



(RESEARCH ARTICLE)



SCHOOL HEADS' SUPERVISORY PRACTICES AND MULTIGRADE TEACHERS' LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE IN THE DIVISION OF QUEZON

Judy Ann M. Aureada *

Department of Education (DepEd) Pitogo District – Division of Quezon Province, Institute of Open and Distance Education Open University System, Polytechnic University of the Philippines, Lopez Campus.

* Corresponding Author

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2026, 32(01), 1793–1808

Publication history: Received on 17 September 2026; revised on 25 October 2026; accepted on 27 October 2026

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2026.32.1.2725>

Copyright © 2026 Author(s) retain the copyright of this article. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between school heads' supervisory practices and multigrade teachers' level of performance in the Third Congressional District of Quezon Province. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, the study involved 25 school heads and 53 multigrade teachers from public multigrade schools. Data were gathered through a validated survey questionnaire adapted from established performance management indicators. The instrument assessed school heads' supervisory practices in terms of leading strategically, managing school operations and resources, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, and building connections. It also measured teachers' performance in content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment, curriculum and planning, and assessment and reporting. Findings showed that school heads demonstrated very satisfactory to outstanding supervisory practices. Their strongest area was focusing on teaching and learning. Multigrade teachers also showed very satisfactory performance across all domains. The chi-square test revealed a significant relationship between overall supervisory practices and teachers' performance. Specific significant links were found between focusing on teaching and learning and teachers' content knowledge, curriculum planning, and assessment practices. Building connections was also significantly related to curriculum planning and assessment reporting. The findings suggest that instructional supervision and stakeholder collaboration support the performance of multigrade teachers. The study recommends sustained technical assistance, focused professional development, and stronger support systems for multigrade instruction.

Keywords: Multigrade Education, Supervisory Practices, Teacher Performance, Instructional Leadership, Quezon Province, PUP Open University

1 INTRODUCTION

Education remains a vital pathway for improving individual capacity and supporting social development. In geographically isolated and underserved communities, multigrade education has become one way to widen access to basic education. It allows learners from different grade levels to study within one classroom under the guidance of one teacher. This arrangement helps sustain schooling in areas where learner populations are small and resources are limited. The implementation of multigrade education also reflects the government's effort to improve participation and academic success in remote communities (SEAMEO INNOTECH, 2020, as cited in Cruz et al., 2023).

In this context, school heads perform a central role in guiding teachers and sustaining learning quality. Their supervisory practices influence how teachers plan lessons, manage learners, use resources, assess learning, and respond to classroom challenges. In multigrade schools, this role becomes more demanding because teachers handle varied grade levels, learning needs, and curriculum expectations at the same time.

Studies in different settings show that multigrade schools face both challenges and opportunities. In African contexts, common concerns include limited resources, diverse learner needs, inadequate teacher preparation, and irregular supervision. At the same time, multigrade schools may benefit from strong community participation, flexible teaching approaches, and collaborative problem-solving. A supportive work environment can help teachers remain motivated and effective despite these conditions.

In Southeast Asian countries and South Asian contexts such as Pakistan, supervisory practices and teacher performance are shaped by cultural values, education policies, and governance systems. Differences in institutional structures may affect how supervision is carried out. Common concerns include resource limitations and uneven quality of supervision. Capacity building, technology integration, regional collaboration, clear professional standards, and evidence-based supervision have been recommended to improve supervisor effectiveness and teacher performance (Torlak et al., 2019).

In the Philippine setting, related studies suggest a positive relationship between supervisory practices and teacher performance in multigrade schools. These studies also point to the need for targeted support for school heads. Such support should focus on leadership and management skills suited to the multigrade context (Cruz et al., 2023). However, available literature remains limited in explaining how this relationship operates in the Division of Quezon. This gap is worth examining because multigrade schools in the division operate under distinct conditions such as resource limitations, geographic isolation, small school populations, and varied instructional needs.

While previous studies have discussed multigrade supervision in broader contexts, fewer studies have provided empirical evidence on the relationship between school heads' supervisory practices and multigrade teachers' level of performance in Quezon. This lack of local evidence limits the basis for designing support programs, supervisory mechanisms, and professional development activities that respond to the actual needs of multigrade schools in the area.

To address this gap, the present study examined the relationship between school heads' supervisory practices and multigrade teachers' level of performance in the Division of Quezon. Specifically, it assessed supervisory practices in terms of leading strategically, managing school operations and resources, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, and building connections. It also examined teachers' performance in content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment, curriculum and planning, and assessment and reporting.

Generally, in providing local empirical evidence, this study contributes to the literature on multigrade education and instructional supervision. Its findings may help guide school heads, district supervisors, and education officials in designing relevant supervisory support, technical assistance, and professional development programs for multigrade schools.

1.1 Profile of Respondents

The reviewed studies show that the profile of school heads and multigrade teachers influences leadership practices and classroom performance. Specifically, age, sex, position, educational attainment, years of service, and training exposure shape how educators respond to the demands of multigrade education (Cruz et al., 2023; Campos García et al., 2020). In this regard, experienced school heads often demonstrate stronger administrative maturity and decision-making. On the other hand, younger teachers may bring energy and openness to innovation. However, they may also experience greater emotional pressure because of the complex nature of multigrade instruction (Oducado et al., 2021; Reyes & Ching, 2024).

Moreover, the literature shows that multigrade education is influenced by workforce structure. Teaching remains largely female-dominated, and female leaders may adopt relational and nurturing supervisory styles suited to school-based support (Llego, 2022; Salazar, 2023; Anzano et al., 2021). In addition, Head Teacher I often serves as the main leadership position in remote schools. Teacher I also remains common among multigrade teachers (DepEd, 2025; SEAMEO INNOTECH, 2020; Philippine Institute for Development Studies, 2021; Naparan & Alinsug, 2021). Therefore, many multigrade schools depend on early-career teachers who work under the guidance of more experienced school heads.

Furthermore, educational attainment and training affect readiness for multigrade work. Graduate education strengthens the school head's capacity for instructional leadership and technical assistance (Hallinger & Murphy, 2020). Likewise, graduate studies may improve teachers' instructional adaptability in mixed-grade classrooms (Bacani, 2021).

Nevertheless, unequal access to training remains a concern. School heads often receive more structured professional development than classroom teachers (OECD, 2019; Oducado et al., 2021). Hence, multigrade schools need aligned and specialized training for both supervisors and teachers (Bual & Sausa, 2022; Naparan & Castañeda, 2021).

1.2 School Heads' Supervisory Practices

Supervisory practices refer to the school head's efforts to support, guide, and evaluate teachers for better instruction and professional growth (Haramain et al., 2023). In multigrade schools, these practices must address limited resources, varied learner needs, and the difficulty of handling different grade levels in one classroom. Thus, strategic leadership and operations management provide the needed structure. When school heads align school plans with multigrade needs, teachers experience clearer roles and stronger support (Oducado et al., 2024; Villanueva, 2023).

In addition, instructional supervision remains the strongest component of school leadership. Coaching, mentoring, and reflective feedback are more effective than top-down supervision (Naparan, 2021; Catuday & Lim, 2022). Through these practices, school heads can help teachers improve differentiated instruction, peer tutoring, and assessment practices. Similarly, SEAMEO INNOTECH (2020) emphasized the need to strengthen school heads' competencies in instructional supervision, coaching, mentoring, and leadership. This can be supported through formal training, Learning Action Cells, and school cluster systems.

Meanwhile, building connections also supports multigrade schools. School heads who work well with stakeholders can mobilize volunteers, secure resources, and sustain school programs (Panganiban & Jaca, 2023; Mendoza, 2026). As a result, these partnerships help address isolation and limited resources in remote schools. Overall, the literature suggests that effective supervision must be strategic, instructional, and collaborative (Chen, 2018; Ahmed et al., 2021; Day et al., 2016).

1.3 Multigrade Teachers' Level of Performance

Multigrade teachers often perform at very satisfactory to outstanding levels despite the demands of their work (Abutay & Cañeda, 2025; Lizada, 2023). Their strengths are commonly observed in classroom management, learner engagement, social integration, lesson planning, and adaptive instruction. However, these strengths require sustained support because multigrade teaching involves differentiated instruction, flexible grouping, curriculum integration, and continuous assessment.

Furthermore, teacher performance is shaped by experience, position, training, and school support. Experienced teachers develop stronger competence in managing several learning levels at the same time (Philippine E-Journals, n.d.; Rashid & Rahman, 2021). Even so, sustainable performance depends on professional development and specialized preparation (Avenido, 2020; Flores, 2019). Without enough training, teachers may continue to use monograde approaches that do not fully match the needs of multigrade classrooms.

In addition, curriculum planning and assessment remain continuing challenges. Teachers must prepare lessons across grade levels while tracking learner progress at the same time (Naparan, 2021). Assessment and reporting may also create pressure because of documentation demands and varied learner performance (Quinto & Beltran, 2024; Mendoza, 2026). Nevertheless, multigrade teachers continue to show resilience, resourcefulness, and adaptability when supported by technical assistance, professional learning communities, and stakeholders (Erden & Henry, 2020; Urzua et al., 2024; Jamaldin et al., 2022; Okamoto, 2020).

1.4 Relationship Between Supervisory Practices and Teachers' Performance

Studies generally show a positive relationship between school heads' supervisory practices and teachers' performance. Supervision improves teacher effectiveness when it includes instructional monitoring, collaboration, empowerment, and professional support (Cheema et al., 2022; Chen, 2018). Likewise, local studies show that supervisory functions help improve teacher performance and sustain classroom quality (Junio et al., 2019; Encanto, 2021).

However, the relationship is not always direct. Multigrade teachers still face concerns related to grade grouping, lesson planning, instructional focus, learning materials, and pre-service preparation (Bongala et al., 2020). In the same way, some studies show that supervision does not always have a significant link with teacher performance when measured only by extent or frequency (Dioso et al., 2023). Therefore, the quality and relevance of supervision may matter more than the amount of supervision provided.

More recent literature presents school heads as instructional partners rather than mere administrators. Direct guidance, balanced supervision, and motivation help teachers manage multigrade demands (Peñaflor, 2022). In particular, technical assistance becomes more effective when it provides specific feedback on multigrade teaching.

In particular, technical assistance becomes more effective when it provides specific feedback for multigrade teaching (Astudillo, 2022). Adaptive supervision also helps teachers cope with isolation and improve lesson quality in Quezon (Dela Cruz & Magpantay, 2024). Thus, supervision must be contextualized to the actual needs of multigrade classrooms (Naparan, 2021).

1.5 Synthesis

Taken together, the reviewed literature indicates that multigrade education depends on the combined strength of teacher competence and school leadership. Respondent profiles affect leadership style, readiness, and instructional practice. Experienced school heads provide stability and guidance, while early-career teachers bring flexibility and openness to new methods (Cruz et al., 2023; Campos García et al., 2020). In addition, supervisory practices support teacher performance when they focus on instructional improvement, mentoring, professional development, and stakeholder collaboration. School heads must move beyond administrative supervision and provide direct support for multigrade teaching (Chen, 2018; Cheema et al., 2022; SEAMEO INNOTECH, 2020). Finally, multigrade teachers show strong performance but continue to need support in differentiated instruction, curriculum planning, assessment, and resource use. For this reason, literature supports the need to examine how school heads' supervisory practices relate to multigrade teachers' level of performance in the Division of Quezon.

2 EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

2.1 Method

This study employed a quantitative research design using the descriptive-correlational method. Descriptive-correlational research is used to describe the characteristics of variables and determine the relationship between them without manipulating the research setting or the respondents. In this study, the descriptive part assessed the profile of the respondents, the school heads' supervisory practices, and the multigrade teachers' level of performance. The correlational part examined whether a significant relationship existed between school heads' supervisory practices and multigrade teachers' performance. This design was appropriate because the study aimed to describe existing conditions in multigrade schools and determine the association between the two major variables. The school heads' supervisory practices were assessed in terms of leading strategically, managing school operations and resources, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, and building connections. Meanwhile, the multigrade teachers' level of performance was measured in terms of content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment, curriculum and planning, and assessment and reporting. Through this design, the study provided a statistical basis for understanding how supervisory practices relate to teacher performance in multigrade school contexts.

2.2 Participants

The participants of the study were school heads and multigrade teachers from public multigrade schools in the Third Congressional District of Quezon. The study covered 11 municipalities with multigrade schools, namely Agdangan, Buenavista I and II, Catanauan, General Luna, Macalelon, Padre Burgos, Pitogo, San Andres, San Francisco I, San Narciso II, and Unisan. Total population sampling was used because the target population was small, accessible, and specialized. Hence, all qualified respondents were included in the study. The participants consisted of 25 school heads and 53 multigrade teachers, for a total of 78 respondents. This approach allowed the study to represent the actual multigrade education context in the district and reduced sampling error for the identified population.

2.3 Source of Data

Primary data were collected from the school heads and multigrade teachers through a survey questionnaire. The instrument was modified from the study of Sison and Junio (2019) titled "School Heads' Supervisory Practices and Teachers' Instructional Performance: Basis for Mentoring Program." The indicators were aligned with the Office Performance Commitment and Review Form and the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form to fit the multigrade school context. The questionnaire had two major parts. The first part gathered the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, position, educational attainment, years of service, and number of multigrade trainings and seminars attended. The second part measured the school heads' supervisory practices and the multigrade teachers' level of performance. The instrument was validated by experts such as a Public Schools District Supervisor, principal, master teacher, multigrade school head-in-charge, school head from a multigrade school, and district multigrade coordinator. After validation, pilot testing was conducted. The reliability test yielded Cronbach's alpha values of 0.88 for the school heads' instrument and 0.89 for the multigrade teachers' instrument, indicating strong internal consistency.

2.4 Data Gathering Procedure

The data gathering process began with the review and consultation of the research instrument with the thesis adviser. After the adviser's approval, the researcher prepared and submitted a formal request to the Office of the Schools Division Superintendent of Quezon to secure permission to conduct the study. Upon approval, the researcher coordinated with the Public Schools District Supervisor and the concerned schools regarding the administration of the questionnaire.

After the required permissions were obtained, the survey questionnaire was distributed to the 25 school heads and 53 multigrade teachers from the 11 municipalities. The questionnaire was administered through Google Forms to make data collection more accessible and efficient. Clear instructions were provided to guide the respondents in answering the items. The responses collected were organized and encoded using Microsoft Excel for tabulation and statistical processing. Confidentiality was observed during the conduct of the study. The responses were used only for research purposes. Personal identifiers were not emphasized in the analysis. The researcher ensured that the data were handled with care and that the findings were presented in summary form.

2.5 Analysis of Data

The data collected were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Frequency and percentage were used to describe the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, position, educational attainment, years of service, and number of multigrade trainings and seminars attended. The mean was used to determine the level of school heads' supervisory practices and the multigrade teachers' level of performance.

The school heads' supervisory practices were analyzed according to five domains: leading strategically, managing school operations and resources, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, and building connections. The multigrade teachers' level of performance was analyzed according to four domains: content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment, curriculum and planning, and assessment and reporting. To determine the significant relationship between school heads' supervisory practices and multigrade teachers' level of performance, the Chi-square test was used. The test examined whether the categorical ratings of supervisory practices were significantly associated with the categorical ratings of teacher performance. A 0.05 level of significance was used as the basis for accepting or rejecting the null hypothesis.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the discussion and interpretation of the findings of the present study on school heads' supervisory practices and multigrade teachers' level of performance in public multigrade schools in the Third Congressional District of Quezon.

This section presents the discussion and interpretation of findings on school heads' supervisory practices and multigrade teachers' level of performance in public multigrade schools in the Third Congressional District of Quezon.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Profile Variable	Category	School Heads f	School Heads %	Multigrade Teachers f	Multigrade Teachers %
Age	Less than 25 years old	1	4.0	1	1.9
	25–40 years old	12	48.0	46	86.8
	40 years old and above	12	48.0	6	11.3
	Total	25	100.0	53	100.0
Sex	Male	9	36.0	8	15.1
	Female	16	64.0	45	84.9
	Total	25	100.0	53	100.0
Position	Head Teacher I / Teacher I	13	52.0	37	69.8

	Head Teacher II / Teacher II	1	4.0	12	22.6
	Head Teacher III / Teacher III	5	20.0	4	7.5
	Principal I	0	0.0	—	—
	Others	6	24.0	—	—
	Total	25	100.0	53	100.0
Educational Attainment	BS Graduate	0	0.0	17	32.1
	MA/MS Units	9	36.0	24	45.3
	MA/MS Graduate	13	52.0	12	22.6
	Ph.D./Ed.D. Units	2	8.0	0	0.0
	Ph.D./Ed.D. Graduate	1	4.0	0	0.0
	Total	25	100.0	53	100.0
Number of Years in Service	Less than 10 years	4	16.0	43	81.1
	10–30 years	21	84.0	10	18.9
	Above 30 years	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Total	25	100.0	53	100.0
Number of MG Trainings and Seminars	1–10	16	64.0	53	100.0
	11–20	6	24.0	0	0.0
	21–30	2	8.0	0	0.0
	30 and above	1	4.0	0	0.0
	Total	25	100.0	53	100.0

The profile of the respondents shows notable differences between school heads and multigrade teachers. In terms of age, school heads were evenly distributed between the 25–40 age group and the 40 years old and above group, with 12 respondents or 48.0 percent in each category. In contrast, most multigrade teachers were 25–40 years old, with 46 respondents or 86.8 percent. This suggests that school heads were generally more mature in professional experience, while teachers were mostly in the early to middle stage of their teaching careers.

Both groups were female dominated. There were 16 female school heads or 64.0 percent and 45 female multigrade teachers or 84.9 percent. This finding supports Anzano et al. (2021), who noted that multigrade teaching remains largely female-dominated. It also agrees with Llego (2022) and Salazar (2023), who observed that female school leaders often use relational and nurturing supervisory styles. However, male representation was higher among school heads than teachers, which suggests that leadership roles were more gender-balanced than classroom teaching roles.

In terms of position, most school heads were Head Teacher I, with 13 respondents or 52.0 percent. Most teachers were Teacher I, with 37 respondents or 69.8 percent. This reflects the staffing pattern in small and remote multigrade schools, where Head Teachers often lead the school and Teacher I personnel handle classroom instruction (DepEd, 2025; SEAMEO INNOTECH, 2020; Philippine Institute for Development Studies, 2021; Naparan & Alinsug, 2021). This also implies that many teachers may need mentoring because they hold lower ranks while handling complex multigrade responsibilities.

Additionally, educational attainment also differed between the two groups. Most school heads were MA/MS graduates, with 13 respondents or 52.0 percent. Meanwhile, most teachers had MA/MS units, with 24 respondents or 45.3 percent. This shows that school heads had stronger formal academic preparation. The finding supports Hallinger and Murphy (2020), who emphasized that graduate education strengthens instructional leadership. It also aligns with Bacani (2021), who noted that graduate studies help teachers improve instructional adaptability.

Likewise, years of service showed a clear contrast. Most school heads had 10–30 years of service, with 21 respondents or 84.0 percent. Meanwhile, most teachers had less than 10 years of service, with 43 respondents or 81.1 percent. This

supports Oducado et al. (2021), who linked longer experience with administrative maturity. It also agrees with Kini and Podolsky (2019), who stated that teachers grow significantly during the first decade of service. Hence, early-career multigrade teachers need sustained coaching and technical assistance.

Furthermore, training exposure also revealed a gap. Most school heads attended 1–10 multigrade trainings, but some had attended more than 10. In contrast, all teachers attended only 1–10 trainings. This supports OECD (2019) and Oducado et al. (2021), who noted that school leaders often receive more structured professional development than teachers. However, Bual and Sausa (2022) stressed that the depth and relevance of multigrade training matter more than attendance alone.

Generally, the profile of the respondents shows a leadership-teacher pattern that is common in multigrade schools. School heads were generally more experienced, higher in educational attainment, and more exposed to professional development. On the other hand, multigrade teachers were mostly younger in service, mostly Teacher I, and had limited exposure to specialized multigrade training. This pattern has a strong implication for supervisory practice. Since many teachers are still developing their competence in multigrade instruction, school heads need to provide consistent technical assistance, mentoring, classroom-based coaching, and support for curriculum and assessment practices. The findings support previous literature showing that demographic and professional characteristics influence school leadership and teacher performance. Cruz et al. (2023) and Campos García et al. (2020) emphasized that age, tenure, education, and related profile variables shape leadership behavior and decision-making. In the present study, the experienced profile of school heads may help strengthen supervision. However, the early-career profile of teachers may require more targeted professional support.

Table 2: Summary of School Heads' Supervisory Practices

Supervisory Domain	Practice	Grand Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Main Result
Leading Strategically		4.49	Very Satisfactory	School heads showed strong planning and data-based instructional supervision.
Managing School Operations and Resources		4.48	Very Satisfactory	School heads maintained safe, inclusive, and supportive school environments.
Focusing on Teaching and Learning		4.64	Outstanding	School heads provided strong technical assistance and instructional support.
Developing Self and Others		4.51	Outstanding	School heads promoted stakeholder engagement and resource mobilization.
Building Connections		4.49	Very Satisfactory	School heads strengthened planning, monitoring, reporting, and school linkages.
Average Grand Mean		4.52	Outstanding	Overall, school heads demonstrated outstanding supervisory practices.

Legend: 1.00–1.50 Poor; 1.51–2.50 Unsatisfactory; 2.51–3.50 Satisfactory; 3.51–4.50 Very Satisfactory; 4.51–5.00 Outstanding.

Table 2 shows that school heads demonstrated strong supervisory practices across the five domains. The average grand mean was 4.52, interpreted as Outstanding. This indicates that school heads were generally perceived as effective in providing leadership, managing school operations, supporting instruction, developing personnel, and building school linkages. Among the five domains, focusing on teaching and learning obtained the highest grand mean of 4.64, interpreted as Outstanding. This was followed by developing self and others with a grand mean of 4.51, also interpreted as Outstanding. Meanwhile, leading strategically and building connections both obtained a grand mean of 4.49, while managing school operations and resources obtained 4.48. These three domains were interpreted as Very Satisfactory.

In addition, the strongest area was focusing on teaching and learning. This finding suggests that school heads placed strong attention on technical assistance, performance evaluation, development planning, and intervention programs for teachers. This is a positive result because multigrade teachers handle learners from different grade levels in one classroom. They need regular coaching to manage varied competencies, learning needs, and assessment tasks. The outstanding rating in this domain implies that school heads were not limited to administrative work. Rather, they also performed their role as instructional leaders who guide teachers in improving classroom practice. This supports Hallinger's (2018) view that effective school leadership becomes more meaningful when it directly focuses on teaching and learning. It also agrees with Robinson et al. (2008), who emphasized that leadership practices related to teacher learning and development have a strong influence on instructional improvement.

Additionally, developing self and others also emerged as a strong area. This domain obtained an Outstanding rating, which indicates that school heads were able to engage stakeholders and mobilize resources for school needs. In multigrade schools, this is highly relevant because many schools operate with limited materials, small staff, and rural school conditions. Stakeholder meetings and partnerships can help schools secure resources and sustain programs. This finding supports Harris and Jones (2019), who explained that school leaders strengthen school improvement by building networks and using collective support. It also aligns with Leithwood et al. (2020), who stated that effective school leadership includes building productive relationships with stakeholders to support learning and school development.

However, some areas still require attention. Managing school operations and resources obtained the lowest grand mean of 4.48, although it remained Very Satisfactory. This does not indicate weak performance. Rather, it shows that operational concerns may be more difficult to sustain in multigrade settings. The lower rating may reflect challenges in improving learner well-being, health support, school facilities, and resource availability. Multigrade schools are often located in remote or underserved communities. Thus, school heads may face limits in physical resources, health-related services, and support systems. This result agrees with the literature stating that resource limitations remain a common concern in multigrade schools. It also supports Leithwood et al. (2020), who emphasized that operational leadership requires the coordination of human, physical, and policy resources to support student outcomes.

Moreover, leading strategically also received a Very Satisfactory rating. The result suggests that school heads were able to use school plans, assessment results, intervention activities, and learner support programs. However, the rating also implies that strategic leadership can still be improved, especially in long-term planning and sustained intervention design. In multigrade schools, strategic leadership must be responsive to specific classroom realities. These include mixed-grade instruction, teacher workload, learner diversity, and limited resources. The finding supports Oducado et al. (2024) and Villanueva (2023), who noted that aligning school plans with the multigrade context reduces role confusion among teachers. It also supports the idea that strategic leadership must be practical and data-informed to improve school outcomes.

Similarly, building connections was also rated Very Satisfactory. This means that school heads were able to support strategic planning, monitoring and evaluation, financial reporting, data management, and stakeholder coordination. However, the result also suggests that stakeholder involvement in planning and financial transparency may still be strengthened. In rural multigrade schools, school-community partnership is not only an added support. It is often necessary for sustaining programs and addressing resource gaps. The finding supports Panganiban and Jaca (2023) and Mendoza (2026), who reported that school heads who manage stakeholder relationships well can attract community support and resources. At the same time, the Very Satisfactory rating indicates the need to make participation more systematic and visible through clearer partnership plans and transparency practices.

In general, the findings imply that school heads in the study were strong instructional and relational leaders. Their supervisory practices were most evident in teaching and learning support and stakeholder engagement. These strengths can help multigrade teachers improve lesson planning, classroom management, differentiated instruction, and assessment practices. However, the results also point to areas for enhancement. School heads may need additional support in operational management, strategic planning, stakeholder participation, and transparent resource management. These areas are especially relevant in multigrade schools where limited resources and complex teaching demands affect daily school operations.

The findings are generally consistent with previous studies. Haramain et al. (2023) described supervisory practices as support, guidance, and evaluation intended to improve instruction and professional growth. The present findings support this view because school heads were rated highly in instructional supervision and personnel development. Similarly, SEAMEO INNOTECH (2020) emphasized the need to strengthen school heads' competencies in supervision, coaching, mentoring, and leadership in multigrade settings. The Outstanding rating in focusing on teaching and learning confirms the relevance of this recommendation.

In contrast, the findings also show that strong instructional supervision does not automatically remove operational and resource-related concerns. Although school heads were rated highly, managing school operations and resources remained the lowest among the domains. This supports earlier literature showing that multigrade schools continue to face resource limitations, physical constraints, and community-related challenges. Therefore, school heads need support not only as instructional leaders but also as resource managers and partnership builders. Taken together, the results indicate that supervisory leadership in multigrade schools must be both instructional and contextualized. School heads should sustain their strong practices in technical assistance and teacher development. At the same time, they should strengthen operational planning, learner support services, stakeholder participation, and financial transparency.

Table 3: Summary of Multigrade Teachers' Level of Performance

Performance Domain	Grand Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Main Result
Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	4.42	Very Satisfactory	Teachers showed strong content knowledge, teaching strategies, and classroom communication.
Learning Environment	4.49	Very Satisfactory	Teachers maintained safe, respectful, inclusive, and learner-centered classrooms.
Curriculum and Planning	4.36	Very Satisfactory	Teachers planned lessons and learning resources based on curriculum requirements.
Assessment and Reporting	4.37	Very Satisfactory	Teachers monitored learner progress and communicated results to stakeholders.
Average Grand Mean	4.41	Very Satisfactory	Overall, multigrade teachers demonstrated very satisfactory performance across all domains.

Legend: 1.00–1.50 Poor; 1.51–2.50 Unsatisfactory; 2.51–3.50 Satisfactory; 3.51–4.50 Very Satisfactory; 4.51–5.00 Outstanding.

Findings on table 3 revealed that multigrade teachers demonstrated a Very Satisfactory level of performance across all four domains. The average grand mean was 4.41, which indicates that teachers were generally competent in content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment, curriculum and planning, and assessment and reporting. Among the four domains, learning environment obtained the highest grand mean of 4.49. This was followed by content knowledge and pedagogy with 4.42, assessment and reporting with 4.37, and curriculum and planning with 4.36. All domains were interpreted as Very Satisfactory.

Results also showed that the highest-rated domain was learning environment. This finding suggests that multigrade teachers were effective in maintaining safe, respectful, inclusive, and learner-centered classrooms. This is a strong result because multigrade teachers handle learners with different grade levels, ages, abilities, and learning needs in one classroom. A positive learning environment helps maintain order, learner participation, and emotional security. The result agrees with OECD (2019) and UNESCO (2020), which emphasized that safe and inclusive classrooms support learner engagement and well-being. It also supports the idea that effective classroom management is necessary in multigrade instruction because teachers must guide several groups of learners at the same time.

Additionally, content knowledge and pedagogy also received a Very Satisfactory rating. This means that teachers were able to apply content knowledge, use varied teaching strategies, and communicate lessons clearly. The highest indicator under this domain was the use of verbal and non-verbal communication strategies. This implies that teachers were able to explain lessons and guide learner participation effectively. This finding supports Hattie (2012), who emphasized that teacher clarity and communication contribute to learner achievement. It also agrees with Little (2006), who explained that multigrade teaching requires flexible and adaptive pedagogy because teachers must address different competencies within one classroom.

However, the results also show areas that need further attention. Curriculum and planning obtained the lowest grand mean of 4.36, although it remained Very Satisfactory. This suggests that teachers were able to plan lessons and align learning outcomes with curriculum requirements. Yet curriculum adaptation may still be challenging. In multigrade classrooms, teachers must prepare learning activities for different grade levels and adjust instruction based on learners' readiness, interests, and needs. This finding supports Tomlinson (2017), who emphasized that differentiated instruction requires flexible planning and careful knowledge of learners. It also reflects Little's (2006) view that curriculum integration is one of the more demanding aspects of multigrade teaching.

Additionally, assessment and reporting also obtained a Very Satisfactory rating, with a grand mean of 4.37. This result indicates that teachers were able to use assessment strategies, monitor learner progress, and communicate results to parents and stakeholders. However, the lower rating in providing timely, accurate, and constructive feedback suggests a possible area for improvement. This may be due to the heavy workload of multigrade teachers who assess learners from different grade levels at the same time. Black and Wiliam (2018) emphasized that formative assessment and feedback help improve learning when they are timely and specific. In this study, the findings imply that teachers may need more support in designing manageable feedback systems for multigrade classes. The results further imply that multigrade teachers possess strong classroom-based competence, especially in creating safe learning environments and delivering instruction. However, planning, curriculum adaptation, assessment, and feedback remain areas for further development. These areas require time, technical support, and sustained professional development. Since many multigrade teachers in the study were Teacher I and had less than 10 years of service, they may benefit from mentoring,

coaching, and Learning Action Cell sessions focused on differentiated instruction, multigrade lesson planning, and assessment practices.

The same with previous literature in the paper, Naparan and Castañeda (2021) and Haramain et al. (2023) emphasized that multigrade teachers need strong classroom management, flexible pedagogy, and continuous instructional support. The present results support these claims because teachers were rated highly in learning environment and pedagogy. However, the lower grand mean in curriculum and planning shows that multigrade teaching remains complex despite generally strong performance. This finding also agrees with Bual and Sausa (2022), who noted that teacher training must be relevant, sustained, and specific to multigrade classroom needs.

Overall, the findings suggest that multigrade teachers in the Third Congressional District of Quezon performed at a Very Satisfactory level. Their strengths were most evident in maintaining positive learning environments and communicating instruction effectively. Still, the results point to the need for stronger support in curriculum adaptation, differentiated planning, assessment design, and timely feedback. These findings highlight the role of school heads in providing continuous technical assistance and instructional supervision to help teachers meet the complex demands of multigrade teaching.

Table 4: Summary of School Heads' Supervisory Practice

School Heads' Supervisory Practice	Teacher Performance Domain	Chi-Square Value	p-value	Decision	Remarks
Leading Strategically	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	2.5557	0.6347	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Leading Strategically	Learning Environment	1.0548	0.9014	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Leading Strategically	Curriculum and Planning	6.4409	0.1686	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Leading Strategically	Assessment and Reporting	5.6243	0.2290	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Managing School Operations and Resources	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	2.3394	0.6736	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Managing School Operations and Resources	Learning Environment	1.1728	0.8826	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Managing School Operations and Resources	Curriculum and Planning	6.0347	0.1966	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Managing School Operations and Resources	Assessment and Reporting	5.2527	0.2623	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Focusing on Teaching and Learning	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	14.9086	0.0049	Reject Ho	Significant
Focusing on Teaching and Learning	Learning Environment	7.1368	0.1288	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Focusing on Teaching and Learning	Curriculum and Planning	22.3254	0.0002	Reject Ho	Significant
Focusing on Teaching and Learning	Assessment and Reporting	20.8698	0.0003	Reject Ho	Significant
Developing Self and Others	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	2.7845	0.5945	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Developing Self and Others	Learning Environment	0.7642	0.9432	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Developing Self and Others	Curriculum and Planning	6.4391	0.1687	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant

Developing Self and Others	Assessment and Reporting	5.6814	0.2242	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Building Connections	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	4.9635	0.2911	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Building Connections	Learning Environment	1.9904	0.7375	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Building Connections	Curriculum and Planning	12.0663	0.0169	Reject Ho	Significant
Building Connections	Assessment and Reporting	10.5949	0.0315	Reject Ho	Significant
Overall Supervisory Practices	Overall Teacher Performance	23.9166	0.0001	Reject Ho	Significant

Legend: Significant if p-value ≤ 0.05 ; Not Significant if p-value > 0.05 .

The chi-square results show that the overall relationship between school heads' supervisory practices and multigrade teachers' level of performance was statistically significant, $\chi^2 = 23.9166$, $p = 0.0001$. Since the p-value was lower than 0.05, the null hypothesis was rejected. This means that school heads' supervisory practices were significantly associated with the performance of multigrade teachers. The finding suggests that supervisory leadership plays a meaningful role in shaping teacher performance in multigrade schools.

A closer look at the specific domains shows mixed results. Leading strategically was not significantly related to any teacher performance domain. It was not significantly related to content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment, curriculum and planning, or assessment and reporting. This implies that strategic leadership may help set direction, goals, and school plans. However, it may not directly affect classroom-level teacher performance. Its influence may be indirect because strategic plans still need to be translated into coaching, technical assistance, and teacher support.

Managing school operations and resources also showed no significant relationship with all teacher performance domains. This means that operational management may support school functioning, safety, and resource availability. However, it may not directly determine teachers' content knowledge, classroom management, curriculum planning, and assessment practices. This finding implies that administrative efficiency alone is not enough to improve instructional performance. Teachers still need direct instructional guidance and professional development.

In contrast, focusing on teaching and learning showed the strongest set of significant relationships. It was significantly related to content knowledge and pedagogy, $\chi^2 = 14.9086$, $p = 0.0049$; curriculum and planning, $\chi^2 = 22.3254$, $p = 0.0002$; and assessment and reporting, $\chi^2 = 20.8698$, $p = 0.0003$. These findings indicate that school heads' direct attention to teaching and learning is strongly connected with teachers' instructional performance. When school heads provide technical assistance, evaluate performance, analyze teachers' strengths and weaknesses, and implement development interventions, teachers are better supported in improving pedagogy, planning lessons, and using assessment data.

However, focusing on teaching and learning was not significantly related to learning environment, $\chi^2 = 7.1368$, $p = 0.1288$. This suggests that classroom climate may depend more on teachers' own classroom management skills, relational practices, and daily interactions with learners. Although school heads can guide teachers, the actual creation of a safe, respectful, and learner-centered environment remains largely within the teacher's classroom practice.

Developing self and others was not significantly related to any teacher performance domain. This means that stakeholder engagement, resource mobilization, and collaborative activities may not directly influence teachers' instructional competence. These practices remain valuable because they strengthen school-community relationships. However, their effect on teacher performance may be indirect. They may support instruction by providing resources, partnerships, and moral support rather than directly improving teaching skills.

Building connections showed significant relationships with curriculum and planning, $\chi^2 = 12.0663$, $p = 0.0169$, and assessment and reporting, $\chi^2 = 10.5949$, $p = 0.0315$. This suggests that school heads who build strong connections with stakeholders may help teachers improve planning and reporting practices. In multigrade schools, partnerships can provide learning resources, parent support, community information, and communication channels. These supports can help teachers prepare lessons and report learner progress more effectively. On the other hand, building connections was not significantly related to content knowledge and pedagogy or learning environment. This indicates that partnerships and external linkages may support school processes, but they may not directly shape teachers' subject

mastery, teaching strategies, or classroom climate. These areas may require more direct supervision, mentoring, and professional learning.

Moreover, the major finding of the table is that supervisory practices become more strongly related to teacher performance when they are directly connected to instruction. Focusing on teaching and learning had three significant links. Building connections had two significant links. Meanwhile, strategic leadership, operational management, and developing self and others did not show direct significant relationships with the teacher performance domains. This pattern implies that the most influential supervisory practices are those that provide direct instructional support and those that strengthen systems for curriculum planning and reporting.

These findings agree with instructional leadership literature. Hallinger (2018) explained that school leadership affects teaching most strongly when leaders focus on classroom instruction, teacher development, and learning improvement. Robinson et al. (2008) also found that leadership practices related to teacher learning and development have stronger effects on instructional outcomes than general administrative practices. The present findings support these views because focusing on teaching and learning was the most consistently significant supervisory domain. The findings also align with Leithwood et al. (2020), who emphasized that school leaders influence teacher performance through supportive conditions, professional capacity-building, and organizational systems. In this study, the overall relationship was significant. However, some specific domains were not significant. This shows that leadership influence is not always direct. Some practices may create enabling conditions, while others directly affect teacher performance. In the context of multigrade schools, the findings have clear implications. School heads should continue strengthening instructional supervision, classroom-based coaching, technical assistance, and performance feedback. These practices can help teachers manage the complex demands of multigrade teaching. School heads should also strengthen stakeholder connections that support curriculum planning and assessment reporting. However, strategic plans and operational systems should be linked more clearly to teacher development activities. This can help ensure that school leadership actions translate into classroom improvement.

In general, the results confirm that school heads' supervisory practices are significantly related to multigrade teachers' performance. The strongest influence appears in practices that directly support teaching and learning. Therefore, multigrade school heads should prioritize instructional leadership, teacher coaching, curriculum support, assessment guidance, and stakeholder-supported planning to improve teacher performance.

4 CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the study concludes that multigrade schools in the Third Congressional District of Quezon are led mostly by experienced and academically prepared school heads and served by predominantly early-career multigrade teachers. School heads demonstrated Very Satisfactory to Outstanding supervisory practices, especially in focusing on teaching and learning and developing self and others. These results show that school heads provide instructional support, technical assistance, performance monitoring, and stakeholder engagement. Multigrade teachers also obtained Very Satisfactory performance across content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment, curriculum and planning, and assessment and reporting. This indicates that they are able to manage multigrade classrooms, deliver instruction, maintain safe learning environments, plan lessons, and monitor learner progress. However, the findings also show areas that still need support, such as specialized multigrade training, differentiated instruction, curriculum adaptation, feedback provision, resource management, and stronger stakeholder participation. The chi-square results further confirmed that supervisory practices are significantly related to teachers' performance. The strongest links were found in instructional supervision and building connections, which means that school heads' direct support for teaching and learning and their collaboration with stakeholders help strengthen teacher performance in multigrade settings.

In view of these conclusions, the study recommends the institutionalization of a structured professional development and mentoring system for multigrade schools. Experienced school heads may serve as mentors to early-career teachers through regular coaching, classroom observation, technical assistance, and post-observation conferences. Schools may also conduct quarterly multigrade-specific training focused on multilevel lesson planning, differentiated instruction, classroom management, assessment design, and timely feedback. Weekly Professional Learning Community sessions may be used to share lesson plans, localized materials, assessment tools, and strategies for managing learners across grade levels. In addition, school heads may adopt a standardized technical assistance model that uses data-based supervision, documented feedback, and follow-up support. They may also strengthen stakeholder advisory councils to mobilize resources for curriculum enrichment, learning materials, assessment support, and school improvement needs. These recommendations may help improve supervisory practices and move multigrade teachers from Very Satisfactory toward Outstanding performance.

STATEMENTS ON COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS

Acknowledgments

The researcher extends her heartfelt gratitude to her thesis adviser, Dr. Fe R. Baronia, for the guidance, expertise, and encouragement generously shared throughout the conduct of this study. The valuable suggestions and insights provided were instrumental in improving this research. Sincere gratitude is also extended to the Schools Division Superintendent of Quezon, Rommel C. Bautista, CESO V, for providing the opportunity to conduct this research study among multigrade teachers in the Third Congressional District. Moreover, the researcher humbly thanks the Officer-in-Charge of the Curriculum Implementation Division, Dr. Walter F. Galarosa, for his continuous assistance and support in facilitating the participation of the multigrade teachers as respondents. Likewise, heartfelt appreciation is expressed to the Third District Multigrade Teachers for their willingness, cooperation, and full support, which greatly contributed to the successful completion of this research. The researcher would also like to extend my heartfelt appreciation to the distinguished panel of examiners—Dr. Rufo N. Bueza, Dr. Walter F. Galarosa, Dr. Rogel L. Limpida, and Dr. Adelia R. Roadilla—whose insightful remarks and comprehensive comments greatly helped improve the quality of this study. I am deeply grateful for their invaluable guidance throughout this process. The researcher dedicates this effort to her family, friends, and colleagues. To her husband, Vincent Teophel O. Aureada, and two sons, Vin Desmond Doss M. Aureada and Viann Theo Thirdy M. Aureada, who are her constant sources of inspiration and strength. Special dedication is given to her sister, Marie Jennylyn S. Mirador, and her mentor, Magdalena N. Fuerte, whose unwavering support, encouragement, and belief in her abilities have been invaluable throughout this journey. Above all, this work is dedicated to God Almighty, the Creator, unwavering pillar, and the source of wisdom, knowledge, and understanding. He has been the researcher's constant strength throughout the course of this thesis, and it is by His guidance alone that she has been able to soar.

Statement of informed consent

Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the Schools Division Superintendent and the concerned supervisors. The purpose of the study was explained to the participants, and their informed consent was obtained before their participation in the survey. Participation was voluntary, and the confidentiality of the information gathered was maintained throughout the research process.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abutay, J. L., & Cañeda, J. M. (2025). Multi-grade teaching: Its effect on teachers and students' performance at Datu Hoffer Ampatuan District. *American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation*, 4(1), 4320. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajmri.v4i1.4320>
- [2] Ahmed, M., Samee, F., & Khalid, S. (2021). Head teachers' instructional supervisory practices and teachers' motivation in teaching. *Pakistan Journal of Education*, 38(1), 59–72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30971/pje.v38i1.489>
- [3] Anzano, S., Vázquez, S., & Liesa, M. (2021). Analysis of initial training in rural schools for teacher training courses: Assessments and perceptions of students as stakeholders. *Pedagogical Trends*, 37, 43–56. <https://doi.org/10.15366/tp2021.37.005>
- [4] Astudillo, J. M. (2022). Technical assistance and multigrade teacher performance: A correlational study. *Philippine Journal of Basic Education*, 7(1), 12–28.
- [5] Avenido, M. J. (2020). Challenges and performance of multigrade teachers in the Visayas region. *Journal of Rural Education Studies*, 12(2), 45–58.
- [6] Bacani, J. B. (2021). *Multigrade teaching in the Philippines: A century of challenges and opportunities*. IIARI Press.
- [7] Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2018). Classroom assessment and pedagogy. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 25(6), 551–575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2018.1441807>
- [8] Bongala, J. V., Bobis, V. B., Castillo, J. P. R., & Marasigan, A. C. (2020). Pedagogical strategies and challenges of multigrade schoolteachers in Albay, Philippines.
- [9] Bual, J. M., & Sausa, L. P. (2022). Competencies and challenges of multigrade teachers: A basis for a training program. *Journal of Research, Policy & Practice in Teachers and Teacher Education*, 12(1), 34–48.
- [10] Campos-García, I., & Zúñiga-Vicente, J. Á. (2020). Strategic decision-making in secondary schools: The impact of a principal's demographic profile. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 21(3), 543–564. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2020.1802653>

- [11] Catuday, J., & Lim, R. (2022). Coaching the coaches: Professional development for school heads in remote areas. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership*, 6(2), 34–49.
- [12] Cheema, A. B., Parveen, A., & Ahmad, M. (2022). Association of head teachers' instructional supervisory practices with teachers' performance. *Journal of Business and Social Review in Emerging Economies*, 8(1), 97–112.
- [13] Chen, C. C. (2018). Facilitation of teachers' professional development through principals' instructional supervision and teachers' knowledge management behaviors. IntechOpen. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.77978>
- [14] Cruz, A., & Madarang, S. (2023). Leadership and management practices of multi-grade school heads in the Division of Camarines Norte. *IRE Journals*, 7.
- [15] Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2016). *Successful school leadership*. Education Development Trust. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED565740.pdf>
- [16] Dela Cruz, R., & Magpantay, F. (2024). Adaptive supervision in the last-mile schools of Quezon Province. *International Journal of Rural Pedagogy*, 9(3), 45–62.
- [17] Department of Education. (2020). *DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads*. Department of Education.
- [18] Department of Education. (2021). *Policy guidelines on the implementation of the multigrade program in Philippine education* (DepEd Order No. 044, s. 2021). Department of Education.
- [19] DepEd, SEAMEO INNOTECH, & UNICEF. (2020). *A review of the current situation and practices of multigrade schools in the Philippines: Full report*. SEAMEO INNOTECH.
- [20] Dioso, A. R. N. O. E. D. (2023, August 10). Effects of supervisory practices of school principals to work performance of teachers. *EPRA Journals*. <https://eprajournals.com/IJCM/article/11126>
- [21] Encanto, B. (2021). Supervisory functions of school heads and barriers in developing teachers' performance. *IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 3(4).
- [22] Erden, H. (2020, February 14). Teaching and learning in multi-graded classrooms: Is it sustainable? *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*. <https://ijci.globets.org/index.php/IJCI/article/view/330>
- [23] Flores, R. (2019). Workload and burnout among multigrade educators in Davao City. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 15(3), 112–125.
- [24] Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143216670652>
- [25] Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (2020). *Instructional leadership and school improvement*. Corwin Press.
- [26] Haramain, T., & Sumapal, L. (2023). Descriptive study on the instructional supervision practices of Bangsamoro school heads: Evaluating their impact on educational improvement. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 22(3). <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2023.18.3.125>
- [27] Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2019). Teacher leadership and educational change. *School Leadership & Management*, 39(2), 123–126. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1574964>
- [28] Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge.
- [29] Jamaldini, M. A., Asif, M., & Sultan, G. A. (2022). The negative effect of multi-grade teaching on the teachers' performance at primary school level in District Mastung, Balochistan. *Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review*, 6(1), 140–139. [https://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2022\(6-I\)12](https://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2022(6-I)12)
- [30] Kini, T., & Podolsky, A. (2016). *Does teaching experience increase teacher effectiveness? A review of the research*. Learning Policy Institute. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org>
- [31] Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
- [32] Little, A. W. (2006). *Education for all and multigrade teaching: Challenges and opportunities*. Springer.
- [33] Lizada, C. (2023). Factors influencing the effectiveness of multigrade teaching in Northern Samar. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 9(6), 201–215.
- [34] Llego, M. A. (2022). *The state of Philippine education: Demographic shifts in the teaching workforce*. TeacherPH.
- [35] Mendoza, A. L. (2026). The digital divide in reporting: Administrative burdens of multigrade teachers in Quezon Province. *Journal of Rural Education and Technology*, 11(1), 5–19.

- [36] Mendoza, F. (2026). The bridge-builders: How school heads in Quezon utilize community connections to support multigrade instruction. *Journal of Rural Education Development*, 10(1), 15–29.
- [37] Mendoza, S. T. (2026). Relational leadership and teacher resilience: A mixed-methods analysis of rural educators. *Journal of Leadership and Management*, 20(1), 5–18.
- [38] Misláng-Sison, D., & Junio, A. (2019). School heads' supervision practices and teachers' instructional performance: Basis for a proposed mentoring program. *ASEAN Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 3(1). <https://www.paressu.org/online/index.php/aseanmrj/article/view/237>
- [39] Naparan, G. B. (2021a). Instructional supervision in the multigrade context: Perspectives from the field. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 4(3), 112–125.
- [40] Naparan, G. B. (2021b). Planning for diversity: The lived experiences of multigrade teachers in curriculum implementation. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 4(2), 12–25.
- [41] Naparan, G. B., & Alinsug, V. G. (2021). Lived experiences of multigrade teachers in remote schools: A phenomenological study. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 4(2), 88–97.
- [42] Naparan, G. B., & Castañeda, R. (2021). Challenges and coping mechanisms of multigrade teachers in the Division of Misamis Occidental. *Journal of Research, Policy & Practice in Teachers and Teacher Education*, 11(1), 30–45.
- [43] OECD. (2019). *TALIS 2018 results (Volume I): Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/1d0bc92a-en>
- [44] Oducado, D., et al. (2024). Aligning SIP with multigrade realities: A case study of Philippine rural schools. *Educational Planning and Policy*, 8(2), 45–60.
- [45] Oducado, R. M., et al. (2021). Professional maturity and leadership styles of primary school heads in the Philippines. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 35(4).
- [46] Okamoto, Y. (2020). Opportunities and challenges in multi-grade teaching using direct and indirect teaching methods with Zurashi and Watari approaches in the Philippines: Kagay-Anon Ria Schools experiences. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3652738>
- [47] Panganiban, G., & Jaca, C. (2023). Stakeholder engagement and the performance of multigrade schools in the Philippines. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 42(1), 10–24.
- [48] Penaflor, J. (2022). The influence of supervisory practices and competence of public elementary school principals on teachers' performance. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 5(6), 423–425. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7295702>
- [49] Philippine E-Journals. (n.d.). Teachers' core behavior competence and teaching performance in multigrade education in the Division of Kalinga. *Philippine Journal of Education Research*. <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=30560>
- [50] Philippine Institute for Development Studies. (2021). *Pressures on public school teachers and the implications for education quality* (Policy Notes No. 2021-01).
- [51] Quinto, P., & Beltran, S. (2024). Assessment bottlenecks in multigrade instruction: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of Educational Measurement and Evaluation*, 7(3), 89–104.
- [52] Rashid, A., & Rahman, S. (2021). The impact of professional development on multigrade teacher performance in Malaysia. *Southeast Asian Journal of Educational Policy*, 8(4), 33–49.
- [53] Reyes, J., & Ching, M. (2024). Emotional labor and resilience among multigrade educators in the Philippines. *Journal of Rural Education*, 9(2), 201–218.
- [54] Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635–674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321509>
- [55] Salazar, D. J. (2023). Supervisory practices of school heads in the Division of Quezon: A gender-based analysis. *Quezon Educators Journal*, 14(1).
- [56] SEAMEO INNOTECH. (2020). *A review of the current situation and practices of multigrade schools in the Philippines: Summary report*. https://www.seameo-innotech.org/portfolio_page/profile-of-multigrade-schools-in-the-philippines/
- [57] Tomlinson, C. A. (2017). *How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms* (3rd ed.). ASCD.

- [58] Torlak, N. G., & Kuzey, C. (2019). Leadership, job satisfaction and performance links in private education institutes of Pakistan. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 68(2), 276–295. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-05-2018-0182>
- [59] UNESCO. (2020a). *Global education monitoring report 2020: Gender report—A new generation: 25 years of efforts for gender equality in education*. UNESCO Publishing.
- [60] UNESCO. (2020b). *Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education: All means all*. UNESCO Publishing.
- [61] Urzúa, C. A. C., Ranjan, R., Saavedra, R. A., & Philominraj, A. (2024). Levels of teacher performance in formative assessment in multigrade and single-grade classrooms. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 18(2), 579–587. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v18i2.21154>
- [62] Villanueva, K. (2023). Resource management and its impact on teacher administrative load in multigrade schools. *Public Sector Management Journal*, 11(2), 77–92.

AUTHOR'S SHORT BIOGRAPHY

	<p>Judy Ann M. Aureada is affiliated with the Department of Education, Pitogo District, Schools Division of Quezon Province, and the Institute of Open and Distance Education, Open University System, Polytechnic University of the Philippines, Lopez Campus. This manuscript was developed from the author's graduate research titled School Head's Supervisory Practices and Multigrade Teacher's Level of Performance in the Division of Quezon. The author acknowledges the support of the participating school heads and multigrade teachers from public multigrade schools in the Third Congressional District of Quezon. The author also extends gratitude to the research adviser, validators, panel of examiners, statistician, grammarian and education officials who provided technical guidance during the conduct of the study. The author declares no conflict of interest. Correspondence concerning this article may be addressed to Judy Ann M. Aureada through her institutional affiliation.</p>
---	--