

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY: APPLIED BUSINESS AND EDUCATION RESEARCH

2024, Vol. 5, No. 12, 5228 – 5253

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.12.23>

Research Article

School Heads' Direct Supervision, Attitudes and Practices and Teachers' Performance during the Post Pandemic Era

Edgar V. Tuico^{1*}, Elsa C. Callo²

¹San Vicente Integrated High School, Department of Education

²Laguna State Polytechnic University, San Pablo City Campus, Philippines

Article history:

Submission 30 November 2024

Revised 07 December 2024

Accepted 23 December 2024

*Corresponding author:

E-mail:

guidance.scc@lspu.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the impact of school leaders' direct supervision, attitudes, and practices on teachers' performance in the post-pandemic era. This study used a quantitative method with a predictive design involving 350 permanent teachers from SDO San Pablo City's four (4) large public junior high schools for the school year 2022-2023. A survey questionnaire was used to assess the level of direct supervision provided by school heads in terms of lesson planning and delivery; the level of attitudes provided by school heads in terms of motivation, communication, respect, decision-making, and sensitivity; and the level of practices provided by school heads in terms of teachers' support during the transition period; meeting needs; maintaining communication contact and relationship; celebrating success; and maintaining quality. Using the mean and standard deviation, it was discovered that respondents' level of agreement to school heads' direct supervision in all instructional processes is very high; respondents' level of agreement to school heads' attitudes in terms of motivation, communication, and respect is also very high; respondents' level of agreement to school heads' practices in all sub-variables is also very high; and respondents' level of agreement to their performance is also very high. School leaders' direct supervision, attitudes, and practices are significantly related to teachers' performance. Likewise, teachers' performance significantly predicted school heads' practices in maintaining communication contact and relationship, as well as school heads' direct supervision in lesson planning. As a result, it may be recommended that school leaders continue to direct the three (3) instructional processes to improve teaching, develop more positive attitudes to boost teacher morale, and maintain school practices, as teachers require more support in this post-pandemic era.

Keywords: *Direct supervision, Attitudes, Practices, Teachers' performance*

How to cite:

Tuico, E. V. & Callo, E. C. (2024). School Heads' Direct Supervision, Attitudes and Practices and Teachers' Performance during the Post Pandemic Era. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. 5(12), 5228 – 5253. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.05.12.23

Introduction

According to the former DepEd Secretary Leonor Briones' statement on May 8, 2020, the Department of Education's mandate is that education must continue despite the challenges brought about by the current health crisis by adhering to the guidelines established by the Department of Health and the World Health Organization (Montemayor, 2020).

Based on DepEd no. 34, s. 2022 entitled "School Calendar and Activities for the School Year 2022-2023," the Philippine education sector was compelled to implement various learning modalities such as 5-day in-person classes, blended learning, and full distance learning with the utmost consideration of the health safety of the teachers, students, parents, and other school staff. Based on the findings of the department's "Conduct of Rapid Assessment in School Year 2021-2022 for Learning Recovery as well as in Preparation for the 2024 Baseline System Assessment" in June 2022, they discovered that learners failed to master basic skills and competencies using the department's most recently developed BE-LCP. This leads to the development of a framework for learning recovery plans to guide schools in addressing learning gaps (DepEd et al., 2022). Some factors that contribute to this learning loss during the pandemic, according to Suralta (2022), are a lack of academic interest, a lack of in-person classes, ineffective learning delivery, and economic and health issues. According to Asec Alma Torio in one of the DepEd press releases, the department plans for continuous professional development of teachers to intensify physical and online learning action cell sessions, adaptive teaching strategies and classroom assessments, and a shift from the traditional approach to tailored acceleration to cope with the new normal of education (DepEd et al., 2022). According to Jackaria (2022), this new transition in lesson delivery created another challenge for teachers, particularly those involved in instruction, as they needed time to learn new teaching strategies appropriate to the new normal. Hermosa and Andal (2025) pointed out that to ensure seamless teaching and learning during and beyond the pandemic, higher education institutions must empower tech-savvy students who are increasingly

seeking more innovative and captivating educational materials. By creating an enticing online learning environment, these institutions can cater to the interests and requirements of students. According to Vergonia and Mombas's (2022) research, responsive, supportive, and relevant teacher professional development programs should be developed to improve teachers' readiness for blended learning in the post-COVID-19 era and the Philippines' future educational system.

The role of the school head in this transition period is to work hand-in-hand with the teachers and promote collaboration to ensure the quality of teaching and learning in the school (Dare & Saleem, 2022). Strong school leadership is the key to strengthening teachers' effectiveness by protecting their jobs and providing motivation for them to become more resilient, assisting them to become well-equipped in assessing students and improving their technological skills to have better teaching strategies (Beteille, 2020). Thus, the school heads need to determine which components of their direct supervision have a more positive impact on the teachers' performance and students' academic outcomes during the post-pandemic. One of the reasons why supervision becomes ineffective is that the school head needs an understanding of the concept, theory and practice of supervision (Rahabav, 2016). In addition, according to Nevins (2020), school heads should reinvent and adjust to the new demands no matter how successful they are today because there could be forthcoming challenges.

This study will respond to one of the many challenges school heads face in the new normal of education: how they will be able to support their teachers' needs in delivering quality basic education to their learners. As stated in the research conducted by Kaufman et al. (2022), school heads are currently facing greater challenges than ever. School heads are expected to perform more complicated tasks like providing instructional leadership in a time when there are modes of instructional delivery in most schools. The results of this research will provide information on the types of supervision, attitude, and practices of school heads that have a more positive impact on teachers' positively impacts current learning delivery

modalities. The component/s of school heads' direct instructional supervision that significantly influences teachers' performance will have to ensure that the learners can still receive the quality education they deserve.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to determine the school heads' direct supervision, attitudes and practices and teachers' performance during the post pandemic era.

Specifically, it sought answers the following questions:

1. What is the level of the school head's direct supervision in terms of lesson planning; lesson delivery; and assessment practices?
2. What is the level of school head's attitudes in terms of motivation; communication; respect;
3. decision-making; and sensitivity?
4. What is the level of school head's practices in terms of teachers' support during the transition period; meeting the needs of teachers in the facilitation of learning; maintaining communication contact and relationship; celebrating successes; and maintaining quality instruction?
5. What is the level of teacher's performance in terms of Learners' Feedback; Learners' Progress; Teaching-learning Process; Professional Development; Core Behavioral Competencies; and Core Skills?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the school head's direct supervision and teacher's performance?
7. Is there a significant relationship between a school head's attitudes and teacher's performance?
8. Is there a significant relationship between a school head's practices and teacher's performance?
9. Do the school head's direct supervision, attitudes and practices singly or in combination predict the teacher's performance?

Research Methodology

Research Design

This study used a quantitative approach. The quantitative method attempts to correlate the study's collected sample data attributes. The researcher measured the variables as they

were without modifying the independent variable. Because it is a correlational approach, it is appropriate to use observational data.

Furthermore, a predictive design was used because it will determine and measure the relationship between variables, allowing you to predict changes in the dependent variable based on the value of the independent variable (Grant, 2018). This design will demonstrate how a change in one variable, such as instructional supervision by school principals, affects another variable, such as teacher performance.

Population and Sampling Technique

The researcher used simple random sampling. The researcher decided that this study was conducted on 350 permanent teachers of the four (4) large public junior high schools in SDO San Pablo City for the school year 2022-2023.

Research Instruments

The researcher used self-made survey questionnaires adapted from other studies and modified to the local context. For instance, to measure the level of the school head's direct supervision in terms of lesson planning, lesson delivery, and assessment practices, the researcher adopted some of the indicators from the instrument used by Ampofo et al. (2019) in their study entitled "Influence of School Heads' Direct Supervision on Teacher Role Performance in Senior Public High School, Central Region, Ghana" and combined them to other indicators that are based on the related studies and literature. To measure the level of school heads' attitudes, the researcher used entirely self-made questions and indicators based on the results of other studies and related literature.

On the other hand, to measure the level of the school head's practices in terms of teachers' support during the transition period; meeting the needs; maintaining communication contact and relationship; celebrating success; and maintaining quality instruction, the researcher used self-made survey questionnaire with indicators based on the study of Brock et al. (2021) entitled "Instructional Supervision and the Covid-19 Pandemic: Perspective from Principals". Moreover, to measure the level of

teacher's performance in terms of learners' feedback, learners' progress and teaching-learning process, the researcher used a self-made questionnaire with indicators based on the gathered point of view and valuable suggestions from related literature on what should be observed and should be done by teachers during the facilitation of learning. Regarding professional development, the researcher adopted the enumerated activities for teachers' professional development by OECD or the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Lastly, regarding core behavioral competencies and core skills, the researcher used the self-assessment tool in the RPMS.

In this study, the 5-point Likert scale used the verbal descriptions Very often, Often, Sometimes, Seldom, and Never to measure the frequency of the indicators in school heads' direct supervision, attitudes, and practices and in teachers' performance in terms of learners' feedback and in terms of professional development. Meanwhile, the verbal descriptions used were Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor and Very Poor to measure the quality of learners' progress. For teachers' performance in the teaching-learning process, the researcher used verbal descriptions for levels of agreement, such as Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree and Strongly Disagree. However, for the teachers' core behavioral competencies and core skills, he used the standard verbal descriptions in SAT such as Role Model, Consistently Demonstrates, Most of the Time Demonstrates, Sometimes Demonstrates and Rarely Demonstrates. Finally, to determine each variable's value level, the verbal descriptions used are Very High, High, Moderate, Low, and Very Low.

The researcher's panel validated the crafted self-made questionnaire. It consists of 17 parameters with five indicators each for 85 indicators. To determine the validity and reliability of the indicators used in each parameter, the researcher used the scale based on the work of Fisher (2007) and Mohamad et al. (2015), where $>.94$ is excellent, $.91 - .94$ is Very Good, $.81 - .90$ is Good, $.67 - .80$ is Fair, and $< .67$ is Poor. The reality level results are good to excellent, with Cronbach Alpha Coefficient ranging from $.81$ to $.97$ and an overall coefficient of

$.986$. Hence, all the included indicators were considered valid and reliable.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher used a set of questionnaires as the main instrument for the study. The respondents gave a set of questionnaires divided into three parts. The first part includes the profile of the respondents, while the second part includes questions about the school heads' direct supervision, attitudes and practices. The third part includes questions that gather data about the teachers' performance regarding learners' feedback, learners' progress, teaching-learning process, professional development, core behavioral competencies and core skills.

The respondents were asked to respond about the 5-point Likert scale on the constructs covered in the study to make the administration of the questionnaire easy and convenient. The survey instrument was content-validated by the researcher's panel, experts in educational management, quality assurance, statistics, and research. The validated questionnaire was pilot tested on thirty (30) teachers who were not part of the respondents. The Cronbach Alpha was used to test the validity and reliability of the items in the questionnaires. The final instrument was programmed in the Google form for the online survey, while printed copies were reproduced for the in-person survey. The extracted data were analyzed using appropriate tools.

A permission letter to conduct research was submitted to the Schools Division Superintendent of the Division of San Pablo City. After the approval of the letter, the researcher forwarded this to the school heads of the four selected schools. Upon the approval of the school heads, the researcher then administered the prepared questionnaires to the respondents.

Before the actual administration of survey questionnaires in the school, letters of consent containing the relevant information about this research and the importance of their participation in the study were sent to the respondents. The researcher ensured voluntary participation and provided the respondents' information as indicated in the letter. Data privacy

and confidentiality of the gathered information and ethical consideration were practiced.

The instrument was programmed into Google Forms, and the responses were downloaded using the Excel form. The questionnaire was sent via Facebook messenger to the target respondents. They were also asked to describe their profile regarding their gender, age, civil status, length of service, highest degree or level of education, Plantilla position and teaching-related seminars/training attended. The researcher aimed to accomplish the data-gathering procedure in a month.

Statistical Treatment of Data

After gathering the data from the survey, the results were tallied, analyzed, and interpreted using appropriate statistical treatment. The SPSS, or the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, was used to determine the results from the respondents' answers. Descriptive

statistics such as percent, weighted mean, and standard deviation were used to describe the profile of the respondents and their assessment of the level of the school head's direct instructional supervision, attitudes and practices and their teaching performance. Pearson r was employed to assess the significant association between the variables above. Linear Regression using the Stepwise method was also used to determine the significant predictors of the school heads' direct supervision, attitudes, and practices in supervision on the teachers' performance.

Results and Discussion

The following are the results of the data analysis and interpretations of the school head's direct supervision level regarding lesson planning, lesson delivery, and assessment practices.

Table 1. Level of School Head's Direct Supervision in Terms of Lesson Planning Supervision

Indicative Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school head...			
1. ensures lesson objectives are clear, achievable and anchored to the K-12 learning standards.	4.59	.640	Very High
2. checks the sequencing of the activities, congruence and alignment of every part of the plan.	4.53	.667	Very High
3. inspects teaching strategies being employed in the plan.	4.53	.663	Very High
4. offers suggestions to help improve on the preparation of the specific learning activities and to select appropriate teaching resources.	4.52	.676	Very High
5. ensures that the plan is contextualized and addresses the needs of all the students.	4.53	.663	Very High
Overall	4.538	.6260	Very High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low (Never); 1.51 – 2.50=Low (Seldom); 2.51 – 3.50=Medium (Sometimes); 3.51 – 4.50=High (Often); and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High (Very Often).

Based on Table 1, most respondents agree that during direct supervision, their school heads very often ensure that the lesson objectives are clear, achievable, and anchored to the K-12 learning standards, which is the indicator with the highest mean of 4.59. This means that the school head's priority is to ensure that the lesson objectives focus on mastering concepts and skills, which can be effectively achieved by

providing sufficient time to learners. These objectives should be developing the 21st-century skills needed to produce lifelong learners. These should also prepare learners for higher education, middle-level skills, employment and entrepreneurship. This indicator also has the lowest standard deviation of .640, meaning their responses are mostly common and very clustered around the mean. The indicator with

the lowest mean of 4.52 offers suggestions to help improve the preparation of the specific learning activities and to select appropriate teaching resources. It also has the highest standard deviation of .676, meaning their responses are more scattered than other indicators. Even though it has the least meaning, its verbal interpretation is still very high. This could be because the school heads gave the teachers opportunities to decide inde-

pendently rather than always giving them suggestions on what to prepare during lesson planning. The overall mean, 4.538, shows that school heads' direct supervision in lesson planning is very high. This indicates that the school heads are on the right track in supervising the lesson planning, and the teachers appreciate the school heads' assistance in this particular instructional process during this post-pandemic era.

Table 2. Level of School Head's Direct Supervision in Terms of Lesson Delivery Supervision

Indicative Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school head...			
1. conducts classroom visitation and supervision.	4.48	.659	High
2. ensures that I keep allocated instructional time for lesson delivery and fulfill outlined instructional activities in the lesson plan.	4.51	.680	Very High
3. ensures adequate delivery of subject content.	4.55	.653	Very High
4. ensures that students are well-instructed and organized.	4.57	.642	Very High
5. supervises the manner of asking/ distributing questions and moderating feedback.	4.52	.650	Very High
Overall	4.524	.6064	Very High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low (Never); 1.51 – 2.50=Low (Seldom); 2.51 – 3.50=Medium (Sometimes); 3.51 – 4.50=High (Often); and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High (Very Often).

Based on Table 2, when it comes to direct supervision of lesson delivery, most respondents agree that their school heads ensure that students are well-instructed and organized. This indicator has the highest mean of 4.57 and the lowest standard deviation of .642, which signifies that their responses are more clustered around the mean. Because of the shift to different ways of lesson delivery, the school heads need to ensure that students can still understand the instructions, can be able to engage with the given materials and can have meaningful and productive learning experiences. Indicator 1, which states that the school head conducts classroom visitation and supervision, has the lowest mean of 4.48 with a standard deviation of .659.

Even though the school head gives time for classroom observation, it is less often than the other indicators. In the Philippine educational system, especially in public schools, master and head teachers are also tasked to conduct classroom visitation and supervision. The school head's designation of this task to master teachers and head teachers could be one of the reasons behind this result.

The overall mean, 4.524, expresses that school heads' direct supervision regarding lesson delivery is very high. This shows how important it is for the school heads to see that the lessons are well-executed inside the classroom to cope with the learning gap brought on by the challenges during the pandemic.

Table 3. Level of School Head's Direct Supervision in Terms of Assessment Practices Supervision

Indicative Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school head...			
1. ensures the provision of opportunity for all students to participate fully in lessons.	4.59	.558	Very High
2. makes sure that all teachers in the school receive supervisory feedback.	4.59	.548	Very High
3. discusses performance of pupils with teachers.	4.49	.614	High
4. ensures that I will use the assessment result in making decisions on my next steps forward.	4.55	.578	Very High
5. ensures that the assessment I made is appropriate to its purpose	4.57	.561	Very High
Overall	4.557	.5272	Very High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low (Never); 1.51 – 2.50=Low (Seldom); 2.51 – 3.50=Medium (Sometimes); 3.51 – 4.50=High (Often); and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High (Very Often).

In Table 3, the respondents agree that in terms of assessment practices, the school should give focus not only on the students but also on the teachers as indicator 1, which states that the school head ensures the provision of opportunity for all students to participate fully in lessons and indicator two which states that the school head makes sure that all teachers in the school receive supervisory feedback both got the highest mean of 4.59 and with the standard deviation of .558 and .548 respectively. The responses regarding the latter indicator are more common or clustered than those on the first indicator.

The teachers should be given technical assistance in developing strategies to maximize the student's involvement inside the classroom. The teachers should be able to develop more learner-centered facilitation of lessons. The teachers understand the importance of receiving feedback from their school heads to improve their performance. Thus, school heads should devote more time to communicating

with their teachers. They should be able to tackle the teachers' positive points and how to maintain these and be able to identify the things that need to improve; indicator 3, which states that the school head discusses the performance of pupils with teachers, has the lowest mean of 4.49 and the highest standard deviation of .614.

Even though there were evaluations and discussions of students' performance between the school head and the teacher, these were not as often as other indicators. It should be one of the aspects that the school heads need to consider to ensure the quality of assessment and better student performance. The overall mean, 4.557, shows that school heads' direct supervision in assessment practices is very high. This means that for school heads, supervision of assessment practices is equally important as the supervision of the first two instructional processes. This confirms that the school heads did their jobs by ensuring their teachers performed quality assessment practices.

Table 4. Summary of Level of School Head's Direct Supervision

Sub-Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Lesson Planning	4.538	.6260	Very High
Lesson Delivery	4.524	.6064	Very High
Assessment Practices	4.557	.5272	Very High
Overall	4.549	.5824	Very High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low; 1.51 – 2.50=Low; 2.51 – 3.50=Medium; 3.51 – 4.50=High; and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High.

Based on Table 4, the overall mean of the level of school heads' direct supervision is 4.549, which is "Very High". This implies that the school heads were following the instructions of the top management to give higher focus on the supervision of the instructional processes so that we can still give quality basic education despite the challenges brought about by the pandemic. Among the three sub-variables, assessment practices have the highest mean, which means that the school heads and

teachers know the importance of assessment in maintaining quality education. Giving reliable assessments is one of the challenges during the pandemic. This could be the reason why the school is paying more attention to this.

The following are the results of the data analysis and interpretations of the level of the school head's attitudes regarding motivation; communication; respect; decision-making; and sensitivity.

Table 5. Level of School Head's Attitudes in Terms of Motivation

Indicative Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school head...			
1. encourages me to be creative and innovative.	4.64	.548	Very High
2. supports my plan to improve classroom teaching.	4.64	.542	Very High
3. makes me feel that supervision is a collaborative process.	4.63	.566	Very High
4. recognizes my effort whenever I exceed expectations.	4.59	.562	Very High
5. develops in me the sense of responsibility	4.65	.546	Very High
Overall	4.630	.5095	Very High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low (Never); 1.51 – 2.50=Low (Seldom); 2.51 – 3.50=Medium (Sometimes); 3.51 – 4.50=High (Often); and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High (Very Often).

Table 5 shows that in terms of motivation, most of the respondents agree that their school heads developed in them a sense of responsibility as indicator 5 got the highest mean of 4.65 and standard deviation of .546, which means that their responses are more consistent than other indicators. This means that teachers are motivated if they are trusted by the school head to perform their responsibility and be accountable for the outcome of their work. This develops the teachers' self-esteem and professional growth.

On the other hand, indicator 4, which states that the school head recognizes my effort whenever I exceed expectations, has the lowest mean of 4.59 and standard deviation of .562, where their responses are more varied, but still, most of them agree that their school heads had done this very often. The overall mean of 4.630 is very high, which shows that the school heads' attitudes help the teachers to be more motivated to perform their tasks. The enumerated indicators can be the basis for how we can motivate teachers so that they will become more productive.

Table 6. Level of School Head's Attitudes in Terms of Communication

Indicative Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school head...			
1. chooses the most appropriate instructional approach that suits my developmental level.	4.48	.676	High
2. listens and accepts my suggestions for improvement.	4.51	.632	Very High
3. conducts follow-up to determine my improvement.	4.52	.614	Very High
4. communicates with empathy.	4.55	.625	Very High
5. maintains open and safe communication.	4.58	.604	Very High
Overall	4.528	.5718	Very High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low (Never); 1.51 – 2.50=Low (Seldom); 2.51 – 3.50=Medium (Sometimes); 3.51 – 4.50=High (Often); and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High (Very Often)

Table 6 reveals that the level of school heads' attitudes regarding communication is very high, with an overall mean of 4.528 and a standard deviation of .5718. This implies that proper communication between the school head and the teacher is very important in dealing with the challenges during this post-pandemic era. Indicator 5, which states that the school head maintains open and safe communication, has the highest mean of 4.58 and a standard deviation of .604 which shows that their responses are very consistent. The school heads understand they should always be available when the teachers need guidance and as-

sistance. Whenever there are issues, the teachers are assured that it is safe to discuss them with the school head.

When it comes to choosing the most appropriate instructional approach that suits their developmental level, most of the school heads had not done this very often as indicator 1 got the lowest mean of 4.48 and the standard deviation of .676, which means that their responses are more varied. Thus, the school heads should make the necessary adjustment in dealing with teachers, as teachers already have distinct levels of understanding of their responsibilities and different developmental needs.

Table 7. Level of School Head's Attitudes in Terms of Respect

Indicative Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school head...			
1. accepts disagreement during our discussion.	4.45	.707	High
2. allows me to solve problems independently when he/she thinks that I'm already capable.	4.51	.650	Very High
3. respects my academic and personal time.	4.61	.589	Very High
4. is sincere in taking care of my well-being.	4.61	.605	Very High
5. follows what we have agreed upon.	4.59	.597	Very High
Overall	4.554	.5610	Very High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low (Never); 1.51 – 2.50=Low (Seldom); 2.51 – 3.50=Medium (Sometimes); 3.51 – 4.50=High (Often); and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High (Very Often).

Based on Table 7, indicator 3, which states school head respects my academic and personal time and indicator 4, which states that the school head is sincere in taking care of my well-being, have the highest mean of 4.61 in which indicator 3 has the most consistent responses with the standard deviation of .589. This means that even though there are additional workloads for teachers because of the current situation, teachers appreciated the attitude of the school heads by not taking out of them their academic and personal time. And because they experienced too much stress from work, teachers also appreciated the effort of the school

head to take care of their physical, mental, and psychological health.

It is also quite interesting that most of the school heads think that they know better what is good for their school and did not accept very often the disagreement during the discussion as indicator 1 got the lowest mean of 4.45 and standard deviation of .707 which means that respondents had varied perceptions on this matter. Respondents agree that school heads' attitudes regarding respect are very high, with an overall mean of 4.554 and a standard deviation of .5610.

Table 8. Level of School Head's Attitudes in Terms of Decision-making

Indicative Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school head...			
1. asks my opinion in making the final decision on what needs to be improved.	4.45	.716	High
2. allows me to explore and generate a variety of alternatives and to choose the most appropriate plan for my students.	4.49	.659	High
3. considers my views in creating climate and culture in my classroom.	4.54	.617	Very High
4. gives me enough time to think and decide on a particular situation.	4.53	.613	Very High
5. treats me as colleagues and co-managers in running our school.	4.51	.637	Very High
Overall	4.503	.6054	High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low (Never); 1.51 – 2.50=Low (Seldom); 2.51 – 3.50=Medium (Sometimes); 3.51 – 4.50=High (Often); and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High (Very Often).

As shown in Table 8, the level of school heads' attitudes in terms of decision-making is not very high, with an overall mean of 4.503 and a standard deviation of .6054. This implies that there were times when the school heads gave direct instruction on what to do, and some decisions were solely from them. The contributory factors here are indicator 1, which states that the school head asks my opinion in making the final decision on what needs to be improved, and indicator 2, which states that the school head allows me to explore and generate a variety of alternatives and to choose the most

appropriate plan for my students with mean of 4.45 and 4.49 respectively and standard deviation of .716 and .659 respectively.

Indicator 3, which states that the school head considers my views in creating climate and culture in my classroom, has the highest mean of 4.54 and standard deviation of .617. Since most of the time it is the teachers who are with their students. They know better the characters of their students other than the school head. Thus, the school head should always consider the point of views of the teachers in creating climate and culture in the classroom.

Table 9. Level of School Head's Attitudes in Terms of Sensitivity

Indicative Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school head...			
1. chooses the most appropriate supervision approach that suits my developmental level.	4.50	.667	High
2. does not focus more on my mistakes in teaching.	4.45	.715	High
3. has awareness of what I am doing.	4.52	.676	Very High
4. reduces stress time by not adding unnecessary tasks.	4.49	.637	High
5. shows sympathy and empathy when I am experiencing a problem.	4.53	.627	Very High
Overall	4.498	.6090	High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low (Never); 1.51 – 2.50=Low (Seldom); 2.51 – 3.50=Medium (Sometimes); 3.51 – 4.50=High (Often); and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High (Very Often).

Table 9 reveals that school heads' attitudes regarding sensitivity are not that high. The overall mean is only 4.498, with a standard deviation of .6090. It is encouraging to see school leaders show sympathy and empathy when their teachers face challenges, as indicator 5 has the highest mean of 4.53 and standard deviation of .627, indicating that the responses are consistent. Indicator 2, which states that the school principal does not place more emphasis on my teaching mistakes, has the lowest mean

of 4.45 and the highest standard deviation of .715.

This implies that some school leaders are more concerned with the technical aspects of teaching rather than how to assist teachers in improving their craft as facilitators of learning. As shown in indicator 3, some school administrators cannot avoid assigning additional tasks to teachers, which can cause stress on their part.

Table 10. Summary of Level of School Head's Attitudes

Sub-Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Motivation	4.630	.5095	Very High
Communication	4.528	.5718	Very High
Respect	4.554	.5610	Very High
Decision-making	4.503	.6054	High
Sensitivity	4.498	.6090	High
Overall	4.541	.5486	Very High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low; 1.51 – 2.50=Low; 2.51 – 3.50=Medium; 3.51 – 4.50=High; and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High.

Table 10 shows the overall mean of the school heads' attitudes level is "Very High." Motivation has the highest mean that school heads effectively encourage them to perform better and become more productive and responsible teachers. On the other hand, sensitivity has the least meaning, which means that the school heads should be more aware of the current work of the teachers and what they are going through in this present school situation.

The following are the results of the data analysis and interpretations regarding the level of the school head's practices in terms of teachers' support during the transition period, meeting the needs of teachers in the facilitation of learning, maintaining communication contact and relationship, celebrating successes, and maintaining quality instruction.

Table 11. Level of School Head's Practices in Terms of Teachers' Support during the Transition Period

Indicative Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school head...			
1. provides support to map diverse learners.	4.45	.598	High
2. improves school facilities.	4.59	.568	Very High
3. assists teachers in following up learners and in communicating with parents.	4.50	.614	High
4. assists teachers in the reproduction of learning materials.	4.50	.618	High
5. orients teachers on the process flow of learning delivery modalities.	4.58	.569	Very High
Overall	4.526	.5372	Very High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low (Never); 1.51 – 2.50=Low (Seldom); 2.51 – 3.50=Medium (Sometimes); 3.51 – 4.50=High (Often); and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High (Very Often).

In Table 11, most respondents agree that their school heads focus on improving school facilities to support teachers during the transition period, as indicator 2 got the highest mean of 4.59. Its standard deviation has the lowest value of .568, meaning the responses are very clustered or consistent. The school heads understand that they need to upgrade the school facilities to cope with the demand of the current trend in education.

Indicator 1, which states that the school head provides support to map diverse learners, has the lowest mean of 4.45 and standard deviation of .598. This only shows that the respondents were consistent with their responses that their school heads needed more time to be with their teachers in mapping diverse learners and had more time on other school matters considering that school opening required so much preparation and planning.

Overall, the level of school heads' practices regarding teachers' support during the transition period is still very high, with an overall mean of 4.526 and a standard deviation of .5372. It shows that school heads know the importance of supporting the teachers' needs because they are the front liners in delivering quality basic education.

Table 12 shows the very high level of school heads' practices in meeting the needs of teachers in the facilitation of learning, with an overall mean of 4.543 and a standard deviation of .5331. This implies that the school heads successfully gave the immediate needs of teachers during the transition period. Indicator 5, which states that the school head provides training and seminars to address individual needs, has the highest mean of 4.58 and a standard deviation of .570.

Table 12. Level of School Head's Practices in Terms of Meeting the Needs of Teachers in the Facilitation of Learning

Indicative Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school head...			
1. asks the teacher on the type of support he/she needs.	4.53	.584	Very High
2. determines the teacher's capacity on new learning platforms.	4.55	.568	Very High
3. provides technological support.	4.51	.580	Very High
4. provides mentoring and coaching.	4.55	.588	Very High
5. provides training and seminars to address individual needs.	4.58	.570	Very High
Overall	4.543	.5331	Very High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low (Never); 1.51 – 2.50=Low (Seldom); 2.51 – 3.50=Medium (Sometimes); 3.51 – 4.50=High (Often); and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High (Very Often).

The responses were quite consistent that their school heads were aware of the importance of upskilling and reskilling teachers to cope with the current trends in lesson delivery. On the other hand, indicator 3, which states that the school head provides technological

support, has the lowest mean of 4.51 and a standard deviation of .580. Insufficient or limited resources could be one of the factors why some of the school heads can't provide all the necessary technological support.

Table 13. Level of School Head's Practices in Terms of Maintaining Communication Contact and Relationship

Indicative Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school head...			
1. monitors the well-being and emotional needs of teachers.	4.50	.650	High
2. maintains frequent communication.	4.51	.623	Very High
3. expresses appreciation for dedication and commitment.	4.52	.604	Very High
4. provides opportunities for teachers to share good things.	4.55	.622	Very High
5. provides a mechanism for information dissemination.	4.56	.587	Very High
Overall	4.527	.5790	Very High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low (Never); 1.51 – 2.50=Low (Seldom); 2.51 – 3.50=Medium (Sometimes); 3.51 – 4.50=High (Often); and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High (Very Often).

Table 13 reveals that the level of school head's practices in terms of maintaining communication contact and relationship is very high, with an overall mean of 4.527 and a standard deviation of .5790. This means that the school heads understand the importance of constant interaction and good relationships with the teachers to fulfill their goals. Indicator 5, which states that the school head provides a mechanism for information dissemination, has the highest mean of 4.56 and the lowest standard deviation of .587. This means the school

heads already have established mechanisms to disseminate the information using the current platforms.

Indicator 1, which states that the school head monitors teachers' well-being and emotional needs, has the lowest mean of 4.50 and the highest standard deviation of .650. This means that since the responses are more varied, some school heads are not giving so much focus on the well-being and emotional needs of teachers.

Table 14. Level of School Head's Practices in Terms of Celebrating Successes

Indicative Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school head...			
1. recognizes teachers' effort and amazing works.	4.56	.592	Very High
2. conducts teachers' appreciation program.	4.53	.618	Very High
3. uses different platforms in posting or displaying school successes and best practices to motivate others.	4.54	.588	Very High
4. reports successes to internal and external stakeholders.	4.55	.588	Very High
5. creates opportunities for other teachers to succeed.	4.56	.602	Very High
Overall	4.547	.5563	Very High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low (Never); 1.51 – 2.50=Low (Seldom); 2.51 – 3.50=Medium (Sometimes); 3.51 – 4.50=High (Often); and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High (Very Often).

As shown in Table 14, the level of school heads' practices in celebrating successes is also very high, with an overall mean of 4.547 and a standard deviation of .5563. This means the school heads continue the culture of celebrating school accomplishments even in the time of post-pandemic.

Indicator 1 states that the school head recognizes teachers' effort and amazing work, and indicator 5, which states that the school head creates opportunities for other teachers to succeed, both shared the highest mean of 4.56.

Still, indicator 1 has more consistency in the responses, with a standard deviation of .592, compared to indicator 5, with a standard

deviation of .602. This means that recognizing one's effort is very important in celebrating success, but it should motivate others to find ways to succeed. Indicator 2 states that the school head conducts the teachers' appreciation program had the lowest mean of 4.53 and highest standard deviation of .618.

Since the responses are more varied, some respondents needed clarification on whether their school heads had a regular teacher appreciation program. Giving rewards and recognition motivate individuals to perform better. Hence, the school heads should always remember to include the appreciation program in his/her school year plan.

Table 15. Level of School Head's Practices in Terms of Maintaining Quality Instruction

Indicative Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school head...			
1. provides technical assistance to improve the quality of teaching.	4.57	.586	Very High
2. ensures assessment of student work and evaluates the result.	4.53	.604	Very High
3. ensures that teachers conduct remediation and enhancement.	4.56	.592	Very High
4. provides a plan to support struggling learners.	4.54	.589	Very High
5. involves external stakeholders in evaluating school performance.	4.57	.581	Very High
Overall	4.552	.5536	Very High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low (Never); 1.51 – 2.50=Low (Seldom); 2.51 – 3.50=Medium (Sometimes); 3.51 – 4.50=High (Often); and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High (Very Often).

Table 15 reveals that the school heads had already established a mechanism for maintaining quality instruction, as they might have developed this during the pandemic. Overall, the level of the school head's practices in maintaining quality instruction is very high, with an overall mean of 4.552 and a standard deviation of .5536.

Indicator 1, which states that the school head provides technical assistance to improve the quality of teaching, and indicator 5, which states that the school head involves external stakeholders in evaluating school performance, have the highest mean of 4.57. Still, the latter

has the least standard deviation of .581. This implies that in times of post-pandemic, the school heads continue the usual school practices of providing technical assistance to teachers and involving external stakeholders in improving school performance.

Indicator 2, which states that the school head ensures the assessment of student work and evaluates the result, has the lowest mean of 4.53 and the highest standard deviation of .604. Even though it has the lowest mean, still most of the school heads did their part to assist teachers in assessing students' outputs.

Table 16. Summary of Level of School Head's Practices

Sub-Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Teachers' Support during the Transition Period	4.526	.5372	Very High
Meeting the Needs of Teachers in the Facilitation of Learning	4.543	.5331	Very High
Maintaining Communication Contact and Relationship	4.527	.5790	Very High
Celebrating Successes	4.547	.5563	Very High
Maintaining Quality Instruction	4.552	.5536	Very High
Overall	4.539	.5209	Very High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low; 1.51 – 2.50=Low; 2.51 – 3.50=Medium; 3.51 – 4.50=High; and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High.

Table 16 reveals that the level of school heads' practices is also "Very High," with an overall mean of 4.539. Maintaining quality instruction has the highest mean. This means that despite many challenges due to the pandemic, the school prioritizes the maintenance of quality instruction. Teachers' support during the transition has the least mean, but still, the level is "Very High." A minor change is needed on the

part of the school heads to maximize their support to teachers and allot more time to assist teachers in performing their tasks.

The following are the results of the data analysis and interpretations regarding the level of the teachers' performance in terms of learners' feedback, learners' progress, teaching-learning process, professional development, core behavioral competencies, and core skills.

Table 17. Level of Teachers' Performance in Terms of Learners' Feedback

Indicative Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
According to my learners' feedback, I am...			
1. providing them clear instructions.	4.59	.521	Very High
2. using and adapting effective teaching strategies.	4.52	.549	Very High
3. effectively clarifying and answering their queries.	4.61	.544	Very High
4. providing them quality instructional learning materials.	4.55	.542	Very High
5. providing them reliable assessment.	4.55	.532	Very High
Overall	4.564	.4840	Very High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low (Never); 1.51 – 2.50=Low (Seldom); 2.51 – 3.50=Medium (Sometimes); 3.51 – 4.50=High (Often); and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High (Very Often).

Based on Table 17, the level of teachers' performance in terms of learners' feedback is very high, with an overall mean of 4.564 and a standard deviation of .4840. This means the learners were satisfied with how the teachers delivered their lessons. The result also shows that indicator 3, which states that the teacher effectively clarifies and answers the learners' queries, has the highest mean of 4.61 and a standard deviation of .544. In our new setting

of learning delivery, students' activities can be done inside the classroom or at home. So, it is very necessary that teachers can answer all students' queries, especially if they are working on their own.

Indicator 2, which states that the teacher is using and adapting effective teaching strategies, has the lowest mean of 4.52 and highest standard deviation of .549. Even though this indicator has the lowest mean, the result is still

quite high. The teachers were able to adapt to the new normal of education by adapting teaching strategies applicable to the type of learners they have and to the lessons or topics they will teach.

In Table 18, teachers' performance regarding learners' progress is only high, with an

overall mean of 4.345 and a standard deviation of .5296. This means that even though the teachers were doing their job in facilitating learning at a very high level, according to Table 15, it did not reflect so much on the learners' progress.

Table 18. Level of Teachers' Performance in Terms of Learners' Progress

Indicative Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Most of my students...			
1. already know their goals and objectives.	4.29	.614	High
2. display passive or active engagement in class.	4.32	.578	High
3. show interest and enthusiasm in presenting their work.	4.42	.600	High
4. response well to assessment.	4.37	.628	High
5. submit their assignments and other requirements.	4.33	.640	High
Overall	4.345	.5296	High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low (Very Poor); 1.51 – 2.50=Low (Poor); 2.51 – 3.50=Medium (Fair); 3.51 – 4.50=High (Good); and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High (Excellent).

Indicator 3, which states that their students show interest and enthusiasm in presenting their work, has the highest mean of 4.42 and standard deviation of .600. This means that at least the students were willing to showcase what they had accomplished during their classes, usually individual or group presentations.

Indicator 1, which states that their students already know their goals and objectives, has the lowest mean of 4.29 and standard deviation of .614. This means some students needed to be more focused, especially on what they needed to accomplish at the end of the school year.

Table 19. Level of Teachers' Performance in Terms of Teaching-learning Process

Indicative Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
I improved my...			
1. creativity and innovation in lesson delivery.	4.41	.558	High
2. classroom control or management.	4.53	.549	Very High
3. teaching methods, strategies and practices.	4.49	.539	High
4. methods of assessment and monitoring students' progress	4.55	.527	Very High
5. expertise or mastery of the subject matters.	4.58	.539	Very High
Overall	4.510	.4831	Very High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low (Strongly Disagree); 1.51 – 2.50=Low (Disagree); 2.51 – 3.50=Medium (Undecided); 3.51 – 4.50=High (Agree); and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High (Strongly Agree).

As shown in Table 19, the level of teachers' performance in the teaching-learning process based on their self-assessment is very high,

with an overall mean of 5.510 and a standard deviation of .4831. This implies that they have continuous improvement in how they teach as

they adapt to the new normal of education. The teachers strongly agree that they improved their expertise or mastery of the subject matters, indicator 5. It has the highest mean of 4.58 and a lesser standard deviation of .539. This means that respondents know that in the teaching-learning process, they should deeply understand the lesson in s before they can effectively transfer this learning to their students.

Indicator 1, which discusses improving creativity and innovation in lesson delivery, has the lowest mean of 4.41 and the highest standard deviation of .558. This implies that the respondents had more varied self-assessments on this, and some thought they needed to be more creative and innovative as they faced new challenges in the teaching-learning process during the post-pandemic era.

Table 20. Level of Teachers' Performance in Terms of Professional Development

Indicative Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
I participated/attended...			
1. courses or workshops.	4.44	.616	High
2. education conferences or seminars.	4.45	.607	High
3. degree program or graduate studies.	4.13	1.022	High
4. in a network of teachers or learning action cells.	4.54	.617	Very High
5. individual or collaborative research.	3.99	1.080	High
Overall	4.313	.6317	High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low (Never); 1.51 – 2.50=Low (Seldom); 2.51 – 3.50=Medium (Sometimes); 3.51 – 4.50=High (Often); and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High (Very Often).

Table 20 shows that the level of teachers' performance in terms of professional development is not quite high, with an overall mean of 4.313 and a standard deviation of .6317. This means that there is a need to exert additional effort on the part of the school administration to give more encouragement and support to teachers to participate in or attend programs relative to their professional development. But there could be other factors, such as limited access to professional development programs during the pandemic.

Indicator 4, which states that the teacher attended or participated in a network of teachers or learning action cells, has the highest mean of

4.54 and a standard deviation of .617. This implies that the schools follow the department's directive in conducting regular learning action cells that require all teachers to participate.

Indicator 5, which states that teachers attended individual or collaborative research, got the lowest mean of 3.99 and highest standard deviation of 1.080. This means the research culture must still be well-established at the school level. There are efforts to increase awareness of the importance and contribution of research in improving the educational system, and we are already getting there. They only need to have continuous support from school heads and teachers as well.

Table 21. Level of Teachers' Performance in Terms of Core Behavioral Competencies

Indicative Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
1. Self-Management	3.86	1.215	Consistently Demonstrate
2. Professionalism and Ethics	4.04	1.195	Consistently Demonstrate
3. Result Focus	3.62	1.287	Consistently Demonstrate
4. Teamwork	4.04	1.220	Consistently Demonstrate
5. Service Orientation	3.60	1.260	Consistently Demonstrate
6. Innovation	3.52	1.293	Consistently Demonstrate
Overall	3.781	1.1219	High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low (Rarely Demonstrates); 1.51 – 2.50=Low (Sometimes Demonstrates); 2.51 – 3.50=Medium (Most of the Time Demonstrates); 3.51 – 4.50=High (Consistently Demonstrates); and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High (Role Model).

Based on Table 21, the level of teachers' performance in terms of core behavioral competencies is only high, with an overall mean of 3.781 and a standard deviation of 1.2119. Most of the respondents can only demonstrate four (4) out of five (5) behavioral indicators in each Core Behavioral Competency. This is why all the competencies fall under the verbal interpretation of "high or consistently demonstrates." Professional and Ethics and Teamwork have the highest mean of 4.04 and standard deviation of 1.195 and 1.220, respectively. This means that most of the respondents were more aware of the ethical standards of government employees, especially as teachers, know how to act as professionals, have knowledge of their duties and responsibilities as

professionals, understand the meaning of shared responsibility, and work collaboratively. The competency with the lowest mean of 3.52 and also with the highest standard deviation of 1.293 is innovation. This means that more respondents must improve in different aspects of innovation, such as efficiency in finding solutions to problems, ability to think "beyond the box, inspire others to develop original ideas, convert creative thinking into tangible solutions, and demonstrate resourcefulness. Innovation is one of the hardest things to have in school because of different challenges such as lack of innovation culture, the desirability may be due to workload volume, and lack of resources, difficulty in conceptualizing the idea, and others.

Table 22. Level of Teachers' Performance in Terms of Core Skills

Indicative Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
1. Oral Communication	4.02	1.238	Consistently Demonstrate
2. Written Communication	3.44	1.378	Most of the Time Demonstrated
3. Computer/ICT Skills	4.02	1.257	Consistently Demonstrate
Overall	3.829	1.1516	High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low (Rarely Demonstrates); 1.51 – 2.50=Low (Sometimes Demonstrates); 2.51 – 3.50=Medium (Most of the Time Demonstrates); 3.51 – 4.50=High (Consistently Demonstrates); and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High (Role Model).

Table 22 shows that teachers' performance in core skills is high, with an overall mean of 3.829 and a standard deviation of 1.1516. Both oral communication and computer/ICT skills have a mean of 4.02, which is higher than the remaining core skill and standard deviations of 1.238 and 1.257, respectively. Written communication has the least mean of 3.44 and a standard deviation of 1.378, the highest among the three. This means that respondents are more knowledgeable of the skills in oral communication, such as following instructions, expressing themselves clearly, using appropriate mediums, adjusting communication styles to others and guiding discussions to meet the objectives and in computer or ICT, such as preparing basic

compositions using different processing tool, manipulating computers and other computer peripherals, utilizing technologies to access information, and recommending appropriate technology to enhance productivity.

In addition, many of the respondents revealed that they had poor skills in written communication which includes knowledge of the different written communication formats, writing routine correspondence/communications, narrative and descriptive reports, securing information from required references, self-editing, and demonstrating clarity, fluency, impact, conciseness and effectiveness in written communications.

Table 23. Summary of Level of Teachers' Performance

Sub-Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Learners' Feedback	4.564	.4840	Very High
Learners' Progress	4.345	.5296	High
Teaching-Learning Process	4.510	.4831	Very High
Professional Development	4.313	.6317	High
Core Behavioral Competencies	3.781	1.1219	High
Core Skills	3.829	1.1516	High
Overall	4.224	.5439	High

Legend: 1.00 – 1.50=Very Low; 1.51 – 2.50=Low; 2.51 – 3.50=Medium; 3.51 – 4.50=High; and 4.51 – 5.00=Very High.

Table 23 shows that the level of teachers' performance is "High" with an overall mean of 4,224. This means that the teachers' performance is good enough but they need to develop more programs to enhance the skills and competencies of the teachers. Learners' feedback has the highest mean, meaning that students were satisfied with how the teachers perform their duties as facilitator of learning. Core

behavioral competencies has the least mean which means that there is a need to further the evaluation of teachers' developmental needs and determine other interventions to get better outcomes.

The following are the results of the inferential statistics and interpretation that answered the inferential questions of this study.

Table 24. Correlations between the School Heads' Direct Supervision and the Teachers' Performance

School Heads' Direct Supervision (IV)	Teachers' Performance (DV)						
	Learners' Feedback	Learners' Progress	Teaching-Learning Process	Professional Development	Core Behavioral Competencies	Core Skills	Teacher's Performance
Lesson Planning Supervision	.499**	.429**	.437**	.265**	.155**	.112*	.352**
Lesson Delivery Supervision	.494**	.388**	.411**	.248**	.105*	0.082	.310**
Assessment Practices Supervision	.541**	.485**	.497**	.275**	.179**	.145**	.398**
School Heads' Direct Supervision	.545**	.461**	.477**	.280**	.155**	.119*	.376**

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

As indicated in Table 24, a significant moderate positive correlation exists between the school heads' direct supervision and the teachers' performance where $r = .376$, $N = 350$, at $p < 0.01$. This means there is only a moderate connection between the school heads' direct supervision and the teachers' performance. The school heads' direct supervision strongly correlates positively with learners' feedback as $r = .545$, $N = 350$, and $p < 0.01$.

Among the three (3) instructional processes under direct supervision, the assessment practices have the greatest r-value when correlated to learners' feedback, which also has a strong positive correlation as $r = .541$, $N=350$ at $p < 0.01$. This may be because feedback is the response to the teacher's assessment. If the assessment result is high, there is a possibility that the students will give positive feedback on the teachers' performance. Learning progress

($r = .461$) and teaching-learning process ($r = .477$) have a significant moderate positive correlation with the school head's direct supervision, where $N = 350$ at $p < 0.01$. Those sub-variables of teacher's performance that have a weak positive correlation with the school head's direct supervision are professional development ($r = .280$), core behavioral competencies ($r = .155$) where $N = 350$ at $p < 0.01$ and core skills ($r = .119$) where $N = 350$ at $p < 0.05$. This shows that core skills have the weakest correlation with school heads' direct supervision. This means there is only a small relationship between the school heads' supervision and the development of core skills of the teachers. Among the sub-variables of direct supervision, assessment practices have the highest correlation with teachers' performance as $r = .398$, $N = 350$ at $p < 0.01$ and lesson delivery has the lowest correlation as $r = .310$, $N = 350$ at $p < 0.01$. It is also noticeable that lesson delivery supervision is not significantly correlated with core skills where $r = 0.082$, $N = 350$ and $p > 0.05$.

The school heads' direct supervision of the three instructional processes has a greater correlation with learners' feedback, learners' progress and teaching-learning process compared to other sub-variables of teachers'

performance since they directly affect the students' performance. It has a weak correlation with professional development, maybe because it is more on attendance or participation in different programs. Even though the teachers were motivated and encouraged to participate in these programs, they have other factors to consider, like time, money, and availability. The school heads' direct supervision has a weaker correlation with core behavioral competencies and core skills, maybe because these variables focus on personal development that is not directly influenced by the practices and actions made by the school heads. Usually, the division office, schools, and even regional and central offices prepare programs annually to capacitate teachers on their weaknesses. They allotted time to conduct surveys on the developmental needs of the teachers before they prepared programs and training for teachers. In addition, there is no significant correlation between lesson delivery supervision and core skills, maybe because the indicators for lesson delivery supervision are more on the process of how to deliver the lesson while the indicators of core skill are more on the technical ability of the teachers.

Table 25. Correlations between the School Heads' Attitudes and the Teachers' Performance

School Heads' Attitudes (IV)	Teachers' Performance (DV)						
	Learners' Feedback	Learners' Progress	Teaching-Learning Process	Professional Development	Core Behavioral Competencies	Core Skills	Teacher Performance
Motivation	.490**	.460**	.447**	.262**	.172**	.148**	.376**
Communication	.559**	.490**	.513**	.308**	.162**	.127*	.399**
Respect	.542**	.495**	.511**	.295**	.143**	.119*	.385**
Decision-making	.635**	.511**	.540**	.384**	.165**	.121*	.431**
Sensitivity	.598**	.470**	.531**	.361**	.153**	.123*	.410**
School Heads' Attitudes	.616**	.527**	.553**	.352**	.172**	.138**	.435**

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

Table 25 reveals that school heads' attitudes also have a significant moderate positive correlation with teachers' performance where $r = .435$, $N = 350$ at $p < 0.01$. It is good to know that the school heads' attitudes have a strong positive correlation with learners' feedback (r

$= .616$), learners' progress ($r = .527$) and teaching-learning process ($r = .553$). This means that school heads' attitudes have a great impact on the way teachers perform his or her duty as facilitators of learning.

Among the sub-variables of teachers' performance when correlated to school head's attitudes, learners' feedback got the highest r - value of .616 where $N = 350$ at $p < 0.01$. Among the sub-variables of school heads' attitudes, decision-making has the highest correlation with learners' feedback as $r = .635$, $N = 350$ at $p < 0.01$. The school heads' attitudes have only a moderate positive correlation with professional development ($r = .352$) and have weak positive correlation with core behavioral competencies ($r = .172$) and core skills ($r = .138$). This turns out that, again, core skills have the weakest correlation but this time with school heads' attitudes. Among the sub-variables of school heads' attitudes, decision-making has the highest correlation to teachers' performance as $r = .431$, $N = 350$ at $p < 0.01$ and motivation has the lowest correlation to teachers' performance as $r = .376$, $N = 350$ at $p < 0.01$.

School heads' attitudes have greater correlation with teachers' performance compared to school heads' direct supervision. This means that the positive attitudes of the school heads have a greater influence on the teachers' performance. For the teachers to perform better, the school heads should know a deeper understanding of how to motivate their teachers, constant communication, show of respect,

make them part of school decision-making, and be sensitive on the type of work of the teachers. A positive attitude of the school heads can lead to a more positive feeling on the part of the teachers and encourage them to function better. Regarding professional development, there is also a greater correlation to school heads' attitudes, maybe because there is a deeper emotional effect on teachers as they become more motivated to improve themselves. There is also weak correlation on core behavioral competencies and cores maybe because they are also not directly influenced by the attitudes of the school heads. These two sub-variables need a planned program to be able to develop their weaknesses based on a set of indicators included in the assessment tool.

Based on Table 26, the school heads' practices also have a significant moderate positive correlation with teachers' performance where $r = .453$, $N = 350$ at $p < 0.01$. The school heads' practices also have a strong positive correlation with learners' feedback ($r = .646$), learners' progress ($r = .531$) and teaching-learning process ($r = .585$); has e moderate positive correlation with professional development ($r = .360$); and have a weak positive correlation with core behavioral competencies ($r = .182$) and core skills ($r = .149$).

Table 26. Correlations between the School Heads' Direct Practices and the Teachers' Performance

School Heads' Practices (IV)	Teachers' Performance (DV)						
	Learners' Feedback	Learners' Progress	Teaching-Learning Process	Professional Development	Core Behavioral Competencies	Core Skills	Teacher Performance
Teachers' Support during the Transition Period	.606**	.509**	.556**	.349**	.132*	0.102	.404**
Meeting the Needs of Teachers in the Facilitation of Learning	.657**	.524**	.565**	.371**	.155**	.119*	.433**
Maintaining Communication Contact and Relationship	.584**	.494**	.553**	.343**	.192**	.172**	.442**
Celebrating Successes	.585**	.475**	.549**	.305**	.190**	.163**	.427**
Maintaining Quality Instruction	.619**	.507**	.542**	.332**	.187**	.144**	.433**
School Heads' Practices	.646**	.531**	.585**	.360**	.182**	.149**	.453**

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

Similar to the first two results, core skills have the weakest correlation with the independent variable among all the sub-variables of teachers' performance, which is this time, the school heads' practices. Among the sub-variables of school heads' practices, maintaining communication contact and relationship has the highest correlation with teachers' performance as $r = .442$, $N = 350$ at $p < 0.01$, and the teachers' support during the transition period has the lowest correlation with teachers' performance as $r = .404$, $N = 350$ at $p < 0.01$. It can be noticed that teachers' support during the transition period has no significant correlation with core skills where $r = 0.102$, $N = 350$ and $p > 0.05$.

Similar to the correlation results between school heads' direct supervision and attitudes to the teachers' performance, school heads' practices have a stronger correlation with the first three sub-variables of teachers' performance and a weaker yet significant correlation with the last three sub-variables. The school heads' school practices can contribute greatly to the school's success, especially in teachers' performance and student achievement. They positively impact how the teachers perform their other duties aside from teaching through school heads' support, providing their needs to facilitate learning, constant communication, receiving rewards for a job well-done, and achieving quality education despite the current situation.

Table 27. Regression of Teachers' Performance Significantly Predicted by School Heads' Practices in Terms of Maintaining Communication Contact and Relationship

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.345	.206		11.374	<.00
Maintaining Communication Contact and Relationship	.415	.045	.442	9.182	<.00

$R = .442$; $Adj. R^2 = .193$
 $F(1, 349) = 84.307$; $p < .01$

Based on Table 27, .193 or 19.3% of the variance in the teachers' performance is explained by the school heads' practices in maintaining communication contact and relationship.

Regarding the strength of relationship, the r -value of .442 indicates a moderate positive correlation between the school heads' practices in maintaining communication contact and relationship and the teachers' performance. The regression model showing the predicting capacity of school heads' practices in maintaining communication contact and relationship to the teachers' performance is statistically significant with $F(1,349) = 84.307$, $p < 0.01$. In conclusion, school heads' practices in maintaining communication contact and relationship significantly predict teachers' performance ($p < 0.01$). In addition, school heads' practices in maintaining communication contact and relationship can singly predict the teachers' performance.

This study reveals the importance of maintaining communication contact and relationship as it affects the overall performance of the teachers. There is much information that needs to be disseminated to teachers. They need this information to cope with the current trends in education. It is also necessary for teachers to share their good practices and perform peer collaboration. In this post-pandemic era, teachers may encounter many challenges that may give them stress or burnout, so through communication, they can share their emotional needs and address their problems. This way, they will be able to perform better.

As shown in Table 28, .216 or 21.6% of the variance in the teachers' performance is being explained in combination with the school heads' practices in terms of maintaining communication contact and relationship and school heads' direct supervision of lesson planning.

Table 28. Regression of Teachers' Performance Significantly Predicted by School Heads' Direct Supervision in Lesson Planning and Practices in Maintaining Communication Contact and Relationship

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	1.997	.228		8.768	<.00
Maintaining Communication Contact and Relationship	.333	.051	.354	6.557	<.00
Lesson Planning	.159	.047	.183	3.388	.00

R = .470; Adj. R² = .216
 F(2, 349) = 49.161; p <.01

Regarding the strength of the relationship, the r-value of .470 indicates a moderate positive correlation between the combination of school heads' practices in maintaining communication contact and relationships and school heads' direct supervision of lesson planning and the teachers' performance. This r-value here is higher than the correlation between the school heads' practices in maintaining communication contact and relationship and the teachers' performance only. The regression model showing the predicting capacity of both school heads' practices in maintaining communication contact and relationship and the school heads' direct supervision of lesson planning in combination with the teachers' performance is statistically significant with F (2,349) = 49.161, p < 0.01. In conclusion, school heads' practices in maintaining communication contact and relationships and direct supervision of lesson planning are significant predictors of teachers' performance (p < 0.01). Moreover, school heads' practices in maintaining communication contact and relationships and school heads' direct supervision of lesson planning can predict the teachers' performance in combination.

Other than maintaining communication contact and relationship, direct supervision on lesson planning can predict the teachers' performance. As we all know, effective lesson planning is the key to delivering the lessons effectively. It is considered the teacher's guide or map to achieve their objectives inside the classroom. The overall performance of the teachers can be attributed mostly to how the teachers facilitate learning. The more the school heads

give time to supervising the lesson planning, the better performance can be observed by the teachers.

The researchers' observation shows frequent communication builds a better relationship between school heads and teachers. This creates a trusting culture where the school head can share their accumulated learnings and experiences, and the teachers can do the same by comfortably sharing their views without any hesitation. Future problems and issues, if not prevented, can at least mitigate the effect when discussed immediately if there is regular communication.

When it comes to the teaching-learning process, there is a more positive student outcome if, at the very start, the teachers have given technical assistance in developing good instructional plans. It is observed that students find difficulty in following and understanding their lessons if the structure of the teacher's lessons could be better. Lesson planning is the key to making the whole instructional process effective.

Conclusions

In the light of the preceding findings, the conclusions of the study are as follows:

1. As r = .376, N = 350, at p < 0.01, the null hypothesis stating no significant relationship between the school head's direct supervision and the teacher's performance is rejected. A significant moderate positive correlation exists between the school heads' direct supervision and the teachers' performance.

2. As $r = .435$, $N = 350$ at $p < 0.01$, the null hypothesis that no significant relationship exists between the school head's attitudes and teacher's performance is rejected. The school heads' attitudes also significantly positively correlated with teachers' performance.
3. As $r = .453$, $N = 350$ at $p < 0.01$, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship between the school head's practices and the teacher's performance is rejected. The school heads' practices also significantly positively correlated with teachers' performance.
4. As $r = .442$ with $F(1,349) = 84.307$, $p < 0.01$, the school heads' practices in maintaining communication, contact and relationship can singly predict the teachers' performance. On the other hand, the school heads' practices in maintaining communication contact and relationships and the school heads' direct supervision of lesson planning can, in combination, predict the teachers' performance.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are as follows:

1. Given that school heads' direct supervision of the three (3) instructional processes of lesson planning, lesson delivery, and assessment practices has a significant moderate to strong correlation with teacher performance based on learner feedback, learner progress, and the teaching-learning process, it is recommended that this type of supervision be maintained because it has a positive effect on student performance.

Furthermore, school leaders' attitudes significantly impact teachers' performance based on learner feedback, progress, and the teaching-learning process. These sub-variables of teacher performance have a direct impact on student performance. Thus, school leaders can improve and develop more positive attitudes to boost teacher morale.

It also demonstrates that respecting teachers' opinions, allowing them to choose what they want to improve, and involving

them in decision-making motivate teachers to perform better. When it comes to school leaders' practices, they have a strong significant effect on three (3) sub-variables of teacher performance: learner feedback, learner progress, and the teaching-learning process. As a result, school administrators may continue to use these practices in the post-pandemic era. The teachers relied heavily on the school leaders' support, which included regular communication, assisting them in maintaining quality instruction, rewarding them for motivation, and understanding their needs during this transition period.

2. The direct supervision, attitudes, and practices of school leaders have only a moderate impact on teachers' professional development. As a result, it is recommended that school administrators use the most appropriate type of supervision for each of their teachers and demonstrate their positive attitudes and practices, as this affects the teachers' professional development.

On the other hand, direct school leaders' direct supervision, attitudes, and practices k correlation with teachers' core behavioral competencies and skills. As a result, additional research is recommended to identify the factors that can improve teachers' core behavioral competencies and skills.

3. Because maintaining communication contact and relationships and lesson planning supervision predict teachers' performance, school leaders should focus more on these practices. School leaders should check on teachers' well-being and emotional needs regularly, maintain constant communication with them, learn to appreciate their efforts, allow them to share positive experiences, and always provide them with necessary information. It is also recommended that more time be allotted during the teachers' lesson preparation to provide technical assistance to the teachers in improving their teaching strategies and the teaching materials that they will use.
4. Further research and analysis may be conducted to identify other factors that

influence teacher performance to ensure higher-quality education in the future.

References

- Ampofo, S. Y., Onyango, G. A., & Ogola, M. (2019). Influence of School Heads' Direct Supervision on Teacher Role Performance in Public Senior High Schools, Central Region, Ghana. *IAFOR Journal of Education* 7(2), 1-18. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1236226.pdf>
- Basilio, M. & Bueno, D. C. (2022), Instructional Supervision and Assessment in the 21st-century and beyond, *Institutional Multi-disciplinary Research and Development Journal, Research Gate*, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358742303_Instructional_supervision_and_assessment_in_the_21st-century
- Bautista, J. (2022). *No Stopping In-person Classes for PH Schools*. Inquirer.Net, <https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1681141/no-stopping-in-person-classes-for-ph-schools>
- Beteille, T. (2020). *Supporting Teachers during the COVID-19 (Coronavirus) Pandemic, Education for Global Development, World Bank Blogs*, <https://blogs.worldbank.org/education/supporting-teachers-during-covid-19-coronavirus-pandemic>
- Bouchamma, Y. & Basque, M. (2012). Supervision Practices of School Principals: Reflection in Action. *David Publishing, US-China Education Review B* 7 (2012) 627-637, <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED535512.pdf>
- Brock, J. D., Beach, D. M., Musslewhite, M., & Holder, I. (2021). Instructional Supervision and the Covid-19 Pandemic: Perspectives from Principals. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 11(1), 168-180, <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1590&context=jerap>
- Dare, P. S. & Saleem, A. (2022), Principal Leadership Role in Response to the Pandemic Impact on School Process. *Frontiers of Psychology, Opinion Article*. [//www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.943442/full](https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.943442/full)
- DepEd Order No. 34, s. 2022. *School Calendar and Activities for the School Year 2022-2023*
- DepEd Press Releases (2022). *DepEd Develops Learning Recovery Plan as More Schools Conduct Face-To-Face Classes*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2022/03/29/deped-develops-learning-recovery-plan-as-more-schools-conduct-face-to-face-classes/>
- DepEd Press Releases (2022). *DepEd Develops Learning Recovery Plan as More Schools Conduct Face-to-Face Classes*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2022/03/29/deped-develops-learning-recovery-plan-as-more-schools-conduct-face-to-face-classes/>
- Donato, N. M. (2021). The Relationship of the Strategies and Practices of the School Heads and Master Teachers and Teachers' Competencies and Skills in the New Normal. *International Journal of Theory and Application in Elementary and Secondary School Education*, 3(2), 125-139. <https://doi.org/10.31098/ijtaese.v3i2.665>
- Grant, M.O. (2018). Quora. Is there such a Thing as a Predictive Research Design? <https://www.quora.com/Is-there-such-a-thing-as-a-predictive-research-design>
- Hermosa, J. P. & Andal, E. Z. (2025). A Holistic Approach to Improving Students' University Experience: Exploring Philosophical Orientation, Transformational Teaching Methods, and Flexible Learning. In J. Boivin, J. Al-Obaidi, & M. Rao (Eds.), *Emerging Technologies Transforming Higher Education: Instructional Design and Student Success* (pp. 75-96). *IGI Global Scientific Publishing*. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-3904-6.ch004>
- Hoque, K. E., Kenayathulla, H. B., & Islam, R. (2020), Relationships Between Supervision and Teachers' Performance and Attitude in Secondary Schools in Malaysia. *SAGE Journals*. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/215>

- 8244020925501#bibr8-2158244020925501
- Jackaria, P. M. (2022), Elementary teachers' experiences and instructional challenges during the return to school after the COVID-19 closure in the Philippines. *International Research Journal of Science, Technology, Education, and Management*, 2, (2), <https://ejournals.ph/function/reader1/read/web/viewer.php?id=uploads%2Far-chive%2FIRJSTEM%2FVol.+2+No.+2+%282022%29%2FArticles%2FArticle20.pdf&di=18229>
- Kano, D. D., Ayana, D. K., & Debelo, D. B. (2017), The Practices of Instructional Supervisions in Supplementing Holistic Teaching-Learning Process: Qersa and Omo Nada Woreda Secondary Schools of Jimma Zone in Focus. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR)* 36, 3, 1-19, [file:///C:/Users/admin/Downloads/moanassar,+7281-24087-1-LE+\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/admin/Downloads/moanassar,+7281-24087-1-LE+(1).pdf)
- Kaufman, J. H., Deliberti, M. K., & Hamilton, L. S. (2022), How Principals' Perceived Resource Needs and Job Demands are Related to their Dissatisfaction and Intention to Leave their Schools during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *SAGE Journals*. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/23328584221081234>
- Malipot, M. H. (2022). 'Not the Same': DepEd Cites Adjustments in Holding Face-to-Face Classes. *Manila Bulletin*, <https://mb.com.ph/2022/03/23/not-the-same-deped-cites-adjustments-in-holding-face-to-face-classes/>
- Malipot, M. H. (2022). 97.5% of Public Schools Resumed Full In-person Classes: DepED. *Manila Bulletin*, <https://mb.com.ph/2022/11/07/7-5-of-public-schools-resumed-full-in-person-classes-deped/>
- Montemayor, M. T. (2020). *Education Goes on Amid Covid-19 thru DepEd's Continuity Plan*, *Philippine News Agency*. <https://www.pna.gov.ph/articles/1126058>
- Nevins, M. (2020). *Leadership in the Times of COVID-19*. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/hillennevins/2020/03/19/leadership-in-the-time-of-covid-19/?sh=39a1d69f5e4e>
- Rahabav, P. (2016), The Effectiveness of Academic Supervision for Teachers. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7, 9, <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1095817.pdf>
- Sergiovanni, T. J. & Starratt, R. J. (2007). *Supervision: A Redefinition*, 8th Edition, New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, <https://www.rebeccawestburns.com/my-blog-3/notes/sergiiovanni-starratt-redefinition-of-supervision-notes>
- Suralta, R. P. (2022). *On DepEd's Learning Recovery Plan*. *The Freeman*. <https://www.philstar.com/the-freeman/opinion/2022/08/03/2199893/deped-learning-recovery-plan>
- United Nations (2020). *Policy Brief: Education during COVID-19 and beyond*. https://www.un.org/development/desa/dspd/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2020/08/sg_policy_brief_covid-19_and_education_august_2020.pdf
- Vergonia, B. & Mombas, S. E. (2022). Ready to Go? Profiling Philippines High School Teachers' Readiness for Blended Learning in Post-COVID-19 Era. *Journal of Educational Management and Instruction*, 2, 1, <https://ejournal.uinsaid.ac.id/index.php/jemin/article/view/4961>