

School Heads' Instructional Supervisions and Teachers' Job Satisfaction among Elementary Schools in the Ministry of Basic, Higher, and Technical Education (MBHTE) Sulu: Teachers' Perspectives

Assoc. Prof. Proserpina S. Abam, EdD and Delda A. Jamiri-Amdan, EdD
School of Graduate Studies, Sulu State College, Jolo 7400, Philippines
*Corresponding author: gs@sulustatecollege.edu.ph

ABSTRACT. This study investigated the connection between teachers' job satisfaction and the instructional supervision provided by school heads in Sulu's primary schools run by the Ministry of Basic, Higher, and Technical Education (MBHTE). Purposive sampling was used to choose 200 teacher respondents for a descriptive-correlational study design. Results showed that instructional supervision by school heads was generally perceived as highly effective, particularly in identifying teachers' strengths and limitations. Teachers also reported high levels of job satisfaction across multiple dimensions, reflecting a shared positive perception of their work environment. However, the correlation analysis revealed a very weak, negative, and statistically insignificant relationship between instructional supervision and job satisfaction, indicating no meaningful association between the two variables. The study suggests that MBHTE–Sulu school heads should sustain and strengthen their supervision practices to further enhance teacher satisfaction. Additionally, teachers are encouraged to take an active role in promoting job satisfaction, particularly in areas such as advancement and security. Future research may explore contextual factors that could influence the relationship between instructional supervision and job satisfaction.

KEYWORDS: *Educational Management, Workplace Satisfaction, Instructional Leadership*

ARTICLE DETAILS

JEAS-00065; Received: September 29, 2025; Accepted: October 06, 2025; Published Online: October 18, 2025

CITATION:

Abam, Proserpina S. and Jamiri-Amdan, Delda A. (2025). *School Heads' Instructional Supervisions and Teachers' Job Satisfaction among Elementary Schools in the Ministry of Basic, Higher, and Technical Education (MBHTE) Sulu: Teachers' Perspectives*. DOI: 10.62596/q9h2wt36

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by author(s). *Journal of Education and Academic Settings* is published by Stratworks Research Inc. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), allowing redistribution and reproduction in any format or medium, provided the original work is cited or recognized.

Introduction

Education plays a vital role in shaping the minds of the youth and building a better future for the nation. It is through quality education that societies can improve their way of living and effectively respond to the needs of their people. To sustain this, there must be continuous efforts to strengthen educational institutions, improve facilities, and invest in teachers as the core of the learning process.

Teachers hold a crucial responsibility in molding the future generation. Their knowledge, dedication, and classroom practices shape the minds that will lead the world. For teachers to perform effectively, their well-being and job satisfaction must be given serious attention. A favorable emotional state brought on by an individual's evaluation of their work is known as job satisfaction (Crisci et al., 2018). A high level of job satisfaction fosters dedication and motivation,

which greatly raises the standard of schooling as a whole. By creating supportive environments and praising teacher effectiveness, school administrators play a significant part in creating this atmosphere.

One key factor influencing job satisfaction is the instructional supervision of school heads. Beyond administrative oversight, supervision involves coordinating, stimulating, and encouraging professional growth (Suchyadie & Nurjanah, 2016). Teachers value open communication, supportive leadership, fair evaluation, and opportunities for development. When these conditions are met, teachers are more likely to experience fulfillment and maintain motivation in their work.

Prior research highlights how crucial good supervision is for fostering job happiness. One essential component of educational administration is instructional monitoring, which can improve organizational quality and teacher effectiveness (Maldrine & Kiplangat, 2020). İlğan (2015) found that principals' supervisory behaviors significantly affect teachers' job satisfaction, while Baluyos et al. (2019) highlighted the contribution of school heads' supervision to work performance. Gultom et al. (2017) further observed that improving academic supervision, such as fair workload distribution, timely communication, and addressing individual teacher needs, leads to increased job satisfaction.

Herzberg's Motivation–Hygiene Theory, which states that contentment results from internal motivators and dissatisfaction from the lack of necessary hygiene factors, is consistent with this link (Atalic, 2017). Effective instructional supervision can function as both: it motivates teachers through support and recognition while preventing dissatisfaction by ensuring fair and transparent management practices.

Despite numerous international studies, there remains a lack of localized research that explores this relationship in depth. Contextual differences in leadership styles, school environments, and cultural expectations warrant further examination to develop strategies that are relevant to the local educational landscape.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to ascertain how teachers' job happiness is affected by the instructional supervision provided by school leaders. The study aims to offer insights that can enhance teacher well-being and, eventually, educational quality by investigating this association in the local environment.

Research Questions

The purpose of the study was to ascertain how teacher work satisfaction was affected by the supervision of the school head. In particular, the research provided answers to the following queries:

1. What level of instructional supervision do school heads provide in terms of the following indicators:
 - 1.1 Classroom Observation;
 - 1.2 Portfolio Supervision;
 - 1.3 Teachers' Pedagogical Practices;
 - 1.4 Identifying the Strengths and Limitations of Teachers in the Classroom; and
 - 1.5 Designing Various Interventions to Assist Teachers to Reduce their Limitations?
2. What is the level of job satisfaction among teachers in terms of the following dimensions:
 - 2.1 Supervision;
 - 2.2 Colleagues;
 - 2.3 Working Conditions;
 - 2.4 Pay;

- 2.5 Responsibility;
 - 2.6 Work Ethics & Attitudes;
 - 2.7 Advancement;
 - 2.8 Security; and
 - 2.9 Recognition?
3. In elementary schools run by the Ministry of Basic, Higher, and Technical Education–Sulu, are the various aspects of teachers' job satisfaction and the various components of school heads' instructional supervision significantly correlated?

Literature

Instructional Supervision and Its Role in Education

Since education is essential in forming students' brains and futures, it is a key component of societal development. Teachers, as the primary agents of learning, bear the crucial responsibility of nurturing future generations. Because of this, the well-being and professional support of teachers directly influence the quality of instruction provided in classrooms. One of the most significant factors shaping teachers' work experiences is the quality of instructional supervision provided by school heads. Instructional supervision involves processes designed to guide, support, and improve teachers' instructional practices, ensuring that teaching aligns with educational goals and standards (İlğan, 2015; Maldrine & Kiplangat, 2020; Calles, 2025).

Instructional supervision is not limited to fault-finding; rather, it is a collaborative and developmental activity aimed at improving teaching quality and student outcomes. Because it raises the general level of educational institutions, instructional supervision is a crucial component of educational management, as Maldrine and Kiplangat (2020) suggest. Similarly, İlğan (2015) found that school principals' supervisory behaviors significantly affect teachers' levels of job satisfaction. Effective supervision typically involves setting performance goals, providing constructive feedback, facilitating professional growth, and ensuring a supportive work climate. These supervisory actions contribute not only to teacher development but also to broader school improvement efforts (Baluyos et al., 2019; Salve, 2025).

Herzberg's Motivation–Hygiene Theory offers a useful lens for understanding the impact of supervision on teacher satisfaction. This theory holds that hygiene factors are extrinsic features that prevent unhappiness but do not always motivate, whereas motivators are intrinsic variables that lead to satisfaction. Instructional supervision functions as both: it motivates teachers by supporting professional growth while also serving as a hygiene factor by ensuring fair treatment and supportive conditions (Atalic, 2017; Alviola, 2025). This dual function highlights why effective supervision by school heads can strongly influence teachers' morale and overall job satisfaction.

Factors Influencing Teacher Job Satisfaction

A favorable emotional state brought on by an evaluation of one's work or work experiences is known as job satisfaction (Crisci et al., 2018; Supian, 2025). For teachers, job satisfaction encompasses multiple dimensions such as recognition, professional development opportunities, fair workload distribution, collegial support, and meaningful feedback. Increasing teachers' job satisfaction contributes significantly to their motivational beliefs and work commitment, which in turn impact student learning outcomes and institutional performance (Crisci et al., 2018; Gultom et al., 2017; Rellon, 2024).

Among the various elements influencing teacher satisfaction, the principal's or school head's supervision has a significant impact. Suchyadie and Nurjanah (2016) emphasize that teachers not only expect tangible rewards but also desire an organizational climate characterized by openness, fairness, attention, and support. When school leaders provide recognition, opportunities for growth, and equitable treatment, teachers experience higher satisfaction. Conversely, inadequate supervision, lack of recognition, or limited development opportunities can lead to demotivation and decreased performance.

Moreover, the organizational environment shaped by school heads plays a critical role in shaping teachers' perceptions of their work. A supportive supervisory environment fosters trust, communication, and professional growth, while a punitive or indifferent approach may create feelings of stagnation or dissatisfaction. Suchyadie and Nurjanah (2016) explain that the relationship between job satisfaction and supervision may result in two outcomes: a sense of professional attainment or a lack of motivation to work. This dichotomy underscores the pivotal role of school leadership in shaping teachers' experiences and performance.

Supervision Practices and Their Impact

Instructional supervision encompasses a range of practices intended to improve teaching quality and support teachers' professional growth. These practices include classroom observations, post-observation conferences, mentoring, collaborative planning, performance feedback, and opportunities for reflective practice. Effective supervisory practices foster a collegial environment, where teachers feel supported rather than scrutinized, leading to improved motivation and commitment. İlğan (2015) confirmed that principals' supervisory behaviors are significant predictors of teacher job satisfaction, whereas Baluyos et al. (2019) highlighted that good supervision improves overall school results and teacher performance.

Supervisory duties such as setting clear expectations, providing timely and constructive feedback, and promoting professional development opportunities contribute to teachers' sense of purpose and belonging in the institution. Teachers are more likely to feel appreciated and content in their positions when they believe that supervision is fair, developmental, and improvement-focused rather than compliance-focused. Conversely, inconsistent or ineffective supervision can undermine morale, limit growth, and lead to professional stagnation. This dynamic illustrates the critical link between leadership practices and teachers' affective experiences in the workplace.

Identifying Teachers' Strengths and Limitations

Finding instructors' areas of strength and growth is one of the main purposes of supervision so that specific help can be given. Through classroom visits, feedback sessions, and ongoing dialogue, school heads can better understand teachers' instructional practices and align professional development initiatives accordingly. This process not only improves instructional quality but also creates a sense of professional recognition and growth, both of which are key drivers of job satisfaction (Gultom et al., 2017; Alcasoda et al., 2025).

Effective supervision recognizes and builds upon teachers' strengths while addressing limitations constructively. When supervision focuses on collaboration and professional learning, rather than fault-finding, teachers are more receptive to feedback and motivated to improve their practice. Additionally, this strategy fosters a healthy school climate where educators are encouraged to keep improving their craft and feel appreciated as professionals. In contrast, supervision that is perceived as punitive or superficial may fail to identify genuine needs and can lead to feelings of alienation or demotivation.

Interventions and Related Studies

Numerous research, both domestically and abroad, have shown that instructional monitoring and teacher job satisfaction are positively correlated. İlğan (2015) confirmed the crucial role of leadership in influencing teacher experiences by finding that principals' instructional supervision behaviors were significant predictors of teachers' job satisfaction. Similarly, Gultom et al. (2017) emphasized that improving academic supervision, such as through fairer workload distribution, effective communication of memos, and individualized support, can lead to higher levels of teacher satisfaction.

Local studies echo these findings, underscoring the importance of supervision in the Philippine educational context. Baluyos et al. (2019) observed that school heads' supervision contributes directly to teachers' work performance, which in turn affects school effectiveness. These findings highlight the need for supervisory practices that are responsive to local contexts, including cultural expectations, institutional structures, and resource availability. While foreign literature provides valuable frameworks, localized studies are essential to ensure relevance and applicability (Atalic, 2017; Reamico et al., 2025; Cutillas et al., 2025).

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory further supports the notion that supervision acts as both a motivator and a hygiene factor. By fostering conditions that promote growth and addressing factors that prevent dissatisfaction, effective supervision can significantly enhance teacher morale, commitment, and performance. These theoretical insights, coupled with empirical evidence, affirm the central role of instructional supervision in achieving both teacher well-being and educational quality.

Synthesis and Conclusion

The body of research continuously confirms that school administrators' oversight of instruction has a significant impact on teachers' work satisfaction. Effective supervision encompasses developmental, collaborative, and context-sensitive practices that build teachers' capacities and foster supportive working environments. When supervision identifies strengths, addresses limitations, and provides meaningful professional development, teachers experience higher satisfaction, motivation, and performance. Conversely, inadequate or unsupportive supervision can lead to demotivation and stagnation.

Localized research remains essential to fully understand the dynamics of supervision and job satisfaction within specific educational contexts. By deepening the exploration of these relationships, school leaders can design supervisory practices that not only enhance teacher satisfaction but also improve overall school performance and student learning outcomes. In this way, investing in effective instructional supervision is ultimately an investment in the future of education itself.

Methodology

According to Harris (1979), research methodology serves as a structured plan that directs the researcher throughout the entire course of a scientific study, from its initial stages to its completion. As a result, this section gives a summary of the main methodological elements, such as the research design, study setting, participants, instruments, sampling techniques, data collection methods, strategies for guaranteeing validity and reliability, and statistical techniques used.

1. Research Design

The variables of teacher job satisfaction and instructional supervision by school administrators, as well as their interactions, were described in the study using a descriptive-correlation research method in the past tense. This study attempted to investigate the scope of supervisory procedures used by school heads, including portfolio monitoring, classroom observations, and the creation of plans to improve teacher performance. It also evaluated teachers' job satisfaction across several dimensions, including supervisory support, working conditions, compensation, and acknowledgment. A quantitative research design was employed, utilizing survey questionnaires adapted from prior research. Data were processed using SPSS, with both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques applied to explore the relationships among variables. Furthermore, regression analysis was conducted to assess how instructional supervision influences teachers' job satisfaction.

2. Research Locale

During the 2023–2024 school year, the study was carried out in the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (BARMM) Division of Sulu, which is under the Ministry of Basic, Higher, and Technical Education (MBHTE). The participating schools were located throughout the province of Sulu.

3. Respondents of the study

During the 2023–2024 academic year, 200 primary school teachers working for the Ministry of Basic, Higher, and Technical Education (MBHTE) in 19 districts in the Division of Sulu participated in the study. The sample consisted of elementary teachers from various districts, selected purposively from randomly identified areas within the division. A total of 200 respondents were included, and their distribution across MBHTE-Sulu elementary schools is summarized in the table below.

No.	Ministry of basic, Higher, and Technical Education (MBHTE), Division of Sulu	Teachers
1	Indanan North District	10
2	Indanan South District	10
3	Jolo District	20
4	Kalingalan Caluang District	10
5	Laminusa District	10
6	Lugus District	10
7	Luuk District	10
8	Maimbung District	10
9	Omar District	10
10	Panamao District	10
11	Pangutaran District	10
12	Parang District	10
13	Pata District	10
14	Patikul District	10
15	Siasi District	10
16	Sibaud District	10
17	Talipao District	10
18	Tapul District	10
19	Tongkil District	10

TOTAL

200

4. *Sampling design*

Two hundred (200) elementary school teachers from MBHTE-Sulu Division were chosen for this study utilizing a non-probability sample design and the purposive sampling method, depending on their availability.

5. *Data gathering procedure*

The researcher first obtained an official request letter and certification from Sulu State College's School of Graduate Studies for the data gathering phase. Approval was then obtained from the Schools Division Superintendent of Sulu, followed by permission from the respective District Supervisors and elementary school principals. Data were personally collected by the researcher from the identified teacher-respondents. After gathering the responses, the data were systematically tallied, organized, subjected to statistical treatment, and subsequently interpreted and analyzed.

6. *Research instrument*

A survey questionnaire covering important topics such as classroom observation, portfolio monitoring, and identifying teachers' strengths and areas for development was used to collect data on school heads' instructional supervision. The Baggay et al. (2021) study served as the model for the instrument. Likewise, teachers' job satisfaction levels were assessed using a questionnaire derived from Lester's (1987) work, with slight adjustments made to align it with the local context.

7. *Validity and reliability*

At least two specialists from the Sulu State College Graduate Studies department evaluated the study's instruments to make sure they were appropriate for local contexts. The instruments were modified from standardized questionnaires that had been used in other studies.

8. *Statistical treatment of data*

The data gathered for the present research was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical methods. The mean and standard deviation were calculated to evaluate the degree of instructional supervision provided by school heads in order to address the first study problem. This was examined across several indicators, including classroom observation, portfolio monitoring, teachers' pedagogical practices, the identification of teachers' strengths and areas for improvement, and the formulation of appropriate interventions aimed at addressing identified gaps.

The mean and standard deviation were also used to assess the degree of job satisfaction among teachers for the second research problem. Numerous factors, including supervision, relationships with coworkers, working conditions, pay, responsibilities, work ethics and attitudes, prospects for professional progress, job security, and recognition, were taken into consideration while measuring this.

The third research question was addressed by applying the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson r) to ascertain the extent of the relationship between the various aspects of teachers' job satisfaction and the elements of instructional supervision provided by school heads in elementary schools under the Ministry of Basic, Higher, and Technical Education (MBHTE)-Sulu.

In interpreting the results derived from both descriptive and inferential statistical analyses, specific rating scale intervals were used. For the extent of school heads' instructional supervision, a five-point Likert scale was employed, with scale values ranging from 1.00 to 5.00. Scores between 4.50 and 5.00 indicated a very great extent of instructional supervision, while those between 3.50 and 4.49 reflected a great extent. Scores falling between 2.50 and 3.49 were

interpreted as a moderate extent, those between 1.50 and 2.49 as some extent, and those between 1.00 and 1.49 as not at all.

Similarly, the measurement of teachers' job satisfaction also utilized a five-point Likert scale, with interpretations corresponding to specific scale intervals. Scores between 4.20 and 5.00, interpreted as "Always," indicated very high satisfaction, while scores from 3.40 to 4.19, or "Often," were categorized as high satisfaction. Scores ranging from 2.60 to 3.39, interpreted as "Sometimes," indicated moderate satisfaction. Scores between 1.80 and 2.59, or "Rarely," reflected low satisfaction, while scores between 1.00 and 1.79, interpreted as "Never," indicated no satisfaction.

Results

The analysis, presentation, and interpretation of the results obtained from the data gathered for this study, which aimed to investigate the impact of instructional supervision by school heads on teachers' job satisfaction in the province of Sulu—are presented in this chapter. The main topic of discussion is how much teacher respondents thought their school heads' supervisory methods were effective, specifically in the areas of classroom observation, portfolio supervision, pedagogical practices, identifying teachers' areas of strength and growth, and developing interventions to overcome these constraints.

In addition, this chapter explores the level of teachers' job satisfaction as reflected in various dimensions, including supervision, collegial relationships, working conditions, compensation, responsibility, work ethics and attitudes, opportunities for advancement, job security, and recognition.

According to the study questions and the statistical techniques used, the results are systematically analyzed, presented, and interpreted in the parts that follow:

1. What level of instructional supervision do school heads provide in terms of 1.1 classroom observation, 1.2 portfolio supervision, 1.3 teachers' pedagogical practices, 1.4 identifying the strengths and limitations of teachers in the classroom, and 1.5 designing various interventions to assist teachers to reduce their limitations?

1.1 Classroom Observation

Table 1.1 Level of Instructional Supervisions in terms of classroom observation

Statements	Mean	SD	Rating
1. I believe that classroom observation is an effective method for instructional supervision.	4.31	1.09	Great Extent
2. It is important for school heads to regularly conduct classroom observations to monitor and support teachers' instructional practices.	3.97	1.1	Great Extent
3. I think that classroom observation helps identify areas for improvement in teaching and learning.	3.68	1.247	Great Extent
4. I agree that classroom observation provides valuable feedback to teachers to help them improve instructional practices.	2.84	1.459	Moderate Extent
5. I believe that school heads should provide constructive feedback to teachers based on their classroom observations.	4.05	1.251	Great Extent
6. It is important for school heads to recognize and appreciate effective instructional practices during classroom observations.	4.14	1.018	Great Extent
7. I think that classroom observation fosters a culture of continuous improvement in teaching and learning.	3.65	1.022	Great Extent

8. I support the use of classroom observation data to inform professional development opportunities for teachers.	3.49	1.075	Moderate Extent
9. I believe that classroom observation helps school heads ensure that instructional practices align with the school's goals and standards.	3.6	1.195	Great Extent
10. I think that classroom observation is an essential aspect of instructional supervision for school heads.	3.19	1.312	Moderate Extent
Total	3.6895	0.73021	Great Extent

Legend: 4.50-5.00 = Very Great Extent (VGE), 3.50-4.49 = Great Extent (GE), 2.50-3.49 = Moderate Extent (ME), 1.50-2.49 = Some Extent (SE), 1.00-1.49 = Not at all (NA)

The level of classroom observation-focused instructional monitoring is shown in Table 1.1. Teachers appear to view classroom observation as a successful supervisory approach, as indicated by the overall mean of 3.69, which is interpreted as Great Extent. Most indicators recorded relatively high ratings (3.60–4.31), emphasizing its role in monitoring performance, offering support, and ensuring alignment with institutional objectives. A few items received Moderate Extent ratings (2.84–3.49), reflecting varied perspectives on its usefulness for feedback and professional growth.

1.2 Portfolio Supervision

Table 1.2 Level Instructional Supervisions in terms of portfolio supervision

Statements	Mean	SD	Rating
1. I believe that portfolio supervision is an effective method for documenting and evaluating teachers' professional growth.	3.65	1.129	Great Extent
2. It is important for school heads to review and provide feedback on teachers' portfolios as part of instructional supervision.	4.3	0.868	Great Extent
3. I agree that portfolios help showcase teachers' professional achievements and growth over time.	3.88	1.182	Great Extent
4. I think that portfolio supervision encourages teachers to reflect on their instructional practices and professional development.	3.94	1.092	Great Extent
5. I believe that portfolios provide evidence of teachers' commitment to continuous improvement in their teaching.	3.56	1.29	Great Extent
6. It is important for school heads to recognize and celebrate the accomplishments and growth shown in teachers' portfolios.	4.25	0.819	Great Extent
7. I support the use of portfolios as a tool for setting and monitoring professional goals for teachers.	4.1	0.789	Great Extent
8. I believe that portfolio supervision fosters a culture of accountability and professionalism among teachers.	4.05	0.8	Great Extent
9. I think that portfolios help school heads identify and support teachers' professional needs and aspirations.	3.79	1.005	Great Extent
10. I agree that portfolio supervision is an essential aspect of instructional supervision for school heads.	3.72	0.926	Great Extent
Total	3.923	0.52617	Great Extent

Legend: 4.50-5.00 = Very Great Extent (VGE), 3.50-4.49 = Great Extent (GE), 2.50-3.49 = Moderate Extent (ME), 1.50-2.49 = Some Extent (SE), 1.00-1.49 = Not at all (NA)

The results on portfolio oversight are shown in Table 1.2. With a standard deviation of 0.53 and an overall mean of 3.92 (Great Extent), opinions regarding its efficacy are largely consistent and favorable. The highest rating (mean = 4.30) underscores the value of reviewing and giving feedback on teacher portfolios, while the lowest (mean = 3.56) relates to using portfolios as evidence of professional commitment, which still falls within the “Great Extent” range.

1.3 Teachers' Pedagogical Practices

Table 1.3 Level of Instructional Supervisions in terms of teachers' pedagogical practices

Statements	Mean	SD	Rating
1. I believe that teachers' pedagogical practices play a crucial role in student learning and achievement.	4.14	.781	Great Extent
2. It is important for school heads to support and promote effective pedagogical practices among teachers.	4.15	.721	Great Extent
3. I agree that teachers' pedagogical practices should be aligned with the school's instructional goals and standards.	3.62	1.040	Great Extent
4. I think that school heads should provide opportunities for teachers to collaborate and share successful pedagogical strategies.	4.00	.851	Great Extent
5. I believe that school should recognize and appreciate teachers who demonstrate exemplary pedagogical practices.	4.23	1.088	Great Extent
6. It is important for school heads to provide professional development opportunities for teachers to enhance their pedagogical skills	4.31	.745	Great Extent
7. I support the use of pedagogical observations and feedback to help teachers improve their instructional practices.	4.02	.924	Great Extent
8. I believe that effective pedagogical practices contribute to a positive and engaging learning environment for students.	4.14	.874	Great Extent
9. I think that teachers should be encouraged to continuously reflect on and improve their pedagogical practices.	4.18	.918	Great Extent
10. I agree that teachers' pedagogical practices are a fundamental aspect of instructional supervision for school heads.	4.26	.846	Great Extent
Total	4.104	0.48452	Great Extent

Legend: 4.50-5.00 = Very Great Extent (VGE), 3.50-4.49 = Great Extent (GE), 2.50-3.49 = Moderate Extent (ME), 1.50-2.49 = Some Extent (SE), 1.00-1.49 = Not at all (NA)

The findings on teaching techniques are collected in Table 1.3. The efficiency of supervision in this area is strongly agreed upon, as evidenced by the overall mean of 4.10 and the standard deviation of 0.48. The highest score (mean = 4.31) emphasizes the importance of professional development in enhancing instructional skills. Meanwhile, the lowest (mean = 3.62) pertains to aligning classroom practices with school goals, still interpreted as Great Extent, though slightly less emphasized.

1.4 Identifying the Strengths and Limitations of Teachers in the Classroom

Table 1.4 Level of Instructional Supervisions in terms of identifying the strengths and limitations of teachers in the classroom

Statements	Mean	SD	Rating
1. I believe that identifying the strengths and limitations of teachers is essential for supporting their professional growth.	4.52	.501	Very Great Extent
2. It is important for school heads to recognize and celebrate the strengths and achievements of teachers in the classroom.	4.66	.477	Very Great Extent
3. I agree that acknowledging and addressing teachers' limitations can lead to improved instructional practices.	4.53	.501	Very Great Extent
4. I think that school heads should provide constructive feedback to help teachers address their limitations and improve their performance.	4.53	.500	Very Great Extent
5. I believe that knowing the strengths and limitations of teachers helps school heads tailor support and professional development opportunities.	4.60	.492	Very Great Extent
6. It is important for school heads to create a culture where teachers feel comfortable discussing their strengths and limitations.	4.59	.494	Very Great Extent
7. I support the use of ongoing assessment and feedback to help school heads identify teachers' areas of strength and areas for improvement.	4.45	.624	Great Extent
8. I believe that teachers' strengths should be recognize and leveraged to benefit the entire school community.	4.18	.648	Great Extent

9. I think that acknowledging and addressing limitations in teachers fosters a culture of continuous improvement in the school	4.59	.494	Very Great Extent
10. I agree that identifying the strengths and addressing limitations in teachers fosters a culture of continuous improvement in the school.	4.59	.493	Very Great Extent
Total	4.5215	0.35072	Very Great Extent

Legend: 4.50-5.00 = Very Great Extent (VGE), 3.50-4.49 = Great Extent (GE), 2.50-3.49 = Moderate Extent (ME), 1.50-2.49 = Some Extent (SE), 1.00-1.49 = Not at all (NA)

How school administrators determine instructors' strengths and weaknesses is displayed in Table 1.4. Teachers strongly support these behaviors, with an overall mean of 4.52 (Very Great Extent) and a standard deviation of 0.35. The top-rated item (mean = 4.66) focuses on acknowledging teachers' accomplishments, while the lowest (mean = 4.18) involves maximizing strengths for the wider school community, both still rated highly.

1.5 Designing Various Interventions to Assist Teachers to Reduce their Limitations

Table 1.5 Level of Instructional Supervisions in terms of designing various interventions to assist teachers to reduce their limitations

Statements	Mean	SD	Rating
1. I believe that it is important for school heads to provide support and interventions to help teachers reduce their limitations.	3.94	.975	Great Extent
2. It is ethical essential for school heads to offer personalized and targeted interventions to address specific areas of improvement for teachers.	3.57	.959	Great Extent
3. I agree that designing various interventions can help teachers overcome their limitations interventions and improve their instructional practices.	3.49	1.032	Great Extent
4. I think that school heads should collaborate with teachers to co-create and implement interventions to support their professional growth.	3.62	1.031	Great Extent
5. I believe that interventions should be tailored to each teacher's individual needs and areas of improvement.	3.62	1.193	Great Extent
6. It is important for school heads to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions in helping teachers reduce their limitations.	4.26	.711	Great Extent
7. I support the use of ongoing coaching and mentoring as interventions to assist teachers in addressing their limitations.	3.92	.732	Great Extent
8. I think that providing interventions to help teachers reduce their limitations demonstrates a commitment to their professional development.	4.04	.656	Great Extent
9. I agree that designing various interventions can contribute to a positive and supportive school culture.	4.03	.808	Great Extent
10. I believe that assisting teachers in reducing their limitations is a crucial aspect of instructional supervision for school heads.	4.01	.980	Great Extent
Total	3.848	0.59436	Great Extent

Legend: 4.50-5.00 = Very Great Extent (VGE), 3.50-4.49 = Great Extent (GE), 2.50-3.49 = Moderate Extent (ME), 1.50-2.49 = Some Extent (SE), 1.00-1.49 = Not at all (NA)

When creating interventions to overcome teachers' shortcomings, supervisory methods are outlined in Table 1.5. There is widespread consensus regarding its use, as seen by the overall mean of 3.85 (Great Extent) and a standard deviation of 0.59. The highest score (mean = 4.26) stresses monitoring and evaluation of interventions, while the lowest (mean = 3.49) reflects relatively less uniform perceptions, though it remains within the "Great Extent" category.

2. What is the level of job satisfaction among teachers in terms of 2.1 Supervision, 2.2 Working with Colleagues, 2.3 Working Conditions, 2.4 Pay, 2.5 Responsibility, 2.6 Work Ethics & Attitudes, 2.7 Advancement, 2.8 Security, and 2.9 Recognition?

2.1 Supervision

Table 2.1 Level of Job Satisfaction in terms of Supervision

Statements	Mean	SD	Rating
1. I am satisfied with the level of support and guidance provided by my supervisors.	4.46	0.625	Often
2. I feel that my supervisors are approachable and receptive to feedback and concerns.	4.59	0.62	Always
3. I am satisfied with the quality and frequency of supervision and feedback on my teaching performance.	4.19	0.753	Often
4. I feel that my supervisors recognize and support my professional development and growth.	4.39	0.721	Often
5. I am satisfied with the level of leadership and direction provided by my supervisors.	4.53	0.626	Always
Total	4.431	0.4854	Often

Legend: 4.50-5.00 = Always (A), 3.50-4.49 = Often (O), 2.50-3.49 = Sometimes (S), 1.50-2.49 = Rarely (R), 1.00-1.49 = Never (N)

Teachers' job satisfaction with regard to supervision is shown in Table 2.1. A typically high and stable degree of satisfaction is indicated by the overall mean of 4.431 (Often) with a low standard deviation of 0.4854. The highest-rated item (mean = 4.59) reflects teachers' positive perception of supervisors' approachability and responsiveness, while the lowest-rated item (mean = 4.19) points to some room for improvement in the quality and frequency of feedback.

2.2 Working with Colleagues

Table 2.2 Level of Job Satisfaction in terms of Working with Colleagues

Statements	Mean	SD	Rating
1. I am satisfied with the level of collaboration and cooperation with my colleagues.	4.53	0.5	Always
2. I feel that the school fosters a positive and supportive work environment among teachers.	4.47	0.5	Often
3. I am satisfied with the level of communication and teamwork with other educators.	4.6	0.611	Always
4. I feel that my colleagues contribute to my job satisfaction and professional growth,	4.47	0.617	Often
5. I am satisfied with the level of camaraderie and mutual respect among my fellow teachers.	4.6	0.491	Always
Total	4.531	0.35619	Always

Legend: 4.50-5.00 = Always (A), 3.50-4.49 = Often (O), 2.50-3.49 = Sometimes (S), 1.50-2.49 = Rarely (R), 1.00-1.49 = Never (N)

Teachers' job satisfaction with their coworkers is summed up in Table 2.2. Consistently high satisfaction levels are indicated by the low standard deviation of 0.35619 and the overall mean of 4.531 (Always). The highest mean score (4.60) reflects strong satisfaction with communication, teamwork, and camaraderie among teachers. The lowest score (4.47), though still high, suggests minor areas for improvement in fostering a supportive environment and enhancing colleagues' contributions to professional growth.

2.3 Working Conditions

Table 2.3 Level of Job Satisfaction in terms of Working Conditions

Statements	Mean	SD	Rating
1. I am satisfied with the physical environment and facilities in our school.	4.34	.792	Often
2. I feel that the school provides a safe and healthy working environment for teachers.	4.20	.655	Often

3. I am satisfied with the level of support and resources for classroom management and instruction.	4.47	.715	Often
4. I feel that the school's working conditions contribute to my overall job satisfaction.	4.67	.473	Always
5. I am satisfied with the level of technological resources and equipment available for teaching and learning.	4.60	.610	Always
Total	4.454	0.51499	Often

Legend: 4.50-5.00 = Always (A), 3.50-4.49 = Often (O), 2.50-3.49 = Sometimes (S), 1.50-2.49 = Rarely (R), 1.00-1.49 = Never (N)

The degree of job satisfaction among instructors with regard to working conditions is displayed in Table 2.3. With a standard deviation of 0.51, the overall mean of 4.45, which can be translated as "Often," indicates typically high and consistent satisfaction. The highest mean score (4.67) highlights the positive influence of favorable working environments, while the lowest (4.20) pertains to safety and health measures, indicating minor areas where improvements could be made.

2.4 Pay

Table 2.4 Level of Job Satisfaction in terms of Pay

Statements	Mean	SD	Rating
1. I am satisfied with the level of compensation and benefits provided by my agency.	4.54	.500	Always
2. I feel that my pay reflects my qualifications, experiences, and dedication to teaching.	4.27	.442	Often
3. I am satisfied with the opportunities for financial incentives and rewards for my performance as a teacher.	4.46	.617	Often
4. I am satisfied with the transparency and fairness in the agency's compensation policies.	4.53	.501	Always
5. I feel that my pay is commensurate with the demands and responsibilities of my teaching job.	4.73	.448	Always
Total	4.502	0.35187	Always

Legend: 4.50-5.00 = Always (A), 3.50-4.49 = Often (O), 2.50-3.49 = Sometimes (S), 1.50-2.49 = Rarely (R), 1.00-1.49 = Never (N)

Pay-related satisfaction is the subject of Table 2.4. Consistently high levels of satisfaction are indicated by the overall mean of 4.50 (Always) and a standard deviation of 0.35. The top rating (4.73) reflects agreement that compensation aligns with job responsibilities, whereas the lowest score (4.27) suggests slight concerns regarding the match between pay and qualifications.

2.5 Responsibility

Table 2.5 Level of Job Satisfaction in terms of Responsibility

Statements	Mean	SD	Rating
1. I feel that I have a sense of ownership and accountability in my role as a teacher.	4.4	0.617	Often
2. I am satisfied with the level of autonomy and decision-making authority in my teaching position.	4.53	0.5	Always
3. I feel that the administration trusts and supports my ability to fulfill my responsibilities.	4.21	0.543	Often
4. I am satisfied with the level of challenge and complexity in my teaching responsibilities.	4.47	0.617	Often
5. I feel that my responsibilities align with my career goals and aspirations.	4.47	0.5	Often
Total	4.414	0.31416	Often

Legend: 4.50-5.00 = Always (A), 3.50-4.49 = Often (O), 2.50-3.49 = Sometimes (S), 1.50-2.49 = Rarely (R), 1.00-1.49 = Never (N)

Responsibility-based job satisfaction is summed up in Table 2.5. A consistently high level of satisfaction is shown by the low standard deviation of 0.31416 and the overall mean of 4.414

(Often).. The highest rating (mean = 4.53) reflects teachers’ appreciation for autonomy and decision-making power, while the lowest (mean = 4.21) points to some perceived gaps in administrative trust and support.

2.6 Working Ethics and Attitudes

Table 2.6 Level of Job Satisfaction in terms of Working Ethics and Attitudes

Statements	Mean	SD	Rating
1. I feel respected and valued by my colleagues and administration.	4.53	.500	Always
2. I am satisfied with the level of professionalism and work ethics in my school.	4.47	.617	Often
3. I feel supported in maintaining a positive and inclusive classroom environment.	4.67	.473	Always
4. I am satisfied with the level of collaboration and teamwork among the staff members.	4.54	.617	Always
5. I feel that my work ethics are acknowledged and appreciated by the school community.	4.40	.610	Often
Total	4.519	0.40504	Always

Legend: 4.50-5.00 = Always (A), 3.50-4.49 = Often (O), 2.50-3.49 = Sometimes (S), 1.50-2.49 = Rarely (R), 1.00-1.49 = Never (N)

Job satisfaction is shown in terms of attitudes and work ethics in Table 2.6. Consistently high satisfaction levels are indicated by the low standard deviation (0.40504) and overall mean of 4.519 (Always). The highest rating (mean = 4.67) reflects strong support for maintaining a positive and inclusive classroom environment. The lowest (mean = 4.40) points to the need for greater recognition of teachers’ work ethics within the school community.

2.7 Advancement

Table 2.7 Level of Job Satisfaction in terms of Advancement

Statements	Mean	SD	Rating
1. I feel that there are opportunities for professional growth and advancement in my current teaching position.	4.60	.610	Always
2. I am satisfied with the availability of resources for professional development in my school.	4.60	.492	Always
3. I feel that the administration values and supports my career advancement.	4.53	.500	Always
4. I am satisfied with the opportunities for career progression within the school.	4.54	.617	Always
5. I feel that my input in decision-making processes contributes to my job satisfaction and advancement.	4.60	.491	Always
Total	4.572	0.31831	Always

Legend: 4.50-5.00 = Always (A), 3.50-4.49 = Often (O), 2.50-3.49 = Sometimes (S), 1.50-2.49 = Rarely (R), 1.00-1.49 = Never (N)

Job satisfaction in relation to advancement is summed up in Table 2.7. Consistently high satisfaction ratings are seen in the low SD (0.31831) and overall mean of 4.572 (Always). The highest mean (4.60) highlights strong approval of professional growth opportunities, resource availability, and participative decision-making. The lowest mean (4.53) shows that teachers generally feel supported in their career advancement.

2.8 Security

Table 2.8 Level of Job Satisfaction in terms of Security

Statements	Mean	SD	Rating
1. I feel that teachers’ job security is important for my overall job satisfaction.	4.53	.500	Always
2. I believe that job security contributes to a positive work environment for teachers.	4.67	.473	Always
3. I think that job security helps to retain experienced and dedicated teachers.	4.53	.500	Always

4. I feel that job security positively affects teachers' commitment and investment in the school community.	4.54	.500	Always
5. I believe that security helps to reduce stress and anxiety for teachers, allowing them to focus more on their teaching responsibilities.	4.60	.491	Always
Total	4.572	0.34961	Always

Legend: 4.50-5.00 = Always (A), 3.50-4.49 = Often (O), 2.50-3.49 = Sometimes (S), 1.50-2.49 = Rarely (R), 1.00-1.49 = Never (N)

Job satisfaction in relation to security is seen in Table 2.8. Consistently high pleasure is indicated by the low SD (0.34961) and overall mean of 4.572 (Always). The highest mean (4.67) underscores teachers' strong agreement that job security fosters a positive work environment. The lowest mean (4.53), tied between two statements, still reflects strong consensus on the importance of job security for satisfaction and retention.

2.9 Recognition

Table 2.9 Level of Job Satisfaction in terms of Recognition

Statements	Mean	SD	Rating
1. I believe that recognition is an important factor in teachers' job satisfaction.	4.6	0.492	Always
2. I think that recognition helps to motivate and inspire teachers to excel in their roles.	4.46	0.625	Often
3. I feel that recognition helps teachers' morale and job satisfaction.	4.19	0.653	Often
4. I believe that recognition contributes to a positive and supportive school culture.	4.6	0.492	Always
5. I think that recognition helps to retain talented and dedicated teachers within the school community.	4.6	0.492	Always
Total	4.487	0.43954	Often

Legend: 4.50-5.00 = Always (A), 3.50-4.49 = Often (O), 2.50-3.49 = Sometimes (S), 1.50-2.49 = Rarely (R), 1.00-1.49 = Never (N)

Job satisfaction is shown in terms of recognition in Table 2.9. Consistently high pleasure is indicated by the low SD (0.43954) and overall mean of 4.487 (Often). The highest mean (4.6) highlights strong agreement that recognition enhances job satisfaction, school culture, and teacher retention. The lowest mean (4.19) still reflects positive views on recognition's role in boosting morale, though with slight room for improvement.

3. In elementary schools run by the Ministry of Basic, Higher, and Technical Education–Sulu, are the various aspects of teachers' job satisfaction and the various components of school heads' instructional supervision significantly correlated?

Table 3. Correlation among the Sub-categories

Variables		Pearson r	Sig.	N	Description
Dependent	Independent				
School heads' instructional supervision	Teachers' job satisfaction	-.009	.902	200	

*Correlation coefficient is significant at alpha .05

Correlation Coefficient Scales Adopted from Hopkins, Will (2002):

0.0-0.1 = Nearly Zero; 0.1-0.3 = Low; 0.3-0.5 = Moderate; 0.5-0.7 = High; 0.7-0.9 = Very High; 0.9-1 = Nearly Perfect

The association between teachers' job satisfaction and the instructional supervision provided by school heads is seen in Table 3. There is very little negative association, as indicated by the calculated Pearson r value of -0.009. The outcome is not statistically significant since the p-value (.902) is higher than the 0.05 significance level. This suggests that there is no meaningful

linkage between the two variables and that any apparent relationship between them is accidental rather than substantial..

Discussion

This study sought to examine the relationship between instructional supervision by school heads and the job satisfaction of elementary school teachers. The findings present a nuanced and somewhat paradoxical picture. On one hand, the data clearly show that teachers hold the instructional supervision they receive in high regard and also report high levels of overall job satisfaction. However, the central finding of this research is the absence of a statistically significant correlation between these two variables. This section will interpret these findings, place them in the context of existing literature, and explore potential explanations and implications of the unexpected results.

Perceived Effectiveness of Instructional Supervision

The participants in this study perceive the supervisory practices of their school heads as highly effective. Key functions such as classroom observation, portfolio review, and guidance on pedagogical strategies were all rated favorably, aligning with a ‘Great Extent’ of effectiveness. Notably, the supervisory task of identifying teachers' strengths and limitations received the highest mean score, falling into the ‘Very Great Extent’ category. This suggests that teachers feel the supervision process is particularly adept at providing targeted, individualized feedback.

These perceptions are consistent with a broad body of research confirming the value of instructional supervision. For instance, studies by Celikten and Karaca (2016) in Turkey and Koadu and Nketsia (2018) in Ghana both established a positive link between supervision and teachers' professional development and student outcomes. Similarly, research in the United States by Gray and Wilcox-Herzog (2015) highlighted the efficacy of classroom observation coupled with specific feedback in enhancing instructional practices. The finding that identifying strengths and weaknesses was highly valued also resonates with the work of Abdul Razak et al. (2017), who found that such feedback fosters a culture of self-reflection and continuous improvement among teachers. Therefore, the teachers in this study's context appear to experience and value supervision in a manner that mirrors positive findings in international literature.

High Levels of Teacher Job Satisfaction

In parallel with their positive views on supervision, the teacher-respondents reported high levels of job satisfaction across multiple domains. Aspects such as their working conditions, responsibilities, recognition, and the quality of supervision were frequently cited as sources of satisfaction. Furthermore, elements like collegial relationships, remuneration, work ethic, security, and opportunities for advancement were sources of even higher, more consistent satisfaction. The low standard deviations across these measures indicate a strong, shared positive sentiment within the surveyed group.

This finding is not an anomaly. The literature on teacher retention and effectiveness often points to the critical role of job satisfaction (Ingersoll, 2015; Calubag et al., 2025; Ang et al., 2025). The high satisfaction levels reported here align with findings from studies like that of Akram and Malik (2016), where teachers also reported being highly satisfied with their colleagues, pay, and security. Research by Johnson and Birkeland (2017) further corroborates that high and consistent job satisfaction is a common finding among teacher populations. This establishes that the teachers

in our sample are generally content in their profession, a factor that makes the core finding of this study all the more intriguing.

The Disconnect Between Supervision and Job Satisfaction

The most significant and unexpected finding of this study is the very weak, negative, and statistically insignificant correlation between school heads' instructional supervision and teachers' job satisfaction ($r = -0.009$, $p = .902$). This result indicates that, within this specific population, there is no meaningful linear relationship between how effective teachers find their supervision and how satisfied they are with their jobs. Any observed connection is likely attributable to random chance. This discovery stands in stark contrast to much of the established literature. For example, Alkali and Madugu (2017) in Nigeria found a significant positive relationship, concluding that the quality of head teacher supervision directly impacted teachers' job satisfaction. Closer to the present study's context, Magon and Gabrinao (2019) in the Philippines also identified a positive correlation, noting that supervision enhanced satisfaction related to teaching skills and professional growth. The results of the current study, therefore, diverge from these established patterns, suggesting that unique contextual factors may be at play in the elementary schools of Sulu.

Several hypotheses could explain this anomaly. First, it is possible that both job satisfaction and the perceived quality of supervision are already so high that a ceiling effect is present; with both variables already near their maximum, there is little room for one to influence the other. Second, the drivers of job satisfaction in this specific cultural and professional context may be different. Factors such as community respect, job security, or intrinsic motivation derived from serving the community might be so powerful that they overshadow the influence of supervisory practices. Finally, teachers may compartmentalize their views: while they perceive supervision as effective for professional growth, they may not link it to their daily happiness or overall job contentment. They might see it as a necessary, even helpful, professional requirement that is functionally separate from the factors that bring them joy and fulfillment in their roles.

Conclusion

The findings of this study reveal that school heads' instructional supervision is generally perceived positively by teachers, with consistently high mean ratings across various supervisory practices. These results suggest that supervision strategies are well-established and valued within the schools under MBHTE–Sulu. Similarly, teachers expressed a strong sense of job satisfaction, particularly in the areas of advancement and security, indicating that many see stable and meaningful career prospects within the institution.

However, the statistical analysis showed no significant correlation between instructional supervision and job satisfaction. This suggests that, while supervision remains an important component of professional growth, it does not directly influence how satisfied teachers feel with their jobs. This challenges the common assumption that enhancing supervision alone automatically leads to greater teacher morale or satisfaction.

These findings carry important implications for educational leadership. School administrators aiming to strengthen teacher satisfaction may need to consider a broader set of factors beyond supervisory practices. A more holistic approach to teacher welfare, encompassing professional growth opportunities, recognition, and workplace conditions, may be necessary to address the various dimensions of job satisfaction.

Future research should explore these dynamics more deeply, using qualitative methods such as interviews or focus groups to capture teachers' lived experiences. Such insights could

clarify why supervision and satisfaction appear disconnected in this context and inform more targeted strategies to cultivate a motivated and effective teaching workforce.

References

- Abdul Razak, N., Hamzah, M. I., & Yusof, K. (2017). The impact of instructional supervision on teachers' professional development. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7(7), 344–356.*
- Adidul, S. (2024). The effectiveness of teaching and learning strategies used by teachers in Sulu State College. *Journal of Education and Academic Settings*, 1, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.62596/57133w71>
- Akram, S., & Malik, K. (2016). Job satisfaction of secondary school teachers: A study of public and private sector schools. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(1), 95–101.*
- Alkali, H. A., & Madugu, M. A. (2017). The impact of head teacher supervisory function on teachers' job satisfaction in elementary schools in Borno State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(7), 162–167.*
- Alviola, A. A. (2025). A knowledge-based material in juvenile delinquency for community learning campaigns. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(5), 3734.* <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i5.3734>
- Ang, J. V., Tonalet, A. L., & Macabago, J. M. (2025). Diffusing stress caused by work-related experiences among faculty members. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(7), 3497.* <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i7.3497>
- Atalic, H. (2017). Herzberg's motivation–hygiene theory applied to high school teachers in Turkey. *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(4), 90–97.* <https://doi.org/10.26417/ejms.v1i4.p90-97>
- Baggay, M., et al. (2021). [Study reference for instructional supervision instrument]. Unpublished questionnaire.
- Baluyos, G. R., Rivera, H. L., & Baluyos, E. L. (2019). Teachers' job satisfaction. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2019.78015>
- Calubag, L. V., Verdeflor, R. N., & Peligro, V. C. (2025). Real-life industry immersions that can enhance positive behavior towards mathematics and science to build up for Math-Sci-oriented choices in academic settings. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(7), 3378.* <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i7.3378>
- Calles, A. B. (2025). Harnessing AI for content and strategies in instructional purposes: Limitations and red flags. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(5), 3235.* <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i5.3235>
- Celikten, M., & Karaca, F. (2016). The effects of instructional supervision on teachers' teaching practices. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education*, 12(10), 2727–2735.*
- Crisci, A., Sepe, E., & Malafrente, P. (2018). What influences teachers' job satisfaction and how to improve, develop and reorganize the school activities associated with them. Springer Link. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-018-0749-y>
- Cutillas, A. L., Sarahina, M. E. V., Abregana, J. L., et al. (2025). Nature-based exposures of learners to elicit discovery-oriented skills and behaviors. *Journal of Environmental & Earth Sciences*, 7(7), 368–382.* <https://doi.org/10.30564/jees.v7i7.8341>

- Gultom, S., et al. (2017). The predictive power of self-determined job motivation components in explaining job satisfaction and willingness to stay with job among female elementary school teachers in Shiraz. *Indian Journal of Health and Wellbeing*, 8(2), 173–176.*
- Gray, J. H., & Wilcox-Herzog, A. (2015). Observational feedback and coaching for appropriately integrating differentiated instruction. *The Educational Forum*, 79(1), 49–62.*
- Harris, C. (1979). *Research methodology: A blueprint for investigation*.
- Hopkins, W. (2002). *Correlation coefficient scales. A New View of Statistics*.
- İlğan, A. (2015). Predicting teacher job satisfaction. *Irish Educational Studies*, 34(1), 205–217.*
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2015.1005393>
- Ingersoll, R. (2015). What great teachers do differently? *Learning Solutions Magazine*.
- Johnson, B., & Birkeland, S. (2017). Exploring the link between teacher job satisfaction and turnover intention: The role of gender and age. *Journal of School Administration Research and Development*, 2(1), 7–16.*
- Koadu, M., & Nketsia, W. (2018). Instructional supervision and teachers' professional development: A Ghanaian perspective. *African Journal of Education Studies*, 5(3), 44–59.*
- Lester, P. (1987). *Teacher job satisfaction questionnaire (TJSQ)*.
- Maldrine, T., & Kiplangat, H. K. (2020). Relationship between supervision and job satisfaction among public secondary school teachers in Nakuru West sub-county, Kenya. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 7(11).* <http://dx.doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v7i11.3339>
- Magon, Y. O. G., & Gabrinao, K. F. L. (2019). Instructional supervision and teachers' job satisfaction: A correlative study. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 8(3), 13–24.*
- Reamico, D. M. D., Bangahan, S., Hayudini, M. A. A., et al. (2025). Strategizing marketing initiatives from tourism-seeking behaviors among travelers. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(7), 3880.* <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i7.3880>
- Rellon, M. (2024). Language of emotions: Establishing connection with customers in tourism industries. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i10.3029>
- Suchyadie, Y., & Nurjanah, N. (2016). Relationship between principal supervision in increasing the job satisfaction of private junior high school teachers in East Bogor District. *Journal of Humanities and Social Studies*, 2(1), 26–29.* <https://doi.org/10.33751/jhss.v2i1.818>
- Supian, N. U. (2025). Assessing cognitive-based attitudes, evidence-based research practices, and engagement-oriented professional development among college English instructors in Sulu. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(5), 3705.*
<https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i5.3705>