

# Subject coordinators, head teachers and master teachers coaching practices and its impact on teachers' instructional performance in Nagcarlan District Laguna: Basis for enhance teacher development program

Gabasa, Maria Teresa G. ✉

Emilio Aguinaldo College, Manila, Philippines ([tessgabasa4@gmail.com](mailto:tessgabasa4@gmail.com))



ISSN: 2243-7703  
Online ISSN: 2243-7711

OPEN ACCESS

Received: 14 January 2023

Revised: 2 February 2023

Accepted: 8 February 2023

Available Online: 9 February 2023

DOI: 10.5861/ijrse.2023.8

## Abstract

The study was aimed to find out the subject coordinators, head teachers and master teachers coaching practices and its impact on teacher's instructional performance in Nagcarlan District Laguna as basis for enhance teacher development program. Utilizing a cross-sectional quantitative research design, thirty (30) respondents from subject coordinators, Head teachers and Master Teachers at the District of Nagcarlan. A purposive sampling technique has been used in the study. The findings of the study, that there is the correlation between coaching practices and instructional performance of teachers. The results show that coaching practices of SC, MT and HT correlates positively with instructional performance of teachers. This suggest that an increase in the level of coaching practices, which is in terms of frequency, will translate to an increase in the level of instructional performance of teachers, the hypothesis is rejected. The researcher concluded that the coaching practices of the SC, HT and MT should expand based on the needs of each teacher to develop the instructional performances. It recommends that it may have modified the coaching practices based on the needs of the teachers on the current situation.

**Keywords:** coaching practices, subject coordinators, head teachers, master teachers, instructional performance

## **Subject coordinators, head teachers and master teachers coaching practices and its impact on teachers' instructional performance in Nagcarlan District Laguna: Basis for enhance teacher development program**

### **1. Introduction**

Coaching is an adult learning strategy that is used to build the capacity of a parent, caregiver, or colleague to improve existing abilities, develop new skills, and gain a deeper understanding of his or her practices in current and future situations cited by Hanft, Rush, and Shelden (2017). In the workplace, however, distinctions between the roles and tasks of mentor and coach frequently overlap and are often blurred. Both mentoring and coaching can promote changes in thinking about and doing one's job and developing an innovative mindset. Subject coordinators, head teachers and master teachers are those leaders who will guide and give a good environment to the teachers to become better and do the task correctly. Thus, Aldeman (2011) underscores the importance of coaching as the facilitation of learning wherein there is engagement that promotes people to think for themselves and generate solutions to issues and challenges in the workplace. Coaching supports new thinking which can lead to a continuous improvement change processes (Prydale, 2011).

#### *1.1 Background of the Study*

From the DepEd Memorandum No. 45, s, 2015 "The Guidelines on School Based Management (SBM) grants in line with Republic Act No. 9155 also known as Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, the Department of education (DepEd) shall continue providing School Based Management (SBM formulated enabling policies and mechanisms to ensure that the school and its community are equipped and empowered to make decisions on what is best for their learners. The SBM Grant aims to improve the performance of schools in terms of student participation and school attendance, completion rates and student learning outcomes, to attain this goals the SBM Grant should support activities directed towards enhancing the teaching and learning experience in school, improving school management and administrative processes and strengthening resiliency of disadvantaged schools. Through Learning Action Cell (LAC) the heads were monitored and evaluate the teachers and gives feed backing to help the teachers to improve and enhance the teaching practices of each teacher.

Coaching and Mentoring are one of the indicators to be evident on the School Based Management (SBM) to produce quality, assurance, and resources because subject coordinators, head teacher and master teachers are the leaders that the teacher should be followed, and they also serve as model specially for the new hired teachers. Whereas they will be serves as a mentor in all aspects in the workplace. Based on the knowledge and information above the researcher was motivated to find out the subject coordinators, Head teachers and Master teachers coaching practices and its impact on teacher's instructional performance in Nagcarlan District Laguna as basis for enhance teacher development program.

#### *1.2 Research Design*

The research design was quantitative design as a descriptive method has been handled with easiness by the present researcher to lay down the basis for validity and reliability in answering the five (5) basic problem areas of investigation as advanced in the chapter with the fore view of the full assurance by the respondents to generously share the information and data during the final day of distribution and retrieval of the major instrument intended for this kind of research. In the words of wisdom by Festinger (2015), descriptive design was the only influence for the researcher to stand on the safer ground in attacking with final closure the main and basic problem specification by ending into a successful research undertaking. Utilizing a cross-sectional

quantitative research design, thirty (30) respondents from subject coordinators, Head teachers and Master Teachers at the District of Nagcarlan.

### *1.3 Sampling Technique*

Purposive sampling technique was used in this study, the respondents were chosen based on their position as subject coordinator, Head teachers and Master teachers in the said district. As sustained further by Festinger (2015), purposive sampling was a technique designed with intention to select the homogeneous group of population parameter with common characteristics as equally distributed in their respective places of cohabitation. The researcher was distributed the locally made questionnaire inspired from the coaching tools of Francisco (2020) through google form as the quality tested data gathering instrument hence liberated from personal bias during the actual gathering of data by following the simple guidelines.

Two (2) sets of questionnaires were issued to and retrieved from the groups of respondents. The questionnaire was validated and checked by the expert in the said field. The improved draft was tried out through dry-run statistical computations by means of randomly selected ten (10) teachers who will not be included as the actual respondents during the actual gathering of data by using the rho formula for rank correlation based on the value of one (1) as the standard basis for assurance of validity and reliability of the foregoing commonplace instrument. To avoid guesswork in answering the questionnaire, a five-scale Likert-checklist ranging from 1 to 5 was reflected in each question queried. The responses of the above respondents to the said five (5) sets of major instrument will be tallied and tabulated as basis for using the following formulas in order to test the aforementioned null hypotheses. Percentage for sub problem 1, weighted mean formula for the focal weight of the responses for sub-problems 2, and 3, standard deviation formula to measure the variability of responses from the foregoing weighted mean for sub-problems 2, and 3. P value for the relationship between the coaching practices of subject coordinators, head teachers and master teachers and the teachers' instructional performance as basis for testing null hypothesis.

## **2. Literature**

An adult learning strategy in which the coach promotes the learner's ability to reflect on his or her actions to determine the effectiveness of an action or practice and develop a plan for refinement and use of the action in immediate and future situations (Rush & Shelden, 2019). Moreover, asserted by Michael (2018) that the skills of mentor and coach overlap to some extent. Both mentors and coaches are 'critical friends' although they might use different methods. A coach is more likely to use direct feedback, while a mentor relies more heavily on the questioning process. A coach is a specialist who works with the protégé on specific goals and objectives – the professional equivalent of a fitness trainer. A mentor is likely to have followed a similar career to the one their protégé is starting and will pass on their expertise. Whereas the coaching and mentoring of the subject coordinators, head teachers and master teachers are important to the development of one's teacher to improve their strategies and teaching.

Thus, the result of Hollywood, et.al. (2016) that leaders face the challenge of creating learning organizations, communities of practice, and systems that promote the full potential of each worker, while attaining or exceeding organizational expectations and goals. An integrated, holistic model of mentoring and coaching consisting of four well researched theoretical frames is described: strengths-based leadership, Emotional Intelligence, courageous conversations, and Appreciative Inquiry. The rarely acknowledged, imperceptible, but significant and indelible, neurological, and biochemical links that connect the theoretical frames as well as the impact of self-efficacy beliefs and the thoughts and emotions of both mentor/coach and mentee/coaches are discussed.

Although, that both mentoring and coaching are a means to support workers' knowledge acquisition and organizational learning. Traditionally and theoretically, role and task distinctions have been drawn between mentoring and coaching asserted by Starcevich (2019). Nevertheless, Clifton and Harter (2013) asserted that

strengths-based leadership capitalizes on the talents of the work force as the basis for the consistent achievement of excellence. Strengths based philosophy is the belief and assertion that an individual is able to gain and grow more, when he or she primarily expends energy and effort to build upon his or her strongest talents, rather than when he or she dwells on and expends time and effort to improve and remediate weaknesses. Building upon and affirming individual strengths also enhances self-efficacy, thereby increasing effort and capabilities as well as promoting more desirable personal, professional, and organizational outcomes.

In addition, Hodges and Clifton (2014) hypothesized that talents are “naturally recurring patterns of thought, feeling, or behavior that can be productively applied” (p. 257). Strengths are viewed as the result of maximized talents. Specifically, a strength is mastery created when one’s most powerful talents are refined with practice and combined with acquired relevant skills and knowledge. Though, Buckingham and Clifton (2018) speculate that only 20% of employees believe that their strengths are aligned to their daily work functions; the remaining 80% of employees are in need of some type of experience to learn about their strengths and how to use them effectively. Receiving feedback and focusing on one’s strengths serve as acknowledgement enabling employees to shift perceptions to an asset-based strength model and self-efficacy, rather than a deficit and weakness model of work. Applying the holistic model of mentoring and coaching may result in a shift from traditional organizational structures to more functional approaches to meeting organizational needs and productivity.

### 3. Results

Table 1 is about the profile of the respondents in terms of Age. 33.33% of the respondents are between 46 to 50 years old, 23.33% of them are between 41 and 45 years old, 13.33% are between 31 and 35 and between 51 and 55 years old, 6.67% are between 56 and 60 and 3.33% is between 61 and 65 years old.

**Table 1**

*The profile of teacher – Respondent in terms of age*

Age	Frequency	Percentage
20 - 25	0	0.00
26 - 30	2	6.67
31 - 35	4	13.33
36 - 40	0	0.00
41 - 45	7	23.33
46 - 50	10	33.33
51 - 55	4	13.33
56 - 60	2	6.67
61 - 65	1	3.33
Total	30	100%

It indicated that the highest percentage of the respondents range from 46-50 teachers it implies that they are more experienced teachers according to Ng and Feldman (2018) that the results of the study was also highlight that the relationships of age with core task performance and with counterproductive work behaviors are curvilinear in nature and that several sample characteristics and data collection characteristics moderate age-performance relationships. The article concludes with a discussion of key research design issues that may further knowledge about the age-performance relationship in the future.

**Table 2**

*The profile of teacher – Respondent in terms of gender*

Gender	Total of Respondents	Percentage
Male	10	33.33
Female	20	66.67
Total	30	100%

With respect to sex, 66.67% of the respondents are females and 33.33% are males. It means that the highest percentage is came from the female respondents. According to Moore (1999) publishes (2018) that the

organizations are no exception. Both men and women are competing for the same job position. This is because in the globalization of business all the individuals are given the equal opportunity to work in the organizations. The low rate of business ownership among women permeates around the world. Aggregate data from the OECD indicate that female self-employment rates are substantially lower than male rates in almost every reported country with an average ratio of 0.543 (OECD 2002)

**Table 3**

*The profile of teacher – Respondent in terms of educational attainment*

Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
Bachelor Degree	13	43.33
Complete Academic Requirements in Master's Degree	8	26.67
Master's Graduate	6	20.00
Complete Academic Requirements in Doctorate	0	0.00
Doctorate Graduate	3	10.00
Total	30	100%

According to highest Educational Attainment; 43.33% of the respondents have a bachelor's degree, 26.67% have CAR in Master's Degree, 20.00% are Master's Degree graduate, and 10% of the respondents are holders of Doctoral degrees. Most of the respondents based on the data presented that bachelor's degree it means that the respondent is most of them they not continue their studies. According to Roberg et al., (2005) that the high school degree requirement has since been upgraded to a college degree requirement, indicating the above-average level of education in the contemporary world. Trusty and Niles (2004) cited on his article that those individuals who hold at least bachelor's degrees because these degrees are necessary for entry into many higher-paying occupations.

**Table 4**

*The profile of teacher – Respondent in terms of years of service*

Years of Service	Frequency	Percentage
1-5	6	20.00
6 – 10	7	23.33
11-15	3	10.00
16 – 20	4	13.33
21 – 25	6	20.00
26 - 30	3	10.00
31 - 35	1	3.33
36 – 40	0	0.00
41 – 45	0	0.00
46 – 50	0	0.00
Total	30	100%

According to years of experience in the service, 23.33% of the respondents have 6 to 10 years of services, 20% have 21 – 25 years of service or 1 – 5 years of service, 13.33% have 16 – 20 years, 10% have 11 – 15 years and 3.33% has 31 – 35 years of service. Most of the respondents were range to 6-10 years of service it means that they are experienced teachers. Gordon (2016) that early investigation of the relationship between length of service and employee performance ratings--in three separate studies--indicated a direct, an inverse and no relationship between the variables. As a result of recent legislative changes to mandatory retirement ceilings, the need for a better understanding of this relationship has become extremely important to the corporate personnel function.

All of the indicators of current coaching practices are being applied by the subject coordinators, head teacher and master teachers most of the time. Coaching practices number 2, 3, 14 and 1 are the best indicators of coaching practices which are being applied most of the time by the subject coordinators, head teacher and master teachers.

**Table 5**

*Current coaching practices of subject coordinators as assessed by the teacher in terms of delivery of instruction*

Coaching Practices	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Acknowledged the teacher’s existing knowledge and abilities as the foundation for improving knowledge and skills.	5.00	0.83	Most of the time
2. Interacted with the teacher in a nonjudgmental and constructive manner during coaching conversations.	5.33	0.80	Most of the time
3. Identified with the teacher the targeted skills and a timeline for the coaching process	5.07	0.94	Most of the time
4. Developed with the teacher a plan for action/practice necessary to achieve targeted skill(s) following each coaching conversation.	4.90	0.88	Most of the time
5. Observed the teacher demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the targeted skill(s) or practice(s).	5.07	0.87	Most of the time
6. Observed the teacher use of the targeted skill(s) or practice(s).	4.93	1.11	Most of the time
7. Created opportunities for the teacher to observe the coach and/or others model the target skill(s) or practice(s).	4.67	1.06	Most of the time
8. Promoted use of multiple opportunities for the teacher to practice implementation of the targeted skill(s) and practice(s)	4.73	0.94	Most of the time
9. Used both planned and spontaneous opportunities to strengthen the teacher’s knowledge and skills	4.83	0.91	Most of the time
10. Asked probing questions to examine the teacher’s knowledge and abilities.	4.50	1.25	Most of the time
11. Prompted teacher reflection on his/her knowledge and use of the targeted skill(s) and practice(s) compared against research-based practice standards	4.53	1.14	Most of the time
12. Provided feedback about the teacher’s knowledge and skills following the learner’s reflection on his/her performance.	4.87	1.25	Most of the time
13. Provided and/or promoting access to new information and resources after the teacher reflects on his/her performance.	4.87	1.04	Most of the time
14. Engaged the teacher in reflection on the usefulness, effectiveness, and need for continuation of the coaching process.	5.07	0.78	Most of the time

**Table 6**

*Instructional performance in terms planning, teaching practices and assessment practices in regards to planning*

Planning	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. I select instructions materials based upon my knowledge of my student’s development needs and learning styles	4.10	0.845	Frequently
2. I select methods and strategies that accommodate individual needs and interest of specific students	4.20	0.610	Frequently
3. I consider how to build upon my student’s existing knowledge and experiences	4.13	0.507	Frequently
4. I create cooperative learning experiences for my students	4.40	0.563	Very Frequently
5. I engage individually and collectively with them during the learning experiences	4.33	0.547	Very Frequently
Average	4.23	0.496	Very Frequently

Table 6 reflects the level of instructional performance in terms planning, teaching practices and assessment practices of the teachers in regard to planning. It has an overall mean of 4.23 and a verbal interpretation of very frequently. All five indicators of planning are very frequently being practiced by the teachers. But the strongest indicators of planning are “I create cooperative learning experiences for my students ( $M = 4.40, SD = 0.563$ ),” and “I engage individually and collectively with them during the learning experiences ( $M = 4.33, SD = 0.547$ ).

Table 7 the level of instructional performance in terms planning, teaching practices and assessment practices of the teachers in regards assessment. It has an overall mean of 4.51 and a verbal interpretation of very frequently. All five indicators of assessment are very frequently being practiced by the teachers. The strongest indicators of

Coordinators, head and master teachers coaching practices and its impact on teachers' instructional performance

assessment are “Keeps and updates class record ( $M = 4.70$ ,  $SD = 0.535$ ),” and “Uses rubrics when and where applicable ( $M = 4.57$ ,  $SD = 0.568$ ).

**Table 7**

*Instructional performance in terms planning, teaching practices and assessment practices in regards assessment*

Assessment	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Conducts pre-test/diagnostic test	4.57	0.626	Very Frequently
2. Keeps and updates class record	4.70	0.535	Very Frequently
3. Uses rubrics when and where applicable	4.57	0.568	Very Frequently
4. Uses written work, Performance tasks, and Quarterly Assessment adequately in evaluation of outcomes	4.50	0.630	Very Frequently
5. Assists students who are hard-up by re-teaching and remedial	4.20	0.664	Frequently
Average	4.51	0.19	Very Frequently

Legend: 5.00 - 4.21 – Very Frequently, 4.20 - 3.41 Frequently, 3.40 – 2.61 Occasionally, 2.60 – 1.81 seldom, 1.80 – 1.00 Rarely

**Table 8**

*Instructional performance in terms planning, teaching practices and assessment practices in regards to teaching*

Teaching	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. I create social interaction among students that enhances learning by requiring students to work as a team with both individual and group responsibilities	4.30	0.651	Very Frequently
2. I vary the size and composition of learning groups	4.17	0.592	Frequently
3. I discuss with my students the importance of courtesy and respect and model for my students the types of personal behaviors that promote responsibility and social development among early adolescents	4.57	0.626	Very Frequently
4. I implement two or more learning activities	4.47	0.571	Very Frequently
5. I implement a learning activity that requires students to read or write in my content area	4.50	0.630	Very Frequently
Average	4.40	0.163	Very Frequently

Legend: 5.00 - 4.21 – Very Frequently, 4.20 - 3.41 Frequently, 3.40 – 2.61 Occasionally, 2.60 – 1.81 seldom, 1.80 – 1.00 Rarely

Table 8 shows the level of instructional performance in terms planning, teaching practices and assessment practices of the teachers in regard to teaching. It has an overall mean of 4.40 and a verbal interpretation of very frequently. It appears that all 5 indicators of teaching are being practiced, very frequently, by the teachers. The best indicators of teaching are “I discuss with my students the importance of courtesy and respect and model for my students the types of personal behaviors that promote responsibility and social development among early adolescents ( $M = 4.57$ ,  $SD = 0.626$ ),” and “I implement a learning activity that requires students to read or write in my content area ( $M = 4.50$ ,  $SD = 0.630$ ).”

**Table 9**

*Correlation between coaching practices and instructional performance*

	Coaching Practice	
Planning	Pearson's r	0.624***
	p-value	< .001
Assessing	Pearson's r	0.468**
	p-value	0.005
Teaching	Pearson's r	0.438**
	p-value	0.008

Note.  $H_a$  is positive correlation

Note. \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$ , one-tailed

Table 9 shows the correlation between coaching practices and instructional performance of teachers. The results show that coaching practices of SC, MT and HT correlates positively with instructional performance of teachers. This suggest that an increase in the level of coaching practices, which is in terms of frequency, will translate to an increase in the level of instructional performance of teachers. The hypothesis of the study is there is no significant linear relationship between the coaching practices of SC, MT and HT and the instructional performance of teachers therefore, its rejected at 0.05 significance level. Hallinger (2013) claimed that managing

instructional program should be one of the focus of instructional supervision, while the other two - communicating school mission and improving school climate are not statistically significant and supported. The researcher concluded that the coaching practices of the SC, HT and MT should expand based on the needs of each teacher to develop the instructional performances. It recommends that it may have modified the coaching practices based on the needs of the teachers on the current situation.

#### 4. References

- Aldeman, W. (2011, March). Coaching in the workplace. Retrieved from the Online Self-Improvement Encyclopedia. <http://www.selfgrowth.com/print/1622831>
- Buckingham, M., & Clifton, D. (2018) *Now, Discover Your Strengths*. New York: Free Press.
- Clifton, D. O., & Harter, J. K. (2013). Strengths investment. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E., Quinn (Eds.). *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 111-121). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Francisco, C. (2020) Teachers' instructional practices and its effects on students' academic performance. City of Malolos Integrated School-Sto. Rosario, Malolos City, Bulacan, Philippines. *Multidisciplinary Studies*, 6(7), 64-71.
- Hallinger, P. (2013). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33, 329-351.
- Hanft, B. E., Rush, D. D., & Shelden, M. L. (2004). *Coaching families and colleagues in early childhood*. Baltimore: Brookes.
- Hodges, T. D., & Clifton, D. O. (2014). Strengths-based development in practice. In A. Linley & S. Joseph (Eds.). *Handbook of positive psychology in practice*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- Hollywood, K. G. et al. (2016). Holistic mentoring and coaching to sustain organizational change and innovation. *Creighton Journal of Interdisciplinary Leadership*, 2(1), 32-46.
- Michael, A. (2018). *Mentoring and coaching*. Topic Gateway Series No. 50.
- Moore, D. (1999). Differential effects of strain on two forms of work performance: Individual employee sales and creativity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(1), 57-74.
- Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2008). The relationship of age to ten dimensions of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 392-423.
- Prydale Partners. Effective coaching in the workplace. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.prydale.com/corporate/effectivecoaching-in-the-workplace>
- Roberg et al. (2005). *Student engagement, retention, and motivation: assessing academic success in today's college students*. Department of Higher Education and Learning Technologies, Texas A&M University.
- Starcevich, M. (2019). *Coach, mentor: Is there a difference?* Retrieved from <http://coachingandmentoring.com/Articles/mentoring.html>
- Trusty & Niles. (2004). *Realized potential or lost talent: high school variables and bachelor's degree completion*. Pennsylvania State University.