# School Head's Supervisory Practices and Teacher's Self- Efficacy: Input to the Performance of Public Elementary School Teachers

## Myla R. Libao

myla.libao@deped.gov.ph
Department of Education, Division of Sto. Tomas City
City of Sto. Tomas Batangas, Philippines

### Abstract

This study served as basis for developing more consistent supervisory frameworks that remain effective despite leadership transitions, ensuring teachers to maintain high performance levels even in the face of administrative changes. Thus, this study examined to investigate the relationship of school heads' supervisory practices, teacher self-efficacy using these insights to assess how they influence teacher performance providing valuable data for the improvement of leadership practices. The study utilized descriptive-correlational with the adapted and modified survey questionnaire as a primary instrument in gathering the data needed. The five schools with 150 randomly selected teachers participated in the Division of Sto. Tomas City on S.Y. 2024-2025. Accountability is identified as significantly related to teacher's instructional planning, classroom environment and instructional delivery. Trust also had a significant relationship with instructional delivery. Teachers tend to perform better if they are properly informed that they are evaluated fairly based on the clear set of standards. Vicarious experience was found to be significantly related to classroom environment as proper role-modeling among teachers may give support on managing classroom routines, atmosphere and student interactivity. While emotional and physiological states influence teachers' performance as teaches are more focused and flexible when teachers manage stress and emotions well. The study suggests that school heads should set clear goals for supervision, provide training and support for teachers using technology, and provide professional development and assistance to instructional supervisors to improve their supervisory abilities and perform their duties.

Keywords: supervisory practices, accountability, self-efficacy, performance.

## INTRODUCTION

The role of school heads in shaping teacher performance and efficacy has been extensively researched, highlighting the significant impact of supervisory practices on educational outcomes.

School heads play a pivotal role in shaping the instructional and organizational climate of schools. Their supervisory practices set the tone for professional expectations, provide guidance for instructional improvement, and create a culture that either fosters or inhibits teacher development. Research has shown that school heads who engage in supportive supervisory practices have a significant influence on teacher performance (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Hallinger & Heck, 2010).

In recent years, schools within the Division of City of Sto. Tomas particularly at Sto. Tomas North Central School experienced frequent changes in school leadership, which has observably impacted on the educational environment

This phenomenon aligns with broader research, which suggests that consistent, supportive supervisory practices are key to enhancing teacher self-efficacy. Studies show that teachers with high self-efficacy are more likely to take risks in their teaching, innovate with new instructional methods, and persist through challenges, ultimately leading to better student outcomes.

The DepEd upholds that quality student learning is contingent upon quality teachers, who are supported by quality school leaders. The changes brought about by various national and global frameworks such as the K to 12 Basic Education Program, ASEAN Integration, globalization, and the changing character of 21st century learners necessitate a call for the rethinking of the National Competency-Based Standards for School Heads (NCBSSH)

Teacher efficacy is the level of confidence teachers have in their ability to guide students to success. This includes helping students learn, building effective programs for students, and effectively changing student learning (Gkolia, Belia, &

Koustelios, 2014). Teacher with strong efficacy exhibit an increased level of persistence. They consider new situations as challenges and do not give up (Gkolia et al., 2014; Bandura, 1994).

Given these concerns, this study seeks to investigate the relationship between school heads' supervisory practices, and teacher efficacy, using these insights to assess how they influence teacher performance providing valuable data for the improvement of leadership strategies within the Division of City of Sto. Tomas.

This research could serve as a basis for developing more consistent supervisory frameworks that remain effective despite leadership transitions, ensuring teachers maintain high performance levels even in the face of administrative changes.

In the context of the Philippine education system, especially in schools affected by leadership instability, enhancing teachers' efficacy can serve as a critical lever for improving both teacher performance and student outcomes. By examining this relationship, the study aims to provide actionable insights for school leaders to adopt more effective supervisory practices, thereby promoting a culture of continuous improvement and high teacher performance.

## Methodology

This study used descriptive and Correlational Research. Descriptive method is used to describe the characteristics of a population. It collects data that is used to answer a wide range of questions pertaining to a particular population or group. Correlational methods attempt to determine the extent of a relationship between two or more variables using statistical data. These methods are appropriate because the study aimed to focus on school head's supervisory practices, and teacher's efficacy towards teacher's performance. Likewise, would want to determine the relationship between them.

The researcher used simple random sampling. This method is a subset of statistical population in which each member of the subset has an equal probability of being chosen. The researcher made letters for well-known and expert teachers and principals scrutinized the instrument's validity, then prepared a letter of request to the Division Superintendent of Sto. Tomas City for the use of the official records and administration of the survey instrument. After the validation of the instrument, the distribution of the questionnaire to the different schools in the Division of Sto. Tomas City was done. The respondents were given enough time to answer the questionnaire.

The survey was conducted thru a printed form in a site and setting chosen by the researcher, so each participating teachers survey form to complete the survey.

## Result and Discussion

**Table 1**
*Descriptive of the Respondent's Assessment on School Head's Supervisory Practices*

| School Head's Supervisory Practices | Mean | SD | VI |
|---|---|---|---|
| Collaboration | 4.30 | 0.58 | Substantially Practiced |
| Accountability | 4.44 | 0.48 | Substantially Practiced |
| Professional Development | 4.56 | 0.47 | Highly Practiced |
| Trust | 4.51 | 0.54 | Highly Practiced |

*Legend: 1.0-1.49 (Not Practiced); 1.50-2.49 (Slightly Practiced); 2.50-3.49 (Moderately Practiced); 3.50-4.49 (Substantially Practiced); 4.50-5.0 (Highly Practiced).*

Table 1 shows the teacher-respondents' assessment to their school head's supervisory practices in four key areas: Collaboration 4.30, Accountability 4.44, Professional Development 4.56 and Trust. Overall, the data suggest that school heads are performing well in their supervisory roles. Professional Development and Trust are highly practiced, indicating strong leadership in these areas. Collaboration and Accountability are substantially practiced, showing good performance with slight potential for improvement.

Professional Development received the highest mean score among the four practices, falling into the "Highly Practiced" category. This indicates a strong emphasis by school heads on encouraging and facilitating continuous professional growth through training, mentoring, or learning opportunities. The low SD further supports a consistent positive perception among respondents.

Trust is also considered "Highly Practiced," with respondents indicating that school heads foster an atmosphere of mutual respect, transparency, and reliability. This is a key trait in leadership and essential for effective school governance. A slightly higher SD compared to other domains may suggest that while the general sentiment is positive, some variability in the level of perceived trust exists across respondents.

Accountability is perceived as being "Substantially Practiced" by school heads, with a mean very close to the threshold for "Highly Practiced." This reflects a consistent perception that school leaders take ownership of their duties and are answerable for school outcomes. The relatively low SD suggests that respondents largely agree in their assessment.

Meanwhile, Collaboration received the lowest score, with a mean score close to the upper limit of the "Substantially Practiced" range (3.50–4.49). This suggests that the respondents generally observe a strong commitment to teamwork, participative decision-making, and shared responsibilities. However, with a standard deviation of 0.58, there is some variability in responses, indicating that this practice may not be uniformly observed by all respondents.

**Table 2**
*Descriptive of the Respondents' Self-Efficacy*

| Teachers' Self-Efficacy | Mean | SD | VI |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mastery Experiences | 4.63 | 0.41 | Very High |
| Vicarious Experiences | 4.53 | 0.43 | Very High |
| Social Persuasion | 4.61 | 0.38 | Very High |
| Emotional and Physiological | 4.57 | 0.434 | Very High |

Legend: 1.0-1.49 (Very Low); 1.50-2.49 (Low); 2.50-3.49 (Moderate); 3.50-4.49 (High); 4.50-5.0 (Very High).

Table 2 shows the teacher-respondents assessment of their self-efficacy in four dimensions: Mastery Experiences, Vicarious Experiences, Social Persuasion and Emotional and Physiological States. The mean scores range from 4.53 to 4.63 categorized as Very High The highest mean is found in Mastery Experiences with a mean of 4.63 and SD 0.41 described as very high. This reflects that teachers are confident on what and how they teach inside the classroom. This is followed closely by Social Persuasion with a mean of 4.61 and an SD of 0.38. This shows that the teachers thrive and appreciate eternal affirmation and value positive feedback and encouragement.

Emotional and Physiological States also received a very high rating with a mean of 4.57 and an SD of 0.45. This shows that the teachers generally agree that they encountered very high emotional and physiological states despite experiencing difficult situations. This reflects their strong emotional resilience. But teachers still experience some slight difficulties in maintaining classroom control. Finally, Vicarious Experiences with a mean of 4.53, SD of 0.43, were also rated very high, This shows that the teachers generally agree that they undergo very high vicarious experiences. Observing and peer modeling is the most common form of vicarious experiences that the teachers have undergone to achieve self-efficacy. Teacher-respondents generally agree that in order to attain confidence in their teaching, a big part of it comes from collaborative learning from their colleagues.

Overall, the consistently very high ratings across all categories express that the teachers possess strong self-efficacy.

**Table 3**
*Descriptives of the Respondents' Performance*

| Teachers' Performance | Mean | SD | VI |
|---|---|---|---|
| Instructional Planning | 4.57 | 0.37 | Outstanding |
| Classroom Environment | 4.57 | 0.41 | Outstanding |
| Instructional Delivery | 4.60 | 0.39 | Outstanding |
| Professionalism | 4.75 | 0.38 | Outstanding |

Legend: 1.0-1.49 (Unsatisfactory); 1.50-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.49 (Good); 3.50-4.49 (Very Good); 4.50-5.0 (Outstanding).

Table 3 shows that all aspects of teacher' performance rated as "Outstanding." This reflects a very high level of competence, professionalism, and effectiveness among the teacher respondents.

The highest mean was recorded in the domain of Professionalism (M = 4.75, SD = 0.38). This suggests that teachers exhibit strong ethical standards, consistently uphold institutional values, and demonstrate a commitment to ongoing professional growth. This high score may also reflect teachers' punctuality, cooperation with colleagues, active participation in professional development programs, and responsible decision-making in various school activities.

Instructional Delivery received a similarly high mean score (M = 4.60, SD = 0.39), indicating that teachers are highly effective in communicating lesson content, using varied teaching strategies, and engaging students in the learning process. This dimension is critical, as it directly affects student learning outcomes and classroom engagement.

The areas of Instructional Planning (M = 4.57, SD = 0.37) and Classroom Environment (M = 4.57, SD = 0.41) also received outstanding ratings. High performance in instructional planning reflects the teachers' ability to design coherent and

well-structured lesson plans aligned with curriculum standards and learner needs. It also suggests that teachers are effectively integrating assessments, learning objectives, and instructional materials in their planning.

The equally high score in classroom environment demonstrates that teachers are creating supportive and respectful learning spaces where students feel safe and motivated. It also implies that classroom management techniques are consistently effective, contributing to a productive learning atmosphere.

**Table 4**
*Correlation between School Head's Supervisory Practices and Teacher's Performance*

| | Instructional Planning | Classroom Environment | Instructional Delivery | Professionalism |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Collaboration | .128 | .077 | .123 | .078 |
| Accountability | .167* | .210* | .252** | .112 |
| Professional Development | .047 | -.033 | .099 | .066 |
| Trust | .139 | .092 | .166* | .144 |

 **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4 shows the test of relationship between the school head's supervisory practices and teacher's performance. The range of the r-values obtained across all possible correlation pairs for the 2 variables ranges from -.033 to .252. This result is interpreted as very weak negative to weak positive correlation. However, there are some correlation pairs that are still flagged as significant even though the strength of correlations are not that high enough. This is because of the reality of considering only to observe a limited number of sub-factors that can work hand in hand to accumulate and be flagged as significantly related. This also shows the reality that there are still other factors that were not part of the study which had relation to the school head's supervisory practices and teacher's performance.

As for Collaboration, having collaborative planning and activity between the school heads and the teachers does not ensure that it will reflect on the teachers' individual outputs. Group work may foster shared goals for the teachers, but it may not directly translate into stronger individual lesson planning or classroom delivery. Also, it may also seem that the teacher-respondents do not see collaboration with school heads to be linked into their own performance. The teachers might view it as supportive efforts but, in the grand scheme of things, it might not be essential for executing personal performance-based tasks.

For Accountability, it may be flagged as significantly related to teacher's instructional planning classroom environment and instructional delivery at the same time as clear expectations set by the school head may improve focus, structure and motivation among teachers. Teachers tend to perform better if they are properly informed that they are evaluated fairly based on the clear set of standards. On the other hand, professionalism may not be related to accountability as professionalism may stem from intrinsic values, ethics and personal development and not from external pressure or monitoring of their school heads.

For Professional Development, there may be no significant relationship found to all the 4 performance factors as there may be an implementation gap happening. This means that teachers may be attending several development programs as initiated or encouraged by the school head, but the knowledge obtained was not put properly into practice. This can be caused by lack of follow-through or support from the school head to their respective faculty members. Without constant mentoring or reinforcement to be done, the professional development obtained by the school head has actually no long-term impact to their constituent faculty members.

And for Trust, it was found to be only significantly related to teachers' instructional delivery may be because school head's trust to the teachers may boost confidence of the teachers to explore and experiment new and innovative teaching strategies which in turn comprises and diversifies the teachers' mode of instructional delivery. However, teacher's planning, classroom environment and professionalism rely on the available structures or on individuality of teachers. Planning requires time, skill and patience while classroom environment and professionalism may be connected more on personality traits of teachers rather than relational trust.

**Table 5**
*Correlation between Teacher's Self-efficacy and Teacher's Performance*

| | Instructional Planning | Classroom Environment | Instructional Delivery | Professionalism |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mastery Experiences | .057 | .090 | .027 | .027 |
| Vicarious Experiences | .156 | .181* | .141 | .133 |
| Social Persuasion | .075 | .147 | .085 | .031 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional and Physiological States | .185[*] | .255[**] | .229[**] | .193[*] |

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 5 shows the test of the relationship between the teachers' self-efficacy and teacher's performance. The range of the r-values obtained across all possible correlation pairs for the 2 variables ranges from .027 to .255. This result is interpreted as very weak positive to weak positive correlation. However, there are some correlation pairs that are still flagged as significant even though the strength of correlations are not that high enough. This is still because of the reality of considering only to observe a limited number of sub-factors that can work hand in hand to accumulate and be flagged as significantly related. This also reflects that there are still other factors that were not part of the study which may have relation to the teachers' self-efficacy and teacher's performance.

On Mastery Experiences, the reason why there is no significant relationship found with all of the 4 teacher performance factors is because of the possible ceiling effect. There may be no more significant relationship detected between the said variables as all of the involved sample data scores were found to be near at the highest possible score, which shows not enough variability among scores to assume trend or pattern. Also, the result may also imply that a teacher's confidence may not always lead to better teaching performance. This might happen as the teacher's perceived self-efficacy is not backed by reflective practice.

As for Vicarious Experience, it was found to only be significantly related to classroom environment as proper role-modeling among teachers may give support on managing classroom routines, atmosphere and student interactivity. Also, observing others may not necessarily improve planning or assessment skills without direct coaching or hands-on activity applying the concept learned.

For Social Persuasion, all 4 factors under teacher performance were not significantly related as praise and positive feedback may boost morale but it cannot assure output quality to improve as well. In addition, external feedback might not translate to the complex skills needed for instructional delivery or professionalism of the teachers.

And last for Emotional and Physiological states, it was found to be significantly related to all 4 teacher performance factors due to many possible reasons. First, the well-being of the teachers encompasses all teaching tasks. As teachers manage stress and emotions well, they are more focused, flexible and focused which influences all their tasks. Second, teachers who have strong emotional regulation support resilience. And highly resilient teachers can plan thoroughly their lessons, can teach more effectively compared to others and can maintain professionalism and composure under intense pressure. Also, the overall mental stability of teachers boosts their multitasking. This is needed by teachers as they handle day-to-day demands of teaching across all tasks that they are expected to do.

These results may be accounted for by many factors. Supervisory practices done by the school head may not be influencing teacher performance in any shape or form. Teachers may be relying more on peer support, self-support and personal experience as those were the ones who have been with the teacher on field most of the time.

While self-efficacy has somewhat had some influence on teacher performance, it was not strong enough in the sample data obtained. There may be other factors that affect self-efficacy more than supervisory behavior like training, prior experience, student success and others.

Also, there may be more alternative variables that might exist but have not been measured in the study like job satisfaction, opportunities for personal development, autonomy in teaching and motivation factors.

**Conclusion**

There is no significant relationship between school heads' supervisory practices and both teachers' self-efficacy and teacher performance. This indicates that supervisory practices, as assessed in this study, do not directly influence how teachers perceive their capabilities or their actual performance. Thus, the hypothesis is only partially supported. There is also no significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and their performance. This suggests that a teacher's belief in their own abilities does not necessarily translate to measurable performance outcomes in this context. Therefore, the hypothesis is again only partially supported

**Recommendation**

Based on the findings, the following are recommended:
1.    The results may guide the principal in maintaining a positive relationship and being an effective leader and manager in schools to efficiently support teachers, improve instructional practices, and promote positive student outcomes.

2. School heads may adopt a differentiated approach to supervision. Understand each teacher's strengths, challenges, and professional disposition, and provide individualized feedback and support tailored to their unique needs.
3. School heads may model emotional resilience and create spaces where teachers can express concerns without fear of judgment or reprisal.
4. Future researchers may be encouraged to explore further studies by incorporating different variables.

**REFERENCES**

Bancifra, J. J. (2023). Supervisory Practices of Department Heads and Teachers' Performance: Towards A Proposed Enhancement Program. *Asia Pacific Journal of Advanced Education and Technology*.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W.H. Freeman.

Battad, J. L. (2024). Instructional Leadership Skills of School Heads and Its Relation to the Self-Efficacy of Elementary Teachers in Castillejos District. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(8), 3071–3078.

Bernardo, A. B. (2019). Influence of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices on Teachers' Work Performance. Philippine Journal of Education, 1(2), 23-34.

Brown, M., & Green, D. (2019). The Impact of Principals' Supervisory Practices on Teacher Performance: The Role of Teacher Self-Efficacy. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 47(6), 936-952.

Cabaraban, J. (2019). Teacher efficacy and its correlates among Filipino public school teachers. *Philippine Educational Measurement and Evaluation Association Journal*, 12(1), 45-58.

Capuno, R., & Jimenez, M. (2018). Impact of supervisory feedback on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 30(4), 71-85.

Cheung, H. Y. (2008). Teacher efficacy: A comparative study of Hong Kong and Shanghai primary in-service teachers. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 35(1), 103-123.

Çoban, O., Demirtaş, Z., & Polatcan, M. (2023). The effect of trust in principal on teacher collaboration and teacher efficacy. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*.

De Guzman, M. (2018). Peer coaching and teacher self-efficacy in Philippine public schools. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 38(4), 431-446.

Esllera, R. A. E., & Escala, E. C. (2024). Exploring the impact of school heads' supervisory skills on teacher self-efficacy: A mixed-methods study. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 5(3).

Guo, Y., Connor, C. M., Yang, Y., Roehrig, A. D., & Morrison, F. J. (2012). The effects of teacher self-efficacy on literacy instructional practices and student reading growth. *Educational Research Journal*, 49(5), 909-934.

Grob, A., & Lüdtke, O. (2020). Self-efficacy and emotional regulation in teachers: The role of self-efficacy beliefs as a psychobiological resource. *Psychology of Education, 15*(2), 212–228.

Hoy, A. W., & Spero, R. B. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(4), 343–356.

Hsieh, C., Hung, M., & Cho, Y. (2024). The effects of distributed leadership on teacher autonomy and instructional quality. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*.

Institute of Education Sciences. (2023). Performance Evaluation Rubric for Teachers of Sta. Fe Indian School. National Center for Education Statistics. https://nces.ed.gov

Ismail, H. N., Don, Y., & Husin, F. (2018). Instructional leadership and teachers' functional competency across the 21st century learning. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(3), 153-166.

Klassen, R. M., Tze, V. M. C., Betts, S. M., & Gordon, K. A. (2011). Teacher efficacy research 1998–2009: *Educational Psychology Review*, 23(1), 21-43.

Koivunen, J., & Mattila, L. (2023). Teachers' emotion regulation and related environmental, personal, instructional, and well-being factors: A meta-analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 118*, 103825.

Lanza, R. A. (2020). *Teachers' self-efficacy for managing disruptive behaviors and its impact on burnout*. University of Connecticut Dissertations.

Lee, Y., & Hallinger, P. (2020). Teacher Self-Efficacy as a Mediator in the Relationship Between School Leadership and Teacher Performance. Teaching and Teacher Education, 95, 103139.

Maldia, A. (2024). Teacher self-efficacy and parental involvement: Their relationship and impact on teaching performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Education and Research, 9*(2), 34-42.

Mestry, R. (2017). Principals' perspectives and experiences of their instructional leadership functions to enhance learner achievement in public schools. *Journal of Education*, 69, 257-280.

Negad, G. R., & Morante, L. M. (2018). Supervisory approaches and practices of school heads, job satisfaction and work performance of teachers. *Asian Journal of Governance and Education*, 1(1).

Nordin, N., Ahmad, A., & Daud, K. (2018). Mastery experience as a source of teacher self-efficacy: A meta-analytic review. *IIUM Journal of Educational Studies, 6*(1), 70–88.

Ordanel, J., & Dioso, S. (2023). Effects Of Supervisory Practices of School Principals to Work Performance of Teachers

Pagunsan, C. E., & Moyani, J. R. (2024). *Instructional leadership practices of public secondary school heads and teachers' performance in the Philippines.* Philippine Journal of Science, Research and Technology, 2(1), 45–58.

Resplandor, M. C. (2021). Differentiated Instruction in Teaching Media and Information Literacy to Senior High School Students. *Journal of Modern Education Review*, 11(7), 1169–1178.

Sarmiento, M. (2015). The role of professional development in enhancing teacher efficacy in the Philippines. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 3(4), 89-104.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Barr, M. (2004). Fostering student learning: The relationship of collective teacher efficacy and student achievement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 3(3), 189-209.