ISSN (online): 2094-9030

Studies in Technology and Education

Volume 5, Issue 4, 2026 | https://www.azalpub.com/index.php/ste

OPEN ACCESS

October-December 2026

RESEARCH ARTICLE

# Navigating Instructional Supervision in the Digital Transformation of Distance Education: A Qualitative Inquiry in the Department of Education

Sharolyn Buhong
Ifugao State University
Lagawe District, Department Educatio, Ifugao
sharolyn.buhong001@deped.gov.ph

Article Info

*Received: 08-08-2026*

*Accepted: 09-26-2026*

*Published: 10-31-2026*

## Abstract

The continuing digital transformation of basic education had reshaped instructional delivery, teacher professional development, communication, assessment, monitoring, and instructional supervision within the Department of Education. This qualitative study explored how supervisors and master teachers had experienced, interpreted, and enacted instructional supervision within digitally mediated and distance education. Specifically, it examined changes in supervisory practices, the use of digital technologies for instructional monitoring and professional support, challenges encountered in digital supervision, and institutional mechanisms that had facilitated effective supervisory practices. The study had employed a qualitative phenomenological design involving 15 participants composed of supervisors and master teachers from the Department of Education who had direct experience in instructional supervision and technology-mediated teaching and learning. Participants had been purposively selected based on their supervisory responsibilities and involvement in digital, flexible, or distance-learning implementation. Data had been gathered through semi-structured individual interviews and relevant document analysis and had been analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis. Five interconnected themes had emerged: reframing instructional supervision beyond the physical classroom; digital technologies as bridges for supervisory communication and instructional visibility; transforming supervision from compliance toward coaching and professional growth; navigating technological, workload, and human-capacity constraints; and building a collaborative and digitally responsive supervisory ecosystem. The findings indicated that digital transformation had expanded instructional supervision beyond conventional classroom observation toward continuous, technology-mediated, evidence-informed, and collaborative support. However, unequal digital competence, connectivity challenges, workload, technological limitations, and perceptions of supervision as compliance had constrained implementation. The study concluded that effective instructional supervision in digitally transformed education required digitally competent supervisors and master teachers, developmental feedback, contextualized monitoring, professional learning, collaborative leadership, adequate technological infrastructure, and institutional mechanisms that balanced accountability with teacher autonomy. A Digitally Responsive Instructional Supervision Framework was proposed to support sustainable supervisory practices in the Department of Education.

Keywords: instructional supervision, digital transformation, supervisors, master teachers, distance education, digital leadership, Department of Education, qualitative inquiry

**Corresponding author:** sharolyn.buhong001@deped.gov.ph

## 1. Introduction

Digital transformation had increasingly influenced the structure and delivery of Philippine basic education. Technology had become embedded in instructional preparation, communication, learning-resource development, assessment, data management, professional development, and school administration. Digital transformation, however, had involved more than the provision of computers, tablets, internet connectivity, or learning platforms. It had required corresponding changes in leadership, teacher competence, instructional practices, organizational systems, and professional support.

The Department of Education had continued to strengthen this direction. Its Quality Basic Education Development Plan 2025–2035 had defined digitalization as the integration of digital technologies into teaching and learning and had emphasized that sustainable transformation required a whole-of-system approach involving leadership and coordination, infrastructure, teacher competencies, digital platforms, and data-informed decision-making. DepEd had also initiated the development of a Digital Transformation Road Map and gathered the experiences, challenges, and aspirations of teachers, learners, and information-technology personnel to inform this transformation. Concrete investments had likewise supported this agenda. In 2025, DepEd reported the distribution of more than 64,000 laptop and smart-TV packages and the acquisition of Google Workspace for Education Plus accounts for approximately one million teaching and non-teaching personnel. These initiatives had reflected the Department's broader commitment to using technology to improve learning delivery, professional efficiency, communication, and access.

The expansion of technology-supported education had important implications for instructional supervision. Traditional supervision had frequently relied on scheduled classroom observations, pre-observation conferences, post-observation conferences, documentary reviews, and face-to-face professional conversations. In digitally mediated environments, however, instructional practice had increasingly become visible through digital lesson resources, online platforms, electronic assessment, virtual meetings, digital communication channels, teacher-created multimedia materials, learning-management systems, and electronic records.

Consequently, supervisors and master teachers had needed to reconsider how instructional quality could be observed, interpreted, supported, and improved when teaching and learning occurred partly or entirely through technological environments. This change had been particularly important because master teachers and supervisors occupied strategic positions within the Department of Education. Master teachers had performed mentoring, coaching, classroom observation, curriculum support, and professional-development functions, while supervisors had provided instructional leadership, technical assistance, monitoring, and quality assurance.

Recent Philippine evidence had confirmed the significance of these roles. Yap (2024) found that master teachers' lived experiences in instructional supervision centered on effective teaching methods and collaboration, leadership and school success, and continuous professional learning. The study also identified adaptability, flexibility, alignment with educational goals, and supervisory challenges as important concerns. Andal (2024), in a phenomenological study involving master teachers, similarly identified challenges related to time management, pedagogical practices, teachers' reactions to feedback, and limited awareness of emerging strategies.

Digital transformation had added another layer to these supervisory responsibilities. Supervisors and master teachers needed not only pedagogical and leadership expertise but also sufficient technological understanding to evaluate digitally mediated teaching fairly and provide relevant assistance. A recent qualitative Philippine study involving school heads and teachers found that DepEd digital policies and digital-pedagogical leadership had influenced teachers' technology practices and learner behaviors, emphasizing the growing connection between leadership and digitally supported instruction.

Despite these developments, relatively limited qualitative research had focused specifically on how supervisors and master teachers experienced instructional supervision during digital transformation. Understanding their experiences was important because policies and technological investments ultimately had to be translated into supervisory practices that supported teachers and improved learning. Accordingly, the study investigated instructional supervision within the digital transformation of education in the Department of Education through the lived experiences of 15 supervisors and master teachers.

## 2. Objectives of the Study

The study aimed to explore the experiences, practices, challenges, and support mechanisms of supervisors and master teachers in implementing instructional supervision within the digital transformation of education in the Department of Education.

Specifically, it sought to:

1. describe the experiences of supervisors and master teachers in conducting instructional supervision within digitally mediated and distance-learning environments;

2. identify the instructional supervisory practices employed by supervisors and master teachers in technology-supported education;
3. explore how digital technologies had influenced classroom observation, instructional monitoring, communication, feedback, mentoring, and professional development;
4. determine the challenges encountered by supervisors and master teachers in implementing digitally mediated instructional supervision;
5. examine the institutional and professional support mechanisms that had facilitated effective instructional supervision; and
6. develop a digitally responsive instructional supervision framework based on the experiences of supervisors and master teachers.
7.

**3. Research Questions**

The study sought to answer the following questions:

1. How had supervisors and master teachers experienced instructional supervision within digitally transformed and distance education?
2. What instructional supervisory practices had supervisors and master teachers employed in digitally mediated educational environments?
3. How had digital technologies influenced instructional observation, monitoring, communication, feedback, mentoring, and professional support?
4. What challenges had supervisors and master teachers encountered in implementing digitally mediated instructional supervision?
5. What institutional and professional support mechanisms had enabled effective digital instructional supervision?
6. What framework for digitally responsive instructional supervision could be developed from the experiences of supervisors and master teachers?

**4. Theoretical and Conceptual Framework**

The study had been anchored in Developmental Supervision Theory, supported by the concepts of digital leadership and distributed instructional leadership.

Developmental supervision conceptualized instructional supervision as a professional-growth process rather than merely an evaluative mechanism. Supervisory approaches had to respond to teachers' levels of competence, professional experience, confidence, needs, and capacity for independent decision-making.

This perspective had been relevant to digital transformation because teachers differed considerably in technological competence. Some teachers had confidently integrated digital platforms and resources into instruction, whereas others had required more intensive guidance, modeling, and technical assistance.

Digital leadership complemented this perspective by emphasizing leaders' ability to integrate technology strategically into organizational practices, communication, professional learning, instructional decision-making, and school improvement.

Distributed instructional leadership further recognized that instructional supervision did not rest solely with one formal administrator. Supervisors, school heads, master teachers, ICT coordinators, learning-resource personnel, and teachers had collectively contributed to instructional improvement.

The conceptual framework had therefore been organized through the following relationship:

Digital Transformation → Digitally Responsive Supervision → Teacher Professional Capacity → Improved Instructional Practice → Enhanced Learning Support

Digital transformation had included infrastructure, digital platforms, learning resources, communication technologies, online assessment, and data systems.

Digitally responsive supervision had encompassed observation, mentoring, coaching, monitoring, feedback, technical assistance, and collaborative professional learning.

Teacher professional capacity had included pedagogical competence, technological competence, assessment literacy, digital-resource development, and reflective practice.

Institutional support had included policies, connectivity, equipment, training, leadership, professional-learning communities, and workload provisions.

**5. Methodology**

The study had employed a qualitative phenomenological research design to explore the lived experiences of supervisors and master teachers regarding instructional supervision within the digital transformation of education in the Department

of Education. The phenomenological approach had been considered appropriate because the study sought to understand how participants had personally experienced, interpreted, and assigned meaning to digitally mediated instructional supervision rather than quantify the frequency or effectiveness of particular supervisory practices. The participants had consisted of 15 supervisors and master teachers from the Department of Education who had direct experience in instructional supervision, teacher mentoring, classroom observation, professional development, and technology-supported educational delivery. Purposive sampling had been used to select participants who could provide rich and relevant information about the phenomenon under investigation. Participants had been eligible when they had held either a supervisory or master-teacher position in the Department of Education, had directly performed instructional-supervision responsibilities, had experienced the use of digital technology in teaching, monitoring, mentoring, professional development, or distance-learning arrangements, and had voluntarily agreed to participate in the study. The 15 participants had been considered sufficient because the study prioritized information richness, depth of experience, and thematic adequacy rather than statistical representation. A semi-structured interview guide had served as the primary research instrument. Interview questions had explored participants' experiences of instructional supervision, changes brought about by digital transformation, technologies used during supervision, approaches to classroom observation and monitoring, feedback and mentoring practices, teacher digital competencies, professional-development support, workload, connectivity and infrastructure challenges, and recommendations for improving supervision. The interview guide had undergone expert review by specialists in educational leadership, instructional supervision, educational technology, and qualitative research to establish relevance, clarity, and alignment with the research questions. Appropriate authorization had been obtained from concerned Department of Education authorities before data gathering. Participants had been informed of the study's purpose, procedures, confidentiality safeguards, voluntary nature, and right to withdraw without penalty. Written informed consent had been obtained prior to the interviews. Individual semi-structured interviews had been conducted and had lasted approximately 40–60 minutes. With participant permission, interviews had been audio-recorded and subsequently transcribed verbatim. Field notes had also been maintained to capture contextual observations, relevant non-verbal expressions, and emerging analytic insights. Available documents related to instructional supervision, professional development, classroom observation, digital-learning implementation, supervisory monitoring, and related DepEd programs had been examined to supplement the interview evidence. Data had been analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's approach. The researcher had first repeatedly read the transcripts to develop familiarity with the data, after which meaningful segments had been coded systematically. Related codes had then been grouped into potential themes, reviewed against the dataset, refined according to their central organizing concepts, and interpreted in relation to the research questions and theoretical framework. The analysis had remained iterative, involving repeated movement among transcripts, codes, themes, literature, and interpretive reflections. Trustworthiness had been addressed through credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability. Credibility had been strengthened through prolonged engagement with the data, comparison of perspectives between supervisors and master teachers, and clarification of participant meanings where necessary. Dependability had been established through systematic documentation of methodological and analytical decisions. Confirmability had been supported through reflexive notes and an audit trail, while transferability had been enhanced through sufficiently detailed contextual descriptions. Participants had been identified through codes such as SUP for supervisors and MT for master teachers to maintain confidentiality. Personally identifying information had been removed from transcripts and research records, while electronic data had been stored securely and accessed only for research purposes.

## 6. Results and Findings

The thematic analysis of the experiences of the 15 supervisors and master teachers revealed that digital transformation had fundamentally broadened the meaning and practice of instructional supervision. Participants had no longer viewed supervision solely as physical classroom observation. Instead, they had increasingly understood it as a continuous professional-support process mediated by technology, digital evidence, communication platforms, teacher-development activities, and collaborative monitoring.

### Theme 1. Reframing Instructional Supervision Beyond the Physical Classroom

Participants had described a noticeable shift from traditional classroom-based supervision toward a broader and more flexible approach to instructional monitoring.

Supervisors and master teachers had reported that digital technology allowed them to examine lesson materials, presentations, instructional videos, digital assessment tasks, electronic records, online communication, and other evidence of instructional practice in addition to conducting actual classroom observations.

An illustrative supervisor response was expressed as:

**SUP1:** "Before, instructional supervision was mostly associated with entering the classroom and observing the teacher. With digitalization, supervision became broader because we could also examine digital materials, activities, assessment practices, and how teachers used technology to support learning."
A master teacher similarly described:
**MT2:** "Observation was still important, but I learned that one classroom visit could not show everything. Sometimes I understood the teacher better when I also looked at the learning materials, digital activities, and how the teacher communicated with learners."
Another participant reflected positively on flexibility:
**SUP3:** Consultation could happen through online meetings or messaging, so supervision became more continuous."
However, one master teacher expressed concern:
**MT4:** "Digital supervision could give us more evidence, but sometimes there was too much emphasis on screenshots and documentation. There was a danger that supervision became more about proving that something was done than discussing whether learning actually improved."
The contrasting experiences revealed that digital transformation had expanded supervisory visibility while also increasing the risk of documentation-oriented supervision.
Yap's (2024) qualitative study of master teachers similarly emphasized that instructional supervision involved collaboration, leadership, improvement of teaching approaches, and continuous adaptation rather than simple inspection. The theme indicated that instructional supervision had evolved from episodic classroom observation toward continuous evidence-informed instructional support.
Digital transformation had expanded what supervisors could examine, but the value of this increased visibility depended on whether the evidence was interpreted pedagogically rather than administratively.

**Theme 2. Digital Technologies as Bridges for Supervisory Communication and Instructional Visibility**
The second theme revealed that participants generally perceived digital technologies as useful tools for improving communication, accessibility, sharing of materials, technical assistance, and professional feedback.
One supervisor explained:
**SUP2:** "Digital platforms made communication faster. If teachers needed clarification, they could send their concerns, lesson plans, or materials, and we could immediately provide suggestions instead of waiting for the next school visit."
A master teacher similarly stated:
**MT1:** "Technology helped us share resources. If I found a good strategy, demonstration video, or digital material, I could immediately send it to teachers. That made mentoring more practical."
Another participant emphasized continuity:
**SUP5:** "Supervision was no longer limited by location. Even when teachers were in another school, we could hold a virtual consultation and discuss their instructional concerns."
Nevertheless, digital communication also created challenges.
**MT5:** "Online communication was convenient, but it could not completely replace face-to-face interaction. Sometimes it was difficult to understand a teacher's concern through messages alone."
Another participant stated:
**SUP6:** "Digital records were helpful, but supervisors needed to be careful. A teacher who was less active online was not automatically ineffective because there could be connectivity or contextual reasons."
DepEd's current digitalization strategy similarly emphasized that technology adoption needed to include teacher digital competence, infrastructure, governance, and data-informed decision-making rather than focusing only on devices. Digital tools had served as bridges rather than substitutes for professional relationships. They increased efficiency and reach but needed to be complemented by dialogue, professional judgment, and sensitivity to context.

**Theme 3. Transforming Supervision from Compliance toward Coaching and Professional Growth**
The third theme revealed that participants considered supervision most meaningful when it promoted teacher development rather than merely checking requirements.
A supervisor explained:
**SUP4:** "Supervision should not make teachers afraid. Our role was to identify what they were doing well and what support they still needed. Especially with technology, some teachers needed coaching rather than criticism."
A master teacher shared:
**MT3:** "When teachers knew that I was there to help and not simply rate them, they became more open about their weaknesses. They would tell me what they could not do, and then we could work on it together."

Another participant described the importance of demonstration:
**MT6:** "Sometimes telling a teacher what to improve was not enough. I demonstrated how to use the application or how to integrate the digital material into the lesson. After that, the teacher became more confident."
However, compliance remained a concern:
**SUP7:**
"There were instances when teachers became focused on completing the required documents because they knew these would be checked. We had to remind them that supervision was not only about complete documents but about improving instruction."
Research on clinical instructional supervision in Philippine public schools had similarly emphasized observation, feedback, and coaching as important elements of teachers' professional development. Reyes and Oropa (2025) also emphasized the critical supervisory role of master teachers in improving teacher and learner performance.
The theme reflected the need to reposition instructional supervision from a compliance culture toward a learning culture. Digital tools could make monitoring easier, but effective supervision remained fundamentally developmental. Teachers needed feedback that was specific, constructive, respectful, and linked to actual teaching challenges.

**Theme 4. Navigating Technological, Workload, and Human-Capacity Constraints**
The fourth theme represented the major challenges experienced by participants.
Supervisors and master teachers had identified differences in teachers' digital competence, unstable internet connectivity, limited equipment, increased documentation, multiple responsibilities, resistance to new technologies, and insufficient time for intensive mentoring.
One master teacher stated:
**MT7:** "Not all teachers had the same level of digital skills. Some learned quickly, while others needed repeated assistance. We could not expect one training to make everyone equally competent."
A supervisor explained:
**SUP3:** "Connectivity remained a problem in some areas. We could encourage digital practices, but implementation depended on whether teachers and learners actually had reliable access."
Workload was another recurring concern:
**MT8:** "The challenge was that master teachers were also teachers. We had our own classes and other assignments. Providing individual coaching to several teachers required additional time."
Another supervisor explained:
**SUP2:** "Digitalization made some processes easier, but it also created additional expectations. Teachers had to prepare digital materials, reports, online submissions, and other evidence. We needed to make sure supervision did not unnecessarily add to their workload."
A participant also described resistance:
**MT9:** "Some teachers were initially hesitant because they were already comfortable with traditional methods. They were afraid that technology would make teaching more complicated."
These experiences were consistent with Andal's (2024) phenomenological findings that master teachers encountered supervisory difficulties involving time management, pedagogical approaches, feedback, adaptability, and awareness of emerging strategies.
DepEd itself had recognized continuing gaps in digital infrastructure and access. In 2025, the Department reported that nearly 40,000 schools remained below the ideal student-to-device ratio and continued expanding devices, connectivity, and education technology.
The findings demonstrated that digital transformation had occurred within uneven conditions of technological and professional readiness.
Consequently, supervisors could not fairly interpret digital practices without considering connectivity, equipment, teacher competence, workload, geographical context, and learner access. Effective digital supervision therefore required context-sensitive judgment rather than uniform expectations.

**Theme 5. Building a Collaborative and Digitally Responsive Supervisory Ecosystem**
The fifth theme indicated that effective instructional supervision had increasingly required collaboration among supervisors, master teachers, school heads, teachers, ICT coordinators, and other education personnel.
A supervisor stated:
**SUP1:** "Digital transformation was too broad for one person to handle. Supervisors understood curriculum and instruction, but sometimes we needed ICT personnel for technical concerns and master teachers for closer mentoring."

One master teacher similarly explained:
**MT10:** "Teachers became more willing to try digital strategies when they knew there were people they could approach. Collaboration reduced their fear of making mistakes."
Another participant emphasized professional sharing:
**MT11:** "Learning Action Cell sessions became important because teachers shared what worked and what did not work. Sometimes the best support came from another teacher who had already experienced the same problem."
A supervisor added:
**SUP11:** "The goal should be to develop a system where supervision continues even when the supervisor is not physically present. Master teachers, school heads, and teachers themselves should become part of the improvement process."
This finding paralleled recent Philippine research showing that master-teacher instructional supervision involved mentoring, coaching, classroom monitoring, and professional-development responsibilities. Digital-pedagogical leadership research in the Philippine context had likewise emphasized the relationship between leadership practices, digital policies, and teachers' use of technology.
The theme suggested that sustainable digital instructional supervision required an ecosystem rather than an individual supervisor.
Responsibility for improvement needed to be distributed across personnel with different forms of expertise.

## 7. Discussion

The study revealed that instructional supervision in digitally transformed basic education had become broader, more continuous, and increasingly technology-mediated.
The experiences of the 15 supervisors and master teachers demonstrated that conventional observation remained important but was no longer sufficient. Digital materials, assessment practices, communication patterns, electronic records, and technology integration had increasingly become relevant evidence of instructional practice.
This finding aligned with DepEd's current movement toward system-wide digitalization. The Quality Basic Education Development Plan 2025–2035 had explicitly emphasized that sustainable digital transformation required alignment among leadership, teacher capacity, infrastructure, digital content, and data systems.
The findings also demonstrated that effective supervision remained fundamentally developmental. Teachers responded more positively when supervisors and master teachers approached supervision as coaching, mentoring, and professional assistance.
This finding was consistent with Yap's (2024) qualitative evidence that master-teacher supervision was grounded in collaboration, teaching improvement, leadership, and continuous professional learning. It also complemented Reyes and Oropa's (2025) evidence regarding the contribution of master teachers' supervision to teacher and learner performance.
However, the study revealed important structural constraints. Digital competence was uneven, connectivity remained unreliable in some contexts, supervisory and teacher workloads were substantial, and increasing digital documentation risked shifting attention from instructional quality toward procedural compliance. These findings supported the interpretation that digital supervision should be developmental, evidence-informed, differentiated, and context-sensitive.

## 8. Conclusions

The study concluded that digital transformation had substantially reshaped instructional supervision within the Department of Education.
The experiences of the 15 supervisors and master teachers indicated that instructional supervision had extended beyond conventional physical classroom observations toward more continuous, digitally supported, and evidence-informed professional assistance.
Digital technologies had facilitated communication, sharing of resources, instructional monitoring, mentoring, and professional development. However, technology had not eliminated the need for professional relationships, contextual judgment, and face-to-face interaction.
The study further concluded that supervision was more meaningful when it emphasized coaching, mentoring, professional dialogue, and instructional improvement rather than documentation and compliance alone.
Technological limitations, differences in teacher digital competence, connectivity problems, workload, equipment availability, and resistance to change continued to affect implementation.
Accordingly, successful digital instructional supervision required more than technological tools. It required digitally competent instructional leaders, collaborative professional structures, appropriate infrastructure, continuous teacher development, contextualized supervision, and institutional commitment to professional growth.

## 10. Recommendations

The Department of Education should continue strengthening the digital competencies of supervisors, master teachers, school heads, and teachers through differentiated and sustained professional-development programs.
Instructional-supervision instruments should incorporate indicators appropriate to digitally supported instruction without reducing evaluation to digital activity or documentary compliance.
Supervisors and master teachers should strengthen coaching, mentoring, demonstration teaching, peer support, and Learning Action Cell activities focusing on technology-supported pedagogy.
Supervisory expectations should account for differences in connectivity, school resources, teacher competence, learner access, and local contexts.
DepEd should continue improving digital infrastructure, access to devices, connectivity, digital platforms, and technical support, consistent with its ongoing digital-transformation agenda.
Collaboration among supervisors, master teachers, school heads, ICT coordinators, and teachers should be institutionalized to ensure that digital instructional supervision becomes a shared professional responsibility.
Future studies should include teachers' perspectives, compare different Schools Division Offices, and investigate how digitally responsive instructional supervision influences teacher competence and learner outcomes.

**References**

Andal, L. L. M. (2024). Challenges in instructional supervision: A phenomenological study of master teachers in Cabuyao. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives, 2*(8).
Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE.
Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE.
Department of Education. (2025). *Quality Basic Education Development Plan 2025–2035*. Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines.
Department of Education. (2025, March 11). *Connecting the last mile: DepEd, PBBM delivering the promise of digitalization*. Department of Education.
Department of Education. (2025, March 20). *Survey on digital transformation in education*. Department of Education.
Octobre, J., & Andal, E. (2025). Clinical instructional supervisory practices: Input to professional growth and development of elementary teachers. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 40*(6).
Reyes, M. III B., & Oropa, J. C. (2025). Instructional supervision of master teachers: Its critical role in advancing teachers' and learners' performance. *American Journal of Education and Technology, 4*(2), 17–33. https://doi.org/10.54536/ajet.v4i2.4399
Wong, R. E. (2024). Navigating master teachers' instructional supervision practices and teaching competence of teachers: Implication for professional development program. *International Journal of Research Publication, 153*(1), 229–238. https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP1001531720246976
Yap, M. (2024). Master teachers lived experiences on instructional supervision: A qualitative study. *Southeast Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*.