow-up allowed the results of the process to be established in the form of long-lasting instructional changes that impacted classroom practice and student interaction.

## **Theme 6: Challenges and Adaptive Strategies**

### Individual Textural Description

Participants encountered difficulties related to the application of instructional supervision based on the GROW Model; these issues included time limitations, work-related pressure, and initial resistance. Despite such difficulties, participants still stayed involved in supervision via adaptive practices and collaborative support.

One Master Teacher reflected:

---

*“Balancing teaching load and supervision made in-depth conferences difficult, but integrating GROW into LAC sessions helped.” (MT3)*

Teachers similarly emphasized adaptation:

*“Limited time for deep reflection was a challenge, but collaboration helped us adjust.” (T4)*

### Individual Structural Description

These experiences occurred through adaptive and relational leadership practices, flexible scheduling, trust-building, and incorporation of supervision into the current professional framework. Reactivity to the situational realities allowed the participants to maintain reflective supervision despite limitations. Despite on the challenges, this study suggest instructional leaders to formulate and implement a GROW-Based Transformative Action Plan, which strategically work around systemic, professional, and organizational obstacles by building coaching competence to enhance supervision and reflective practice, reforming facilitating conditions to ensure a steady implementation process through workload management and structural alignment, and nurturing a culture of collaboration to promote continuous professional development.

### Composite Textural Description

(What was experienced by all participants)

Collectively, the participants experienced instructional supervision under the GROW Model as transformative practice defined by collaboration, reflection, empowerment, and action. The supervision was no longer seen as a judgmental necessity, but a sound collaboration aimed at enhancing learning and teaching. Evidence-based reflection helped participants become more professionally aware, more involved in making instructional decisions, and showed more distinct ways to get feedback to classroom practice. As time requirements and workload pressure continued, participants felt that these issues could be overcome by working together, bending, and trusting each other.

### Composite Structural Description

(How the phenomenon was collectively experienced)

The shared experience of the participants was shaped by structured reflective conversations grounded in the GROW Model’s phases and supported by relational trust and psychological safety. The intentional use of data, guided questioning, non-directive coaching, and collaborative planning provided the structural foundation for reflection and growth. Adaptive leadership practices and integration into existing school structures enabled sustainability despite constraints. Within these conditions, supervision functioned as a dynamic, relational, and context-responsive process that facilitated continuous instructional improvement.

### Essence of the Phenomenon

The lived experience of the participants on the use of GROW Model as instructional supervision was perceived as the change of the judgment-based supervision to process-oriented supervision with the aim of relational involvement, self-reflection, and meaningful action. Supervision was defined as a collaborative investigation of teaching practice, in which dialogue was seen as substituting a compliance-based interaction and reflection was found to be more dominant than evaluative appraisal. In an environment of psychological safety and professional trust, teachers and instructional leaders reported an open involvement with evidence of classroom practice, out of which experiences of self-examination and collective sense could be brought out.

The participants found supervisory conversations structured and non-directive, with the acknowledgement of professional knowledge and guiding reflection through deliberate questioning. Empowerment was also felt because teachers stated their own instructional purposes and determined, contextually relevant strategies, which resulted in the feeling of agency and responsibility in the instructional decisions. The description of

reflection was not an abstract thought, but an experience based on observable classroom data and associated with realistic plans and actions.

The participants also had the experience of the phenomenon in the context of existing situational factors such as time and workload requirements. Under these circumstances, supervision was maintained on a basis of long-term relational leadership practices that embedded supervisory discourses in the daily professional routines and focused on teamwork. The participants largely outlined the experience of instructional supervision using the GROW Model as a developmental partnership, which included a sense of shared responsibility, reflective interaction, and deliberate action aimed at instructional enhancement.

These adaptive measures changed problems into the opportunity to solve them together and share responsibilities. Supervision turned into a form of developmental collaboration that is marked by trust, reflective dialogue, and collaborative work that allowed the participants to sustain the unrelenting instructional growth in spite of contextual limitations. Notably, the approaches that the participants used to overcome obstacles to intervention, including focusing on targeted coaching sessions, using collegial assistance, and integrating supervision with regular work processes, were valuable mechanisms that contributed to the creation of a transformative Action Plan model. The present model focuses on sustainability, shared leadership, and responsive supervision to context in order to transform reflective knowledge into planned instructional behaviors.

## DISCUSSION

The findings showed that instructional supervision using the GROW Model is a major transformation of evaluative supervision to a form of reflective, collaborative, and structured professional practice. The participants constantly referred to supervision as being more orderly and intentional, with the distinct stages of goal setting, reality checking, option generation, and action planning. This form minimized uncertainty and anxiety that may be linked to supervision and created a sense of psychological safety, which enabled teachers to freely participate in the reflective conversation. The change is consistent with more recent books that focus on developmental supervision models that focus on coaching, rather than compliance and judgment (Hallinger & Heck, 2023; Knight, 2022). The GROW Model was not only a talking tool but also a structuring frame which redefined supervision as professional inquiry as opposed to appraisal.

It is important to note that instructional performance in this study was examined through participant perceptions and reflective narratives rather than through quantitative indicators such as standardized student test scores. This approach is consistent with phenomenological inquiry, which prioritizes meaning-making and lived experience over outcome measurement (Moustakas, 1994/2021).

Reflective and collaborative dialogue was highlighted as a key sense of the experience of the participants. Instructional leaders and teachers indicated that post-observation conferences had become a place of joint sense-making, with an evidence-based foundation as opposed to the assumptions. Reflective practice based on classroom information promoted fairness, transparency, and credibility in feedback procedures. The discovery confirms the studies that reflective supervision is optimal when evidence-based and dialogic, but not direct, dialogue is present (Datnow and Park, 2022; Leithwood et al., 2021). Separating coaching and evaluative judgment enabled participants to critically analyze their practice without apprehension, which reinforced the role of trust as a conditioning precursor to substantial improvement of instruction.

Empowerment and professional growth were also highly demonstrated, with the participants developing greater agency and control of instructional decisions. Instead of getting prescriptive feedback, the teachers were challenged to create context-sensitive solutions which enhanced professional identity and confidence. This result was correlated with the recent research indicating coaching models as the drivers of teacher empowerment and long-term professional learning (Kraft, Blazar, and Hogan, 2022; van der Lans et al., 2023). The fact that I was placed into the role of a problem-solver and not a passive recipient of feedback also helped me to engage in the process and be more motivated to practice.



Evidence-based decision-making further characterized the supervisory experience. Participants noted that reflective discussions were based on classroom observations, learner outputs, and teaching artifacts to support data-informed instructional planning. This corresponds to the literature that highlighted the successful instructional leadership incorporates the use of data into the reflective practice instead of the data as a compliance tool (Datnow, 2021; Schildkamp et al., 2022). The use of supervision based on tangible evidence supported the rigor of the supervision and retained its developmental orientation.

Instructional quality and perceived student influence were observed when the participants converted reflective knowledge into classroom action plans. Way Forward step of the GROW Model facilitated the use and action now to fill the gap between thought and action. This result echoes the findings of recent studies that have shown that instructional change and better engagement with learners can be achieved with coaching models that have distinct action planning elements (Kraft et al., 2022; Sims and Fletcher-Wood, 2021). Even though the outcomes among the students were not directly reported, the participants experienced a sense of meaningful instructional gains associated with reflective supervision.

Although these good results were achieved, a few challenges like time limits, workloads, and reluctance were encountered. Yet, participants showed adaptive solutions, such as including supervision as a part of Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions and exercising flexible scheduling. This corresponds to the current literature stating that contextual constraints are typical of school-based coaching but can be addressed with the help of adaptive leadership and structural integration (Hallinger and Heck, 2023; Nguyen et al., 2024). It can be inferred that the sustainability of reflective supervision is not only based on the model, but also on its responsive practice within the current school systems.

Despite on the challenges, this study proposed a GROW-Based Transformative Action Plan, which responds strategically to the challenges systemic, professional, and organizational through enhancing the competence of coaching, redesigning facilitating conditions to support the implementation process and developing a culture of collaboration sustaining the professional development.

## FINDINGS

This phenomenological study examined the lived experiences of teachers and instructional leaders implementing instructional supervision through the GROW Model. The data analysis revealed six interconnected findings that explained the experiences of supervision as experienced, practiced, and sustained in the school setting.

First, participants experienced the GROW Model as systematic and organized supervisory process that facilitated the interactions in terms of goal setting, action planning. The model was very clear and predictable, making anxiety and ambiguity that comes with conventional supervision less, and facilitated very purposeful conversations.

Second, supervision has been found to constitute a shift of an evaluative supervision to reflective and collaborative dialogue. Supervisory relationships were termed as supportive and non-judgmental, which led to the establishment of trust and psychological safety. This collaborative model promoted critical thinking about teaching methods and not an evaluation that was based on compliance.

Third, evidence-based dialogue based on classroom observations, the work of learners and assessment data helped to strengthen reflective practice. It was a method which encouraged fairness, enhanced professional consciousness and facilitated systematic reflection which facilitated its perpetual professional learning.

Fourth, the GROW Model of instructional supervision helped in professional development and empowerment of teachers. One of the reported benefits of supervision by teachers was greater agency because supervision did not focus on giving prescriptive solutions but on questioning and exploration, which helped to create a sense of ownership of the improvement and enhance professional identity.

Fifth, participants reported improvement in instructions and perceived positive impact on learners. Clear goals and action plans were credited to improved lesson planning, management and instructional strategies, and teachers reported more engagement among the students as instruction became more purposeful.

Lastly, contextual barriers described by the participants included time constraints, workload pressures, and preliminary resistance. This was met with flexibility through adaptive strategies such as flexible scheduling, building of trust, and integrating supervision in the already developed school structures to maintain relevant supervisory practices. These plans were directly used to create a transformative Action Plan model that would guarantee sustainable and context-sensitive instructional supervision.

Overall, the findings indicate that instructional supervision using the GROW Model was perceived as a collaborative, reflective, and developmental experience that facilitated professional learning and improvement of instructions irrespective of the contextual difficulties.

## CONCLUSION

This phenomenological study finds that instructional supervision through GROW Model was perceived by teachers and instructional leaders as an organized, interactive, and reflective process, helping teachers to grow professionally and to improve instructional practices. The results showed that the GROW Model promotes psychological safety, professional agency, and evidence-based reflective practice, which allow supervision to shift away from the evaluative oversight to the developmental partnership based on the classroom realities. Participants noted the improvement in instructional planning, instructor strategies, and student involvement with the availability of contextual issues, including time and workload pressures. Critically, the adaptive measures adopted by the participants to deal with these challenges presented the empirical basis in the formulation of a transformative Action Plan among instructional leaders, that aimed at enhancing sustainable and context-based instructional supervision. The study concludes that the GROW Model offers a viable and meaningful framework for strengthening reflective supervision and continuous professional learning across diverse school contexts.

## RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings and conclusion of this phenomenological investigation, the following recommendations can be made:

**For Instructional Leaders (School Heads, Master Teachers, Supervisors):** Formulate and implement a transformative Action Plan for instructional supervision grounded in the GROW Model to institutionalize coaching-oriented supervision practices. This Action Plan must be used to operationalize structured post-observation conferences, reflective dialogue, and evidence-based feedback and make it sustainable by providing time protection and integrating supervision activities into Learning Action Cells (LACs) and In-Service Trainings (INSETs).

**For teachers:** Actively engage in GROW-based reflective supervision as a professional learning activity, adopt GROW model to conduct independent self-reflection to solve instructional problems, and engage colleagues to discuss effective practices that were formed during options and Way Forward stages.

**For Policy Makers and Education Program Developers:** Encouraged to develop localized GROW supervision guides aligned with PPST, RPMS, and curriculum frameworks, provide professional development on coaching and reflective supervision, and support flexible supervision models that respond to workload demands and diverse school contexts.

**For Future Research:** Conduct longitudinal and mixed-methods research to investigate the long-term effects of GROW-based supervision on teacher performance and student outcomes, combine the results of phenomenological studies with measures of performance, and examine the overall school-level effects of GROW-based supervision on organization trust and professional collaboration.

---

## REFERENCES

1. Abdullah, J., Suprammaniam, S., Mohamed, N., & Yusof, S. (2020). The relationship of instructional leadership towards teachers' development through instructional coaching among Malaysian school leaders. *International Educational Research*, 3(2), 9–18. <https://doi.org/10.30560/ier.v3n2p9>
2. Akter, M. (2025). The Role of Teachers in Implementing Quality Education at the Secondary Level for Achieving Sustainable Development Goal 4: An Analytical Study Based on Students' Perceptions. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. 9.7719-7728. 10.47772/IJRISS.2025.908000642.
3. Albano, M. G., & Qunito, J. A. (2025). Coaching-based instructional supervision and teacher professional growth in public schools. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Leadership*, 12(1), 45–60.
4. Albano, R. L. S., & Qunito, D. I. (2025). Goal, Reality, Options, Way Forward (GROW) Model: Bridging content knowledge and pedagogy on coaching and mentoring strategy. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(10), 3012–3020.
5. American Journal of Education and Evaluation Studies. (2025). Supervision and teacher development practices. *American Journal of Education and Evaluation Studies*, 2(9). <https://semantjournals.org/index.php/AJEES/article/download/2515/1979/2680>
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, e2025482.
7. Basilio, M., & Bueno, D. C. (2022). Instructional supervision and assessment in the 21st century. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.24038.09280>
8. Brown, S., & Grant, A. M. (2010). From GROW to GROUP: Theoretical issues and a practical model for group coaching in organisations. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 3(1), 30–45.
9. Brown, S., Harrell, S., & Browning, S. (2017). Models of influence on mathematics instructional coaches. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 25(5), 566–588.
10. Carey, W., Philippon, D. J., & Cummings, G. G. (2011). Coaching models for leadership development: An integrative review. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5(1), 51–69. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.20204>
11. Castillo, R. (2025). Instructional supervision and teachers' job performance: Insights from academic heads. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 46, 156–168. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.460203>
12. Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2024). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
13. Datnow, A. (2021). *Data-driven leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
14. Datnow, A., & Park, V. (2022). Professional collaboration with purpose: Teacher learning for equitable and excellent schools. *Teachers College Record*, 124(3), 1–28.
15. Eleck, C. (2024). Identifying the theoretical foundations of coaching as a ... *Coaching Theory Journal*.
16. Fedillaga, M., & Despi, D. (2023). Instructional supervision: A metacognitive approach in improving teachers' competence. *Global Scientific Journal*, 11(2). [https://www.globalscientificjournal.com/researchpaper/INSTRUCTIONAL\\_SUPERVISION\\_A\\_METACOGNITIVE\\_APPROACH\\_IN\\_IMPROVING\\_TEACHERS\\_COMPETENCE.pdf](https://www.globalscientificjournal.com/researchpaper/INSTRUCTIONAL_SUPERVISION_A_METACOGNITIVE_APPROACH_IN_IMPROVING_TEACHERS_COMPETENCE.pdf)
17. Francisco, C. D., & Macayan, J. V. (2025). Instructional leadership and coaching supervision in Philippine public schools. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 39(2), 210–225.
18. Francisco, J., & Macayan, R. (2025). Strengthening instructional supervision for teacher professional growth. *American Journal of Education and Evaluation Studies*, 2(9). <https://semantjournals.org/index.php/AJEES/article/download/2515/1979/2680>
19. Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2023). Instructional leadership, professional learning, and student outcomes: A longitudinal perspective. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 51(4), 577–596. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432211035864>
20. He, P., Guo, F., & Abazie, G. A. (2024). School principals' instructional leadership as a predictor of teacher professional development. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 9, Article 63.

21. He, Y., Guo, Y., & Abazie, A. (2024). Reflective supervision and teacher decision-making: A systematic qualitative review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 136, 104368.
22. Houchens, G. W., Stewart, A., & Jennings, S. (2017). Enhancing instructional leadership through collaborative coaching: A multi-case study. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 6(1), 34–49. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-07-2016-0057>
23. Issitt, M. (2003). Reflecting on reflective practice for professional education and development in health promotion. *Health Education Journal*, 62(2), 173–188. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001789690306200210>
24. Juanite, M. L. Q., & Ardiente, M. R. M. (2025). Lived experiences of teachers and school heads on learning action cell (LAC). *EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management*. <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra0414>
25. Knight, J. (2022). *The instructional playbook: The missing link for translating research into practice*. Corwin.
26. Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2022). The effect of teacher coaching on instruction and achievement: A meta-analysis of the causal evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 92(2), 293–343. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543211066425>
27. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2021). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 41(1–2), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2020.1596077>
28. Li, H. (2025). Reflective practice for pre-service teachers' professional development. *SAGE Open*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251363136>
29. Lofthouse, R. (2018). Coaching in education: A professional development process in formation. *Professional Development in Education*, 45(1), 33–45.
30. Lyons, P., & Bandura, R. P. (2021). Coaching to enhance learning and reinforce commitment. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 19(2), 100–114.
31. Main, P. (2023). *GROW Model for coaching*. Structural Learning.
32. Maliha, H. A., Yun, W., Yuanfa, M., Siyu, D., Mengxuan, L., Nooreen, N., & Ahmad, N. (2024). Role of reflective practice in professional development for English language teachers.
33. Masharipova, F. (2025). Fostering reflective practice: A pathway to effective teaching and professional growth. *Pubmedia Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, 2(3), 9. <https://doi.org/10.47134/jpbi.v2i3.1537>
34. Mubinan, F., Fuad, N., & Sari, E. (2024). Academic supervision through coaching techniques to enhance teachers' professional competence. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 7(7). <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v7-i07-100>
35. Musta'in, M., Rahman, A., & Restu. (2020). Application of academic supervision of GROW model coaching to improve the ability to make learning modules using the Flipbook Maker application of motorcycle engineering competence teachers at SMK N 2 Binjai.
36. Nguyen, T. D., Pham, L., & Springer, M. G. (2024). Coaching implementation and sustainability in school systems. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 60(1), 3–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X231198765>
37. Oberholzer, L., & Boyle, D. J. (2023). *Mentoring and coaching in education*.
38. Oluwakemi, A., & Hassan, O. (2023). Teachers' professional development and instructional supervision as contributory factors to job performance in Ogun State secondary schools, Nigeria. *Journal of Education in Black Sea Region*, 8(2), 68–79. <https://doi.org/10.31578/jeps.v8i2.293>
39. Othman, N., & Yee, C. (2015). Empowering Teaching, Learning, and Supervision. *Journal of Management Research*. 7. 98. [10.5296/jmr.v7i2.6931](https://doi.org/10.5296/jmr.v7i2.6931).
40. Panchal, S. and Riddell, P. (2020) The GROWS model: extending the GROW coaching model to support behavioural change. *The Coaching Psychologist*, 16 (2). pp. 12-25. <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/104381/>
41. Pantoja, J. S., & Villocino, R. P. (2025). In the hot seat: Lived experiences of elementary teachers on classroom observation. *Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 5(7), 186–199.
42. Prakasvudhisarn, C., Wiriyanon, S., & Kamtab, T. (2025). Coaching models and instructional performance: Evidence from school-based supervision. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 53(1), 89–107.

43. Prakasvudhisarn, K., Wiriyanon, T., & Kamtab, P. (2025). Developing an integrated digital technology-based instructional supervision model using the GROW Model. *Suranaree Journal of Social Science*, 19(1).
44. Quilala, R., & Tantiado, R. (2025). Instructional supervision and teachers' efficacy. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v8-i03-13>
45. Rahman, M. (2023). Professional development in an institution through GROW model. *Assyfa Learning Journal*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.61650/alj.v1i2.187>
46. Ray, B. (2018). Educational leadership coaching as professional development. *School Leadership Review*, 12(1), Article 5. <https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/slr/vol12/iss1/5>
47. Sadewo, Y. D., Wibawa, B., Hanafi, I., Purnasari, P. D., & Saputro, T. V. (2025). Enhancing the GROW syntax in GAARANTUNG: A study on the coaching model development in education. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*.
48. Sanchez, J. M., & Lugo, M. G. (2025). Teachers' proficiency and instructional supervision in public elementary schools: A phenomenological study. *World Education Connect*, 5.
49. Schildkamp, K., Poortman, C. L., Ebbeler, J., & Pieters, J. M. (2022). How school leaders can build effective data teams: Five building blocks for a data-informed culture. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220945702>
50. Serenas, L., & Siat, G. (2025). Lived experiences of elementary teachers on instructional supervision: A case study. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 6(12), 4259–4262. <https://ijrpr.com/uploads/V6ISSUE12/IJRPR57629.pdf>
51. Siagian, A. A., Sitorus, F., & Tambunan, S. W. G. (2025). Educational supervision: Models, approaches, and techniques in enhancing teacher professionalism and learning quality. *International Journal of Educational Practice and Policy*, 3(1), 35–42.
52. Sims, S., & Fletcher-Wood, H. (2021). Identifying the characteristics of effective teacher professional development: A critical review. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 32(1), 47–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2020.1772841>
53. Sun, Y., & Ahmad, N. J. (2025). Exploring in-service English teachers' reflective practice for professional development in Chinese higher education. *International Journal of Instruction*, 18(4), 691–712. <https://e-iji.net/ats/index.php/pub/article/view/840>
54. Tsarkos, A. (2024). Coaching and educational leadership development: Harnessing coaching for leadership excellence. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-5242-7.ch009>
55. Ubas, F. (2025). Nurturing teachers' professional growth: Lived experiences. *European Journal of Educational Studies*. <https://oapub.org/edu/index.php/ejes/article/view/6148>
56. Ubas, J. R. (2025). Contextual challenges in instructional coaching implementation. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, 9(1), 1–15.
57. United Nations. (2025). Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all. <https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal4> Sustainable Development Goals
58. Vahidov, H. (2024). The Impact of Instructional Leadership on Teacher Professional Development and Its Effect on Student Learning Outcomes. *Excellencia: International Multi-Disciplinary Journal of Education* (2994-9521), 2(12), 16-25. <https://doi.org/10.5281/>
59. van der Lans, R. M., van de Grift, W. J. C. M., & van Veen, K. (2023). Developing teacher leadership through instructional coaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 122, 103941. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.103941>
60. Whitmore, J. (2009). *Coaching for Performance, Growing Human Potential and Purpose, The Principles and Practice of Coaching and Leadership*, 4th Ed. London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing
61. Yap, M. (2024). Master teachers' lived experiences on instructional supervision: A qualitative study. *Southeast Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(2). <https://research.cmc.edu.ph/index.php/journals/issue/view/28>