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ABSTRACT

This study aimed to analyze and determine the relationship of supervisory functions of school heads and barriers in developing teachers’ performance. This study utilized a descriptive-correlational type of research. The researcher used a self-check list in gathering data. The test was administered to a group of teachers after securing permission from the District Supervisor. The researcher collated the data, coded and tallied them for statistical analysis and interpretations. Mean, standard deviation and Pearson-Product-Moment-Correlation-Coefficient were used as statistical tools. The respondents of this study were 125 elementary teachers employed in 13 schools of Mauban North District Division of Quezon. The data gathered indicated that supervisory functions of school heads in terms of classroom visitation, staff development, human relation supervision, and improvement of instruction and delegation are effective. In the barriers in the supervisory function as to resistance to change, multitasking, communication, attitudes and beliefs towards supervision, and technical expertise were rarely observed. As to performance of teachers in terms of content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment and diversity of learners, curriculum planning, assessment and reporting, and plus factor they were very satisfactory. Based on the findings, the researcher came up with the following conclusions: School heads’ supervisory functions were found to be effective in developing teacher’s performance while barriers in supervisory functions of school heads have no significant effect in the teacher’s performance. Since supervisory functions of school heads were effective, they may be encouraged to improve those functions to make them very effective. To raise awareness in barriers in the supervisory functions, understanding the cause and effect will be a great help to minimize the problem. The result may be considered as a roadmap for the school heads to assist teachers who need guidance in developing teacher’s performance.
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INTRODUCTION

In building and maintaining a pleasant working environment, there are some aspects that should be considered. One of these is the principal-teacher relationship. As it is, having a harmonious and balanced relationship with subordinates may bring positive results not only with the school and pupils’ development but also to the teachers’ performance. Leading them on the right path may lead them to success.

One of the most important and influential individuals inside the school is the school head. It is the school head that sets and imparts rules and sets the goals and objectives of the school, the climate for learning, sets the moral of the teachers
and level of professionalism and relationships with the teachers.

School heads supervise and monitor the development of the school. As Durotulu (2002) defines supervision, it is the day-to-day activities and guidance of all operations, coordination, and improvement of the positive relationships between the people involved in the teaching-learning process. Without the supervision, the objectives and goals of the organization will not be achieved.

On the other hand, there are barriers which affect the school heads' ability to develop teachers to perform well. These barriers have a significant effect on performing their supervisory functions. According to the study of Gottfried and Ryan (2012), success of a supervisor depends on understanding oneself and his/her subordinates. The group will break if conflicting attitudes, values and beliefs come among the group members over an issue and behaviors.

According to the Department of Education (DepEd) Order No. 85, s.2003 entitled “Guidelines on the Selection, Promotion and Designation of School Heads,” school heads are in charge in the instructional supervision and administration of the school. They have the ability to lead the development of curriculum; ability to work and develop effective relationship, inspire and promote effectiveness and development of people inside the organization; ang ability to manage educational enterprise, explore issues from a wider perspective and motivate their subordinates in the achievement of the shared school vision.

As stated by Boaduo (2011) in the process of developing teacher instructional competencies, many educators realize that the quality of instruction depends not only on teachers but on supervisory staff. According to Cornelius (2012), effective performance management begins with respect for one another and ends with excellence in performance. It is the responsibility of supervisors to communicate on an ongoing basis with their employees. These conversations should be grounded in honest communication and provide staff with clear role expectations, feedback, identify performance improvement, development opportunities, and career possibilities.

As to DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017, good teachers play an important role in the students' achievements. Improving teacher quality is important and may lead sustainable nation building and long-term result.

In this manner, this research is considered significant to the school heads as one of the many beneficiaries of this study as they may be guided accordingly on how they can develop quality teachers. It will also serve as basis in improving their supervision, relationship with teachers and management of the school and their teachers. Aside from the school heads, it will be a great help to the teachers as well as they are the reason for conducting this study. It will serve as an understanding of why and what is the problem affecting the school head's ability in shaping a kind of teachers and school heads working in the school. This study may be of great help to the DepEd personnel for them to quickly identify the needs and what to improve not just the facilities but also to the people working inside the school.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to determine the supervisory functions of school heads and the barriers in developing teachers' performance. Specifically, this aimed to 1) evaluate the respondent’s mean perception on supervisory functions of school heads in terms of: Classroom visitation; Staff development; Human relation; Supervision and improvement of instruction; and Delegation; 2) evaluate the respondent’s mean perception of barriers on the supervisory functions of school heads in terms of: Resistance to change; Multitasking; Communication; Attitudes and beliefs Towards Supervision; and technical expertise; 3) determine the mean performance of teachers in terms of Content Knowledge and Pedagogy; Learning environment and Diversity of Learners; Curriculum Planning; Reporting; and Plus factor. 4) evaluate if supervisory functions of school heads significantly related to teachers’ performance; and 5) evaluate if barriers in the supervisory functions of school heads significantly related to the teachers’ mean performance.
METHODOLOGY

This study utilized a descriptive research design. The subjects of the study were the 125 teachers from public elementary schools of Mauban North District, Mauban, Quezon during the School Year 2019-2020. The whole population itself was used in the study hence no sampling was performed. The researcher used a self-check list for the supervisory functions and barriers in developing teachers’ performance. All instruments that were used in this study underwent validation by the experts in educational management. Recommendation and suggestions were utilized for the final refinement of the instrument. In the administration of instrument to the target respondents, the researcher made a letter and secured permission from the District Supervisor of Mauban North District Division of Quezon. In seeking permission, the researcher gave the letter to the principals, and upon its approval, the test was administered to a group of teachers.

After the distribution of questionnaire to the target respondents, the researcher collated the data, encoded, coded and tallied them for statistical analysis and interpretations. It was checked by the adviser for final validation of the result.

Several statistical tools were used to present, analyze and interpret the data gathered. To determine the respondents’ perception on related variables, mean and standard deviation were employed. To determine the significant relationship between variables, Pearson-Product- Moment-Correlation-Coefficient was used, testing its significance at the 0.05 level.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Respondent’s perception on supervisory functions of school heads

Table 1 shows the respondents’ perception on supervisory functions of the school head as “effective” (Mean=4.33, SD =0.53). Similarly, staff development is “effective” (Mean=4.43, SD =0.51). They also perceived delegation as “effective: (Mean=4.27, SD =0.53).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Functions of School Heads</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Classroom Visitation</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Staff Development</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Human Relations</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supervision and Improvement of Instruction</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Delegation</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
Summary of Supervisory Functions of School Heads

Total 4.33 0.53 Effective

The obtained standard deviation implies that there is homogeneity in the teachers’ response.

2. Respondent’s perception of barriers on the supervisory functions of school heads

Table 2 reflects the barriers in supervisory function of school head. For the respondents, the school head’s resistance to change was “sometimes” observed (Mean=2.63, SD =1.21) but “rarely” observed technical expertise (Mean=2.25, SD =1.22). As a whole, the respondents perceived that the barriers as supervisory function of the school heads “rarely observed” (Mean=2.43, SD =1.18).

Table 2
Summary of Barriers in the Supervisory Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers in the Supervisory Functions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Resistance to Change</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Multitasking</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communication</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Attitudes and Beliefs Towards Supervision</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Technical Expertise</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 2.43 1.18 Rarely
The standard deviations showed that the teachers were homogeneous in their responses.

3. Respondent's mean perception on teachers' performance

Table 3
Summary of Mean Performance of Teachers on Philippine Professional Standards for Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philippine Professional Standard for teachers</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Content Knowledge and Pedagogy</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Learning Environment and Diversity of learners</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Curriculum Planning</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assessment and Reporting</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Plus factor</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean performance of teachers in terms of Philippine Professional Standards for Teacher in Table 3. The overall performance of teachers was indicated to be “very satisfactory” (Mean=4.06, SD=0.54). This means that they performed well in terms of plus factor (Mean=4.08, SD=0.58) Similarly, they performed well in curriculum planning (Mean=3.97, SD=0.54).

The standard deviation implies that there was oneness in the teachers’ response.

4. Supervisory functions of school heads significantly related to teachers’ performance

It can be seen in Table 4 that supervisory functions of school head in terms of effective classroom visitation, staff development, human relations, supervision and improvement of instruction and delegation influenced the performance of teachers in terms of content knowledge and pedagogy. It was revealed in the table that the school head’s effective visitation, wherein they monitored the teacher’s and pupil’s progress, was contributive factor to the efficiency and effectiveness of the teachers in teaching content knowledge and in providing information that the pupils are expected to gain from the teacher.

Table 4
Relationship Between Supervisory Function of School Heads and Teachers Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Functions of School Heads</th>
<th>Content Knowledge and Pedagogy</th>
<th>Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners</th>
<th>Curriculum Planning</th>
<th>Assessment and Reporting</th>
<th>Plus factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Visitation</td>
<td>.412**</td>
<td>.313**</td>
<td>.355**</td>
<td>.249**</td>
<td>.238**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>.385**</td>
<td>.318**</td>
<td>.467**</td>
<td>.391**</td>
<td>.351**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>.263**</td>
<td>.216*</td>
<td>.361**</td>
<td>.337**</td>
<td>.315**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision and Improvement of Instruction Delegation</td>
<td>.364**</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>.464**</td>
<td>.443**</td>
<td>.369**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)****Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)****Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The result/findings in the study justify the effectiveness of classroom visitation on teachers’ performance. This suggests that the more the school head conducts classroom visitation, the better the teacher and the student understand their individual uniqueness or differences in terms of their culture beliefs, physical attributes as well as to how they relate with one another. Moreover, the finding revealed that harmony in their relationship was established by the school head’s practice of seeing, observing and conferring with the teachers in the classroom.
The result tends to reveal that the more the school head actually visits teacher the more the latter tend to be reliable in evaluating and reporting student’s progress. The table also affirms as correlation between the school head practice of actual visiting teachers and their improved awareness of self-identity as well as their development of their skills and personality.

Further, it can be seen in Table 4 that school head encouragement and initiative in conducting staff development activities as seminars and workshops affect teachers’ performance in providing good knowledge and better learning to the pupils.

The result in the study proves the effectiveness of staff development on teachers’ performance. This means that the school head’s initiative of having a staff development activity for teachers may enable the latter to have a clearer understanding of what knowledge and skills should be developed among students. Also, they have to be guided on how to plan a curriculum wherein they will be able to identify individual differences among the students and consider such in providing them with different activities. Moreover, teacher will be guided on how to select curriculum elements based from students’ experiences. Thereafter, the teacher can design appropriate curriculum elements. Likewise, the teacher will be able to promote integrated activities based on the needs, problems and resources not only of the school but also needs of the community. Thus, the reliability of students’ assessment is valid.

As revealed in Table 4, having a good human relationship and better understanding of the teachers’ need while the school heads lead them by setting good example are of significant influence on the teachers’ performance.

The result in the study explains the effectiveness of human relations to teacher’s performance. This implies that the better the school heads understand the teachers’ need and their capacities, the more they become firm with his decision, the better is their relationship. Having this relationship, they can work out easily on identifying the needs and what should be taught to the students while planning the right curriculum for them. Moreover, the findings reveal that the better the relations between the school head and the teacher, the better and easier for the teacher to assess and report students’ achievement among young pupils. Supervision and improvement of instruction as functions of the school head in having a valid assessment and reporting of students’ grade as shown in the table is very important.

The findings reveal the effectiveness of supervision and improvement of instruction. This suggests that the school head has clear goals and plans on how the teachers’ instruction be improved, what should be the teaching contents and what curriculum will be suited after considering individual differences and needs. Moreover, the findings justify that the more the school head focuses on instruction the more the assessment and reporting of the student’s progress becomes valid.

It is seen in the table that proper delegation plays an important factor in teacher’s performance as school head can give enough support and distribute works suited for the right person. Delegation as one of the core concepts of management leadership is one way of giving subordinates to enhance their abilities and skills.

The result in the study justifies the effectiveness of delegation of works to teacher’s performance. This suggests that the better the delegation of work is given and equally distributed the better the teacher can work on the content of their lesson and learning of their student. It is a burden to the teacher having full workload while working on the curriculum suited for their students’ different needs and ability and it will be hard for the teacher to spend sometime for their professional and personal development. Moreover, the findings reveal that having task delegated can give more time to the teacher analyzing and identifying the right assessment to be given to their students as well as in reporting student’s achievement and progress. Delegation was deemed effective in giving the teachers more chances to acquire professional knowledge and skill development. Further, they felt that they have elevated self-esteem and confidence.

5. Barriers in the supervisory functions of school heads significantly related to the teachers’ mean performance
It is revealed in the Table 5 that barriers in the supervisory functions of school head do not have significant relationship with the teachers’ performance. This suggests that teachers can perform well in providing knowledge and information to students and be effective in classroom management in spite of the school head’s difficulties in supervision brought about by some obstacles arising from changes to which the school head should make expected adjustments. Furthermore, teachers can carry out and manage classroom activities effectively, still have professional development, meet curriculum requirements and adopt reliable assessment procedure for the students in spite of the hindrances that the school head effective supervision of instruction.

The results in the study justify that there was no significant relationship between multitasking as barrier to school head supervisory functions to teachers’ performance. This means that even if school head had more time multitasking, the teachers can still perform well in developing curriculum suited for each student’s needs while identifying the knowledge and skills to be taught. More so, it can be implied that teachers can perform varied activities involved in teaching and learning processes. As seen in the table, communication as a barrier to school head supervisory function has no impact on teachers’ performance. This proves that even if the school head rarely has good and active communication with subordinates, still the teachers were able to engage in collegial discussions where teachers and learners were able to give feedbacks necessary for instructional improvement and effective classroom management. Attitudes and beliefs towards supervision as barrier to school head supervisory functions as shown in the table had no significant relationship to teachers’ performance. The result in the study proved that teacher’s effectiveness and efficiency in their works such as understanding students ‘need which is important in determining what knowledge skills to be taught so that they can apply it in planning the curriculum is not affected by attitudes of the school head and his/her beliefs. As a result, in the study, technical expertise as a barrier in supervisory function had no significant relationship to teachers’ performance. This shows that even the school head lacks technical skills, teachers can still perform well in developing and adopting the curriculum that suits individual needs and interest as well as identifying what teaching strategies and techniques will enhance student’s achievement. Furthermore, teachers still have valid assessments of student’s acquired learning and prompt reporting of their achievements to concerned stakeholders.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, the researcher came up with the following conclusions: School heads’ supervisory functions are found to be effective as a one of the key factors in developing teacher’s performance. The data also revealed that barriers in supervisory functions of school heads have no significant effect in the teacher’s performance.

Thus, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between respondent’s mean perception of supervisory functions of school heads and teachers’ performance is not supported.

As per indicated in the findings, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between the respondent’s mean perception on barriers in the supervisory function of school heads and teachers’ performance is accepted.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are given:

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers in Supervisory Functions</th>
<th>Content Knowledge and Pedagogy</th>
<th>Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners</th>
<th>Curriculum Planning</th>
<th>Assessment and Reporting</th>
<th>Plus factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to Change</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multitasking</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes and Beliefs Towards Supervision</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Expertise</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is revealed in the Table 5 that barriers in the supervisory functions of school head do not have significant relationship with the teachers’ performance. This suggests that teachers can perform well in providing knowledge and information to students and be effective in classroom management in spite of the school head’s difficulties in supervision brought about by some obstacles arising from changes to which the school head should make expected adjustments. Furthermore, teachers can carry out and manage classroom activities effectively, still have professional development, meet curriculum requirements and adopt reliable assessment procedure for the students in spite of the hindrances that the school head effective supervision of instruction.

The results in the study justify that there was no significant relationship between multitasking as barrier to school head supervisory functions to teachers’ performance. This means that even if school head had more time multitasking, the teachers can still perform well in developing curriculum suited for each student’s needs while identifying the knowledge and skills to be taught. More so, it can be implied that teachers can perform varied activities involved in teaching and learning processes. As seen in the table, communication as a barrier to school head supervisory function has no impact on teachers’ performance. This proves that even if the school head rarely has good and active communication with subordinates, still the teachers were able to engage in collegial discussions where teachers and learners were able to give feedbacks necessary for instructional improvement and effective classroom management. Attitudes and beliefs towards supervision as barrier to school head supervisory functions as shown in the table had no significant relationship to teachers’ performance. The result in the study proved that teacher’s effectiveness and efficiency in their works such as understanding students ‘need which is important in determining what knowledge skills to be taught so that they can apply it in planning the curriculum is not affected by attitudes of the school head and his/her beliefs. As a result, in the study, technical expertise as a barrier in supervisory function had no significant relationship to teachers’ performance. This shows that even the school head lacks technical skills, teachers can still perform well in developing and adopting the curriculum that suits individual needs and interest as well as identifying what teaching strategies and techniques will enhance student’s achievement. Furthermore, teachers still have valid assessments of student’s acquired learning and prompt reporting of their achievements to concerned stakeholders.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, the researcher came up with the following conclusions: School heads’ supervisory functions are found to be effective as a one of the key factors in developing teacher’s performance. The data also revealed that barriers in supervisory functions of school heads have no significant effect in the teacher’s performance.

Thus, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between respondent’s mean perception of supervisory functions of school heads and teachers’ performance is not supported.

As per indicated in the findings, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between the respondent’s mean perception on barriers in the supervisory function of school heads and teachers’ performance is accepted.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are given:
1. Since it was found out that supervisory functions of school heads are effective in developing teacher’s performance, they may be encouraged to work on how to improve those functions to the next level to make them very effective.

2. This study may recommend school heads to raise their awareness in barriers in the supervisory functions most especially when it comes to multitasking and resistance to change understanding the cause and effect will be a great help to minimize and overcome those barriers that may limit their capacity.

3. Teacher's performance should be prioritized in terms of identifying and improving their needs, skills, capacity will make a great contribution in the development of each student and also in the educational system.

4. The result of this study may be considered as a roadmap for the school heads to assist teachers who needs supervision and guidance in developing teacher’s performance.
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