EduHeart Knowledge Network and Publishing,

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI:https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.278

Linking Instructional Leadership Styles to Supervisory Competencies Among Master Teachers in Region I, Philippines: Implications for Strategic Capacity Development

Gloria Campos Itaas
Sapa Grande Integrated School, Burgos District
gloria.itaas001@deped.gov.ph

Grace G. De Vera, EdD
Pangasinan State University – Open University Systems
gdevera.lingayen@psu.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

This study examined the instructional leadership styles and supervision competencies of master teachers in Region I and their implications on teaching effectiveness. Employing a descriptive-correlational research design, the study involved master teachers and teachers in public elementary schools in Region I. Data were gathered using validated survey instruments aligned with instructional leadership constructs, supervision competency domains, and the DepEd RPMS–IPCRF framework for teaching effectiveness. Descriptive statistics were used to describe levels of instructional leadership styles, supervision competencies, and teaching effectiveness, while inferential statistics, particularly Pearson r and Spearman rank correlation, were employed to assess significant relationships among variables. Findings revealed that the instructional leadership styles of master teachers — namely, authoritative, collaborative/participative, coaching/mentoring, transformational, distributed/shared leadership, instructional monitoring and feedback, and servant leadership — were highly evident. Supervision competencies in planning and organizing instructional supervision, classroom observation and feedback, coaching and mentoring, monitoring and evaluating instructional practices, and facilitating professional development activities were highly competent. Teachers' level of teaching effectiveness based on RPMS–IPCRF indicators was also rated highly effective. Results further showed significant positive relationships between instructional leadership styles and teaching effectiveness, as well as between supervision competencies and teaching effectiveness. Selected profile variables were also significantly related to supervision competencies. These findings underscore the critical role of instructional leadership and effective supervision in enhancing teaching performance. Based on the results, a capacity-building program for master teachers was proposed to strengthen leadership and supervision practices and sustain improvements in teaching effectiveness.

Keywords: *Instructional Leadership Styles, Supervision Competencies, Master Teachers*

EduHeart Knowledge Network and Publishing, Inc.

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI:https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.278

INTRODUCTION

Instructional leadership and supervision have evolved over the past decades from compliance-based inspection to a more developmental, collaborative, and growth-oriented approach. Foundational works emphasized that supervision should not merely evaluate teachers but should foster professional growth, shared responsibility, and a culture of continuous improvement. Instructional leadership literature further highlighted that leaders most effectively influence teaching and learning when they clarify goals, coordinate instructional programs, protect instructional time, and promote teacher development (Hallinger, 2011; 2018).

Contemporary perspectives advocate for developmental supervision, in which teachers are viewed as adult learners whose growth depends on differentiated support, coaching, and mentoring aligned with their needs and the school context (Glickman et al., 2018). In the Philippine context, this shift is reinforced by policy frameworks such as the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) and the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), which institutionalize competency-based teaching and leadership practices. These are operationalized through the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS), linking supervision to measurable performance indicators and professional development (DepEd, 2017a; 2018; 2020; 2023).

Within this system, Master Teachers (MTs) play a critical role as instructional leaders at the school level. Traditionally recognized for exemplary teaching, they now also provide mentoring, coaching, instructional monitoring, and facilitation of professional development. Recent policies have strengthened their role within a career progression framework that allows advancement while remaining in classroom-based leadership positions. Their responsibilities include demonstration teaching, feedback provision, data interpretation, and facilitating professional learning communities — core elements of instructional leadership and supervision (DepEd, 2022; 2024a; 2024b; DBM, n.d.). Empirical evidence suggests that MTs significantly contribute to improving instructional practices and fostering a culture of professional learning (Hare, 2024; Barruga, 2021; Hallinger, 2018).

Despite these advancements, several research gaps remain. First, while national standards provide a framework, there is limited evidence on how MT competencies are enacted in specific regional contexts, such as Region I. Second, instructional leadership is often associated with school heads, leaving little exploration of distributed leadership, in which MTs carry substantial supervisory responsibilities. Third, there is insufficient evidence linking MT supervision practices directly to measurable indicators of teaching effectiveness, such as RPMS–PPST ratings or learner outcomes. Lastly, recent policy updates have not been fully examined regarding their effects on MT workload, supervision practices, and support systems (DepEd, 2023; Hallinger, 2018).

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI:https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.278

These gaps underscore the need for a region-specific investigation into the instructional leadership and supervision competencies of Master Teachers in Region I and their implications for teaching effectiveness. Such a study can provide empirical insights into which competencies — such as feedback literacy, coaching skills, data-informed decision-making, and professional learning facilitation — most strongly influence teacher performance.

The significance of this inquiry is further anchored in global and national development frameworks. Sustainable Development Goal 4 emphasizes the need for quality education through improved teacher quality and professional development. Master Teachers, through their mentoring and supervisory roles, are key contributors to achieving these targets by enhancing instructional practices and supporting continuous teacher growth. Nationally, the Philippine Development Plan (PDP) 2023–2028 prioritizes education quality, teacher development, and effective school leadership as strategies for improving learning outcomes. Strengthening MT competencies aligns with these goals by translating policy into practice at the school level (NEDA, 2023a; 2023b).

At the institutional level, Pangasinan State University (PSU) aligns its research agenda with national and regional priorities, emphasizing education, governance, and human capital development. Investigating MT instructional leadership and supervision practices supports PSU's mandate by generating evidence for capacity-building programs, informing professional development initiatives, and strengthening partnerships with DepEd. The findings can also inform practical interventions, such as coaching academies, supervision toolkits, and professional learning models tailored to regional needs (Pangasinan State University, 2023).

In Region I, these issues are particularly relevant due to challenges in instructional consistency, mentoring coverage, and variability in supervision practices. While policies exist, implementation varies across schools due to time, resource, and training constraints. Master Teachers often assume extensive mentoring roles but may lack structured support systems, tools, and opportunities for professional collaboration. Addressing these challenges requires a clear understanding of the competencies and practices that contribute most to teaching effectiveness.

This study, therefore, aims to provide empirical clarity by examining the instructional leadership styles and supervision competencies of Master Teachers in Region I and their relationship to teaching effectiveness. By integrating leadership theory, policy frameworks, and development agendas, the study seeks to produce actionable insights that can strengthen instructional leadership, improve teaching practices, and ultimately enhance student learning outcomes.

METHODS

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI:https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.278

This study employed a cross-sectional correlational research design to examine the instructional leadership styles and supervision competencies of Master Teachers in Region I and their implications on teaching effectiveness. The cross-sectional approach enabled the collection of data at a single point in time, providing a snapshot of existing leadership practices, supervision competencies, and teaching performance without manipulating variables. The correlational design facilitated the analysis of relationships among variables, particularly between leadership styles, supervision competencies, and teaching effectiveness, as measured through the RPMS–IPCRF framework (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The study involved 85 Master Teachers and 170 teachers from 85 public elementary schools across Pangasinan, La Union, Ilocos Norte, and Ilocos Sur, totaling 255 respondents. A purposive stratified random sampling technique was utilized to ensure representativeness while selecting participants with relevant roles in instructional leadership and supervision (Etikan & Bala, 2017).

Data were gathered using a researcher-made questionnaire, aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) and the RPMS–IPCRF framework. The instrument underwent expert validation to ensure content validity and reliability (Polit & Beck, 2021). Data collection was conducted through Google Forms, enabling efficient and accessible participation across geographically dispersed schools (Evans & Mathur, 2018).

Descriptive statistics, including frequency, percentage, and weighted mean, were used to determine levels of leadership styles, supervision competencies, and teaching effectiveness. Inferential statistics, such as Spearman's rank correlation, eta coefficient, and Pearson's r, were employed to test relationships among variables. These statistical tools ensured rigorous analysis and supported the study's objective of linking instructional leadership and supervision practices with teaching effectiveness.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the study presented the results of the data analysis and the corresponding discussion based on the findings derived from the data gathered.

Table 1: *Profile of Master Teachers in Public Elementary Schools*

Profile	Category	Frequency	Percent
Age	35 years old & below	6	7.1
	36-40 years old	13	15.3
	41-45 years old	39	45.9
	46-50 years old	9	10.6
	51-55 years old	4	4.7
	56-60 years old	10	11.8

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI:https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.278

	61 years old & above	4	4.7
Gender	Male	12	14.1
	Female	73	85.9
Marital Status	Single	5	5.9
	Married	75	88.2
	Separated/Annulled/Widowed	5	5.9
Highest Educational Attainment	With Masters' Units	19	22.4
	With Masters Degree	27	31.8
	With Doctorate Units	23	27.1
	With Doctorate Degree	16	18.8
Bachelor's Degree	Elementary Education	67	78.8
	Secondary Education	18	21.2
Position	Master Teacher I	45	53.0
	Master Teacher II	35	41.2
	Master Teacher III	5	5.9
Number of years of service as master teacher	Less than 5	25	29.4
	5-10	37	43.5
	11-15	18	21.2
	16-20	2	2.4
	More than 20 years	3	3.6
No. of seminars or training attended related to instructional leadership and supervision	Less than 5	29	34.1
	5-10	16	18.8
	11-15	29	34.1
	15-20	7	8.2
	More than 20	4	4.8
Average family monthly income	Less than 30,000	2	2.4
	30,001 – 50,000	6	7.1
	50,001 – 70,000	75	88.2
	More than 70,000	2	2.4

The profile of master teachers in Region I reflects a professionally mature, predominantly female, and academically qualified workforce, with most respondents in mid-career stages and holding graduate-level credentials. This suggests a strong foundation for instructional leadership, as experience and advanced education are associated with enhanced competencies in supervision, mentoring, and decision-making (Hallinger, 2018; Leithwood et al., 2020). The dominance of Master Teacher I and II positions, coupled with 5–10 years of service, indicates a cohort actively consolidating leadership roles, which aligns with studies showing that mid-tenure instructional leaders are more effective in improving teaching practices (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017).

However, variations in training exposure highlight the need for systematic and sustained professional development, as inconsistent training may limit the full

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI:https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.278

development of supervision competencies. Research confirms that continuous, job-embedded professional learning significantly enhances instructional leadership effectiveness and teaching quality (Nguyen et al., 2020). Additionally, the predominance of female master teachers corroborates global trends in basic education and supports findings that relational and collaborative leadership practices contribute positively to teaching effectiveness (Toropova et al., 2021).

The implications suggest that while master teachers possess the necessary qualifications and experience, targeted capacity-building programs are essential to standardize competencies, strengthen instructional supervision, and ensure consistent teaching effectiveness across schools.

Table 2: *Extent of Manifestation of Instructional Leadership Styles of Master Teachers in Region I Based on Self-Ratings and Subordinate Teachers' Ratings*

Instructional leadership styles	Master Teacher		Teacher	
	Weighted Mean	Description	Weighted Mean	Description
A. Authoritative	4.21	Highly Manifested	4.46	Highly Manifested
B. Collaborative/ Participative	4.21	Highly Manifested	4.46	Highly Manifested
C. Coaching/Mentoring	4.20	Highly Manifested	4.45	Highly Manifested
D. Transformational	4.20	Highly Manifested	4.47	Highly Manifested
E. Distributed/Shared Leadership	4.18	Highly Manifested	4.47	Highly Manifested
F. Instructional Monitoring and Feedback	4.20	Highly Manifested	4.47	Highly Manifested
G. Servant Leadership	4.22	Highly Manifested	4.47	Highly Manifested
Grand Mean	**4.20**	**Highly Manifested**	**4.46**	**Highly Manifested**

Note: Highest frequency counts are in **boldface**;
Legend: 1.00-1.50 (NM - Not Manifested);
1.51-2.50 (SM - Slightly Manifested);
2.51-3.50 (MM - Moderately Manifested);
3.51-4.50 (HM - Highly Manifested);
4.51-5.00 (VHM - Very Highly Manifested)

The findings indicate that the instructional leadership styles of master teachers in Region I are consistently highly expressed across all dimensions, with grand means of 4.20 (self-ratings) and 4.46 (teachers' ratings). The convergence of ratings suggests

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI:https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.278

strong alignment between perceived and experienced leadership practices, reinforcing the effectiveness and reliability of instructional leadership in the region.

The uniformly high ratings across authoritative, collaborative, coaching, transformational, distributed, monitoring, and servant leadership styles indicate a balanced and integrative leadership approach. This supports existing literature asserting that effective instructional leaders adapt multiple leadership styles to address diverse instructional needs and contexts (Hallinger, 2018; Leithwood et al., 2020). Notably, servant and transformational leadership emerged as highly valued, highlighting the importance of empowerment, trust, and shared responsibility in enhancing teacher motivation and commitment (Robinson et al., 2017; Toropova et al., 2021).

The strong manifestation of authoritative leadership and instructional monitoring further underscores the role of structure, accountability, and data-driven feedback in improving instructional quality. These findings corroborate studies emphasizing that effective leadership balances direction with professional support to sustain instructional coherence (Glickman et al., 2018; Bush & Glover, 2016).

The implications suggest that master teachers create supportive, collaborative, and performance-oriented environments that enhance teaching effectiveness. However, sustaining such practices requires continuous leadership development to maintain adaptability and responsiveness. Overall, the results affirm that multidimensional instructional leadership is a critical driver of teaching effectiveness and long-term school improvement.

Table 3: *Level of Supervision Competencies of Master Teachers and Teachers in Region I*

Level of supervision	Master Teacher		Teacher	
	Weighted Mean	**Description**	**Weighted Mean**	**Description**
A. Planning and Organizing Instructional Supervision	4.23	Highly Competent	4.47	Highly Competent
B. Classroom Observation and Feedback	4.21	Highly Competent	4.47	Highly Competent
C. Coaching and Mentoring Teachers	4.23	Highly Competent	4.46	Highly Competent
D. Monitoring and Evaluating Instructional Practices	4.20	Highly Competent	4.45	Highly Competent
E. Facilitating Professional Development Activities	4.20	Highly Competent	4.44	Highly Competent
Grand Mean	**4.21**	**Highly Competent**	**4.46**	**Highly Competent**

Note: Highest frequency counts are in **boldface**;

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI:https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.278

Legend: 1.00-1.50 (NC - Not Competent);
1.51-2.50 (SC - Slightly Competent);
2.51-3.50 (MC - Moderately Competent);
3.51-4.50 (HC - Highly Competent);
4.51-5.00 (VHC - Very Highly Competent)

The findings reveal that the supervision competencies of master teachers in Region I are consistently highly competent across all domains, with grand means of 4.21 (self-ratings) and 4.46 (teachers' ratings). The alignment between ratings indicates that supervisory practices are both effectively implemented and positively experienced by teachers.

High ratings across planning, observation and feedback, coaching, monitoring, and professional development reflect a comprehensive and integrated supervision framework. This corroborates literature emphasizing that effective instructional supervision requires a balance of technical, relational, and developmental competencies (Hallinger, 2018; Leithwood et al., 2020). Notably, planning and coaching were highly rated, underscoring the importance of structured supervision and individualized support. Studies confirm that clear supervision processes and high-quality feedback significantly enhance teaching effectiveness (Robinson et al., 2017; Timperley, 2016).

The strong competence in monitoring and feedback reflects a data-driven approach, aligning with research linking evidence-based supervision to sustained instructional improvement (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Similarly, high competence in facilitating professional development suggests effective integration of supervision and teacher learning, which is essential for continuous instructional improvement (Nguyen et al., 2020).

The implications indicate that master teachers foster structured, supportive, and growth-oriented environments that enhance teacher capacity, motivation, and instructional quality. However, sustaining these competencies requires ongoing professional development and system-level support. Overall, the findings affirm that strong supervision competencies are critical drivers of teaching effectiveness and long-term school improvement.

Table 4: *Level of Teaching Effectiveness of Teachers Based on the RPMS-IPCRF Framework Under DepEd*

	Teacher				
A. Planning and Organizing Instructional Supervision	**VHC 5**	**HC 4**	**MC 3**	**SC 2**	**NC 1**
1. Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	**112**	58	0	0	0
	65.9%	34.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%
2. Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners	**109**	61	0	0	0
	64.1%	35.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%
	108	62	0	0	0

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI:https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.278

3.	Curriculum and Planning / Assessment and Reporting	**63.5%**	36.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%
4.	Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	**110** **64.7%**	60 35.3%	0 .0%	0 .0%	0 .0%
5.	Personal Growth and Professional Development	**110** **64.7%**	60 35.3%	0 .0%	0 .0%	0 .0%
	Weighted Mean		**4.23**	**Highly Competent**		

Note: Highest frequency counts are in **boldface**.
Legend: 1.00-1.50 (NC - Not Effective);
1.51-2.50 (SC - Slightly Effective);
2.51-3.50 (MC - Moderately Effective);
3.51-4.50 (HC - Highly Effective);
4.51-5.00 (VHC - Very Highly Effective)

The findings reveal that teachers in Region I demonstrate a high level of teaching effectiveness across all RPMS–IPCRF domains, with an overall mean of 4.23. Most teachers were rated either highly or very highly effective, indicating strong competence in content knowledge, pedagogy, classroom management, assessment, professional engagement, and continuous development.

The consistently high ratings across domains suggest a well-rounded instructional performance, reflecting alignment with DepEd standards. This supports existing literature that effective teaching is anchored in strong content mastery, pedagogical competence, and reflective practice (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). High ratings in learning environment and diversity further indicate teachers' ability to create inclusive and supportive classrooms, consistent with studies linking classroom climate to improved learner outcomes (OECD, 2019; Leithwood et al., 2020).

Moreover, strong performance in curriculum planning, assessment, and professional engagement highlights teachers' capacity for data-informed instruction and collaborative practice, which are essential for sustained instructional improvement (Timperley, 2016; Nguyen et al., 2020). These findings corroborate research emphasizing that instructional leadership and supervision significantly enhance teacher effectiveness by strengthening professional capacity and motivation (Hallinger, 2018; Robinson et al., 2017).

The implications suggest that effective instructional leadership and supervision systems contribute to a high-performing teaching workforce. However, sustaining this level of effectiveness requires continuous professional development, reflective practice, and institutional support. Overall, the findings affirm that strong leadership and supervision are critical drivers of teaching effectiveness and long-term educational quality.

EduHeart Knowledge Network and Publishing, Inc.

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI:https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.278

Table 5: *Relationship Between Extent of Manifestation of the Instructional Leadership Styles of Master Teacher and Their Profile Variables (Part 1)*

Extent of Manifestation of the Instructional Leadership Styles Along:		Profile of Master Teachers					
		Age	Highest Educational Attainment	Position	Number of years of service	Number of seminars or training	Average Family Income (Php)
A. Authoritative	r_s	-.028	**.172****	**.172****	.082	.026	**-.124***
	Sig.	.654	**.006**	**.006**	.193	.683	**.048**
B. Collaborative/ Participative	r_s	-.045	**.179****	**.180****	.075	.037	**-.140***
	Sig.	.475	**.004**	**.004**	.230	.555	**.025**
C. Coaching/ Mentoring	r_s	-.054	**.186****	**.173****	.087	.019	**-.168****
	Sig.	.393	**.003**	**.006**	.167	.760	**.007**
D. Transformational	r_s	-.032	**.168****	**.176****	.082	.012	-.104
	Sig.	.608	**.007**	**.005**	.192	.845	.097
E. Distributed/ Shared Leadership	r_s	-.040	**.177****	**.185****	.086	.033	-.074
	Sig.	.527	**.005**	**.003**	.169	.600	.240
F. Instructional Monitoring and Feedback	r_s	-.040	**.174****	**.174****	.067	-.006	-.102
	Sig.	.522	**.005**	**.005**	.285	.919	.104
G. Servant Leadership	r_s	-.028	**.176****	**.167****	.089	-.008	**-.149***
	Sig.	.658	**.005**	**.008**	.159	.900	**.017**
H. Overall	r_s	-.064	**.187****	**.169****	.083	.030	**-.133***
	Sig.	.306	**.003**	**.007**	.187	.632	**.034**

*** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).* r_s *= spearman rank correlation;*
** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Table 6*: Relationship Between Extent of Manifestation of the Instructional Leadership Styles of Master Teacher and Their Profile Variables (Part 2)*

Extent of Manifestation of Instructional Leadership Styles Along:	Profile of Master Teachers					
	Gender		Civil Status		Bachelor's Degree	
	Eta (η)	Eta Squared (η^2)	Eta (η)	Eta Squared (η^2)	Eta (η)	Eta Squared (η^2)
A. Authoritative	.065	.004	.023	.001	.074	.005

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI:https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.278

B. Collaborative/ Participative	.071	.005	.021	.000	.174	.030
C. Coaching/Mentoring	.052	.003	.026	.001	.083	.007
D. Transformational	.058	.003	.022	.000	.078	.006
E. Distributed/Shared Leadership	.065	.004	.014	.006	.075	.006
F. Instructional Monitoring and Feedback	.055	.003	.021	.006	.077	.006
G. Servant Leadership	.069	.005	.058	.006	.077	.006
H. Overall	.063	.004	.020	.006	.077	.006

Note: Cohen (1988)

η^2 Value	Interpretation	Description
0.01	Small effect	Minimal practical significance
0.06	Medium effect	Moderate practical significance
0.14	Large effect	Substantial practical significance

The findings indicate that the manifestation of instructional leadership styles among master teachers in Region I is significantly associated with highest educational attainment and position, with weak but statistically significant correlations ($rs \approx .168–.187$, $p < .01$). This suggests that master teachers with advanced academic qualifications and higher professional ranks demonstrate stronger instructional leadership practices across multiple dimensions.

Conversely, variables such as age, years of service, and number of trainings showed no significant relationships, indicating that leadership manifestation is not solely dependent on experience or training frequency. This finding aligns with studies emphasizing that leadership effectiveness is more strongly influenced by professional preparation and role expectations rather than tenure alone (Hallinger, 2018; Leithwood et al., 2020). Interestingly, average family income exhibited a weak negative correlation with several leadership styles, suggesting that lower-income master teachers may display higher levels of leadership engagement, possibly due to increased professional motivation or commitment.

Furthermore, gender and civil status demonstrated negligible relationships with instructional leadership, reinforcing that leadership practices are largely independent of personal demographic characteristics. This corroborates literature asserting that instructional leadership is competency-based and shaped by professional development rather than inherent personal traits (Bush & Glover, 2016).

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI:https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.278

The implications of these findings highlight the importance of advanced education and career progression in strengthening instructional leadership. Capacity-building initiatives should prioritize graduate education, leadership training, and role-based development rather than focusing solely on experience or demographic factors. Overall, the results affirm that instructional leadership is primarily driven by professional qualifications and institutional roles, consistent with contemporary research linking leadership capacity to improved teaching effectiveness and school performance (Robinson et al., 2017).

Table 7: *Relationship Between the Level of Supervision Competencies of Master Teachers and their Profile Variables (Part 1)*

		Profile of Master Teachers					
Extent of Level of Supervision Competencies Along:		**Age**	**Highest Educational Attainment**	**Position**	**Number of years of service**	**Number of seminars or training**	**Average Family Income**
A. Planning and Organizing Instructional Supervision	r_s	**.160***	**.140***	.060	-.014	**-.154***	**.160***
	Sig.	**.010**	**.025**	.337	.826	**.014**	**.010**
B. Classroom Observation and Feedback	r_s	**.151***	**.165****	.050	-.009	-.110	**.151***
	Sig.	**.016**	**.008**	.426	.885	.080	**.016**
C. Coaching and Mentoring Teachers	r_s	**.154***	**.179****	.069	-.01	-.121	**.154***
	Sig.	**.014**	**.004**	.269	.868	.053	**.014**
D. Monitoring and Evaluating Instructional Practices	r_s	**.167****	**.188****	.042	.009	-.065	**.167****
	Sig.	**.007**	**.003**	.505	.886	.305	**.007**
E. Facilitating Professional Development Activities	r_s	**.179****	**.170****	.063	.025	-.084	**.179****
	Sig.	**.004**	**.007**	.319	.696	.180	**.004**
H. Overall	r_s	**.172****	**.163****	.056	-.001	-.110	**.172****
	Sig.	**.006**	**.009**	.372	.982	.081	**.006**

*** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*
** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*
r_s = spearman rank correlation;

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI:https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.278

Table 8: *Relationship Between the Level of Supervision Competencies of Master Teachers and Their Profile Variables (Part 2)*

	Profile of Master Teachers					
	Gender		Civil Status		Bachelor's Degree	
Extent of Level of Supervision Competencies Along:	**Eta (η)**	**Eta Squared ($η^2$)**	**Eta (η)**	**Eta Squared ($η^2$)**	**Eta (η)**	**Eta Squared ($η^2$)**
A. Planning and Organizing Instructional Supervision	.137	.019	.027	.001	.035	.001
B. Classroom Observation and Feedback	.151	.023	.027	.001	.001	.000
C. Coaching and Mentoring Teachers	.146	.021	.029	.001	.029	.001
D. Monitoring and Evaluating Instructional Practices	.127	.016	.011	.000	.038	.001
E. Facilitating Professional Development Activities	.151	.023	.016	.000	.022	.000
H. Overall	.063	.004	.019	.001	.025	.001

The findings indicate that the supervision competencies of master teachers in Region I are significantly associated with age, highest educational attainment, and average family income, although relationships are weak to moderate. This suggests that more mature and academically qualified master teachers tend to demonstrate stronger competencies in planning, observation, coaching, monitoring, and professional development facilitation.

The positive relationship with educational attainment corroborates studies emphasizing that advanced academic preparation enhances instructional leadership by strengthening analytical, pedagogical, and decision-making skills (Hallinger, 2018; Leithwood et al., 2020). Similarly, the influence of age reflects the role of professional maturity in developing reflective supervision practices. However, the absence of significant relationships with position and years of service indicates that tenure and rank alone do not guarantee supervisory effectiveness, aligning with research highlighting the importance of continuous professional learning over experience alone (Bush & Glover, 2016).

Interestingly, the negative or weak relationship with training exposure suggests that the quality and relevance of training are more critical than frequency. This supports

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI:https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.278

evidence that sustained, job-embedded professional development is more effective than fragmented training activities (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Furthermore, negligible relationships with gender, civil status, and bachelor's degree indicate that supervision competencies are largely independent of demographic characteristics, reinforcing the competency-based nature of instructional leadership (Nguyen et al., 2020).

The implications highlight the need to prioritize advanced education, targeted leadership development, and high-quality professional learning programs to strengthen supervision competencies. Policies should focus on building instructional expertise and reflective practice rather than relying on demographic or positional factors. Overall, the findings affirm that effective supervision is primarily shaped by professional preparation and continuous development, which are critical in enhancing teaching effectiveness and sustaining school improvement.

Table 9: *Significant Relationship Between the Extent of Manifestation of the Instructional Leadership Styles of Master Teachers and the Level of Teaching Effectiveness of Teachers Based on DepEd RPMS-IPCRF Framework*

Extent of Manifestation of the Instructional Leadership Styles	Level of Teaching Effectiveness Correlation Coefficient (r)	Sig.
A. Authoritative	.648**	.000
B. Collaborative/Participative	.630**	.000
C. Coaching/Mentoring	.610**	.000
D. Transformational	.617**	.000
E. Distributed/Shared Leadership	.623**	.000
F. Instructional Monitoring and Feedback	.604**	.000
G. Servant Leadership	.632**	.000
H. Overall	.639**	.000

*** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).* *r = Pearson r correlation*
** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

The findings reveal a strong and statistically significant positive relationship between the extent of manifestation of instructional leadership styles of master teachers and teaching effectiveness ($r = .639$, $p < .01$). This indicates that enhanced instructional leadership practices are associated with higher levels of teacher effectiveness across RPMS–IPCRF domains.

Across all leadership styles — authoritative, collaborative, coaching, transformational, distributed, monitoring, and servant — strong correlations ($r = .604$–$.648$) were observed, suggesting that effective instructional leadership is inherently multidimensional. Authoritative leadership showed the highest correlation, highlighting the importance of clear expectations and instructional direction. This aligns with research indicating that structured leadership contributes to improved instructional alignment and teacher performance (Bush & Glover, 2016; Robinson et al., 2017).

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI:https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.278

Similarly, collaborative and servant leadership demonstrated strong relationships, emphasizing the role of trust, shared decision-making, and support in fostering teacher motivation and engagement. Studies affirm that such relational leadership approaches enhance school climate and professional commitment, which are critical to teaching effectiveness (Leithwood et al., 2020; Toropova et al., 2021). Coaching, transformational, and distributed leadership further reinforce the importance of mentoring, empowerment, and shared responsibility in improving instructional practices (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Nguyen et al., 2020).

The strong association of instructional monitoring and feedback underscores the value of data-driven supervision and reflective practice, consistent with evidence that targeted feedback significantly improves teaching quality (Timperley, 2016; Hallinger, 2018).

The implications suggest that a balanced, integrated leadership approach is essential for maximizing teaching effectiveness. Strengthening instructional leadership capacities through continuous professional development, coaching systems, and leadership training programs is critical for sustaining high-quality instruction. Overall, the findings corroborate existing literature that positions instructional leadership as a key driver of teacher performance and long-term school improvement.

Table 10: *Significant Relationship Between the Level of Supervision Competencies and the Level of Teaching Effectiveness of Teachers Based on DepEd RPMS-IPCRF Framework*

Extent of Level of Supervision Competencies Along:	Level of Teaching Effectiveness Correlation Coefficient (r)	Sig.
A. Planning and Organizing Instructional Supervision	.568**	.000
B. Classroom Observation and Feedback	.571**	.000
C. Coaching and Mentoring Teachers	.591**	.000
D. Monitoring and Evaluating Instructional Practices	.594**	.000
E. Facilitating Professional Development Activities	.572**	.000
H. Overall	.587**	.000

*** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).* *r = Pearson r correlation*
** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

The findings demonstrate a statistically significant, moderately strong positive relationship between master teachers' supervisory competencies and teaching effectiveness ($r = .587$, $p < .01$). This indicates that higher levels of supervisory

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI:https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.278

competence are associated with improved teacher performance across RPMS–IPCRF domains.

All supervision domains — planning, observation and feedback, coaching and mentoring, monitoring and evaluation, and professional development — showed significant relationships with teaching effectiveness, confirming the multidimensional nature of instructional supervision. Monitoring and evaluation exhibited the strongest relationship (r = .594), emphasizing the importance of data-driven supervision in enhancing instructional quality. This aligns with research highlighting that evidence-based monitoring and feedback strengthen teacher accountability and instructional coherence (Hallinger, 2018; Timperley, 2016).

Coaching and mentoring (r = .591) also exerted a strong influence, underscoring the role of individualized support and reflective practice in improving teachers' competence. Studies affirm that sustained coaching significantly enhances instructional practices and teacher efficacy (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Kraft et al., 2018). Similarly, classroom observation and feedback (r = .571) reinforce the importance of structured feedback mechanisms in driving instructional improvement (Agarwal et al., 2019).

The implications suggest that effective supervision requires a comprehensive, integrated approach that combines planning, feedback, coaching, and professional development. Master teachers who implement such practices create supportive and growth-oriented environments that enhance teacher performance. These findings corroborate literature asserting that instructional supervision is a key driver of teaching effectiveness and school improvement (Leithwood et al., 2020; Nguyen et al., 2020).

Overall, strengthening supervision competencies through targeted capacity-building, continuous professional learning, and leadership support is essential for sustaining high-quality instruction and improving educational outcomes.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings indicate that master teachers in Region I possess mature professional profiles, characterized by advanced educational attainment, relevant experience, and ongoing training, enabling them to perform instructional leadership and supervision roles effectively. Instructional leadership styles were highly manifested across all dimensions, reflecting a balanced integration of authoritative, collaborative, coaching, transformational, distributed, monitoring, and servant leadership practices. Similarly, master teachers demonstrated high supervision competencies, while teachers exhibited high teaching effectiveness across all RPMS–IPCRF domains, suggesting strong alignment with DepEd standards. Significant relationships were found between leadership styles and selected profile variables, and between supervision competencies and professional characteristics such as age and educational attainment. However,

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI:https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.278

demographic variables such as gender and marital status showed negligible influence. Notably, instructional leadership styles and supervision competencies were strongly correlated with teaching effectiveness, affirming their critical role in enhancing instructional quality and professional practice.

Based on these findings, it is recommended that capacity-building initiatives be strengthened through advanced leadership development programs that focus on instructional supervision, coaching, and data-driven practices. Schools should promote the balanced application of multiple leadership styles through mentoring and collaborative learning systems. Continuous professional development, including structured coaching and feedback mechanisms, should be sustained to maintain high levels of teaching effectiveness. Furthermore, leadership development programs should adopt differentiated approaches that consider variations in educational attainment and professional background while maintaining competence-based standards. Policies on selection and promotion should emphasize professional capability rather than demographic factors. Finally, school systems should institutionalize sustained instructional leadership and supervision practices, recognizing their direct contribution to improved teaching effectiveness and long-term educational outcomes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The completion of this dissertation would not have been possible without the invaluable support, guidance, and encouragement of numerous individuals and institutions. The researcher expresses profound gratitude to Dr. Phillip Queroda, Executive Director of Pangasinan State University – Open University Systems (PSU-OUS), for his leadership and unwavering commitment to academic excellence. Sincere appreciation is extended to the dissertation adviser, Dr. Grace G. De Vera, for her expertise, patience, and continuous guidance, as well as to the critic reader, Dr. Joebert D. Ballesteros, for his insightful recommendations. The researcher is likewise grateful to Dr. Katherine V. Queroda, Chairperson, and the members of the dissertation committee for their valuable contributions, and to Dr. Melody C. De Vera for her assistance in statistical analysis.

Gratitude is also extended to DepEd Region I, school administrators, and participating schools for their support during data collection, as well as to the respondents whose cooperation made this study possible. The researcher acknowledges PSU-OUS faculty and staff for fostering a conducive academic environment. On a personal note, heartfelt thanks are given to the researcher's husband, MSg Rino C Itaas PAF (Ret), and her twin daughters, Hannah Margaret and Frances Arabelle, for their unwavering love, inspiration, and support. Appreciation is also extended to family members, relatives, and friends for their encouragement and prayers.

This dissertation is lovingly dedicated to the researcher's husband and daughters for their constant motivation, as well as to her family and loved ones whose sacrifices and

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI:https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.278

support made this achievement possible. It is also dedicated in memory of loved ones who served as sources of inspiration. Above all, this work is offered to Almighty God for His guidance, strength, and blessings throughout this academic journey.

REFERENCES

Agarwal, P., Bain, P. M., & Chamberlain, R. (2019). The value of structured classroom observation and feedback. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 82*, 20–29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.03.016

Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2016). School leadership and management. *International Journal of Educational Management, 30*(2), 211–231.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute. https://doi.org/10.54300/122.311

Etikan, I., & Bala, K. (2017). Sampling and sampling methods. *Biometrics & Biostatistics International Journal, 5*(6), 00149. https://doi.org/10.15406/bbij.2017.05.00149

Evans, J. R., & Mathur, A. (2018). The value of online surveys: A look back and a look ahead. *Internet Research, 28*(4), 854–887. https://doi.org/10.1108/IntR-03-2018-0089

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2018). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (9th ed.). Pearson.

Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration, 49*(2), 125–142. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111116699

Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 46*(1), 5–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143216670652

Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). The effect of teacher coaching. *Review of Educational Research, 88*(4), 547–588. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318759268

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management, 40*(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077

Nguyen, D., Ng, D., & Yap, P. S. (2020). Instructional leadership practices and teacher professional development. *School Leadership & Management, 40*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1580804

OECD. (2019). *TALIS 2018 results (Vol. I): Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/1d0bc92a-en

Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2021). *Nursing research: Generating and assessing evidence for nursing practice* (11th ed.). Wolters Kluwer.

Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2017). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types.

Asian Research Journal of Education, 2026
E-ISSN: 3028-0842
P-ISSN: 3028-0834
Vol. 3 No. 2

DOI:https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.2026.278

Educational Administration Quarterly, 53(4), 635–674. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X16638455

Timperley, H. (2016). Professional conversations and improvement-focused feedback. *The Australian Educational Researcher, 43*(1), 5–20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-015-0181-2

Toropova, A., Myrberg, E., & Johansson, S. (2021). Teacher job satisfaction: The importance of school working conditions and teacher characteristics. *Educational Review, 73*(1), 71–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2019.1705247