

# **Assessment of the Performance of the Examination Supervisors of Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) Region IV-A**

**April V. Cataquiz**

Master in Public Administration (MPA), Laguna Polytechnic State University, Sta. Cruz Main Campus,  
Laguna, Philippines

## **Abstract**

This study evaluated the performance of examination supervisors of the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) Regional Office IV-A during licensure examinations conducted from January to February 2025. The research examined supervisory efficiency, policy adherence, communication quality, and effectiveness. Findings indicate that most supervisors were aged 25–34, predominantly female, and had experience in both public and private employment. A significant number had supervised multiple examinations, with the criminologist licensure examination (CLE) being the most common.

The study revealed a very high level of implementation in key supervisory areas, including time management, fairness, handling disputes, and maintaining examination integrity. Supervisors demonstrated strong communication skills, ensuring clear instructions and professional interactions with examinees. Their commitment to preventing irregularities, safeguarding examination accountability forms, and enforcing policies contributed to the smooth administration of exams. Additionally, the research found a positive correlation between supervisory skills, communication quality, policy adherence, and overall performance.

While demographic factors such as age, occupation, and supervisory experience showed no significant impact on performance levels, gender influenced proctor satisfaction, with female supervisors receiving higher satisfaction ratings. The study underscores the importance of ongoing training, feedback collection, and resource management to enhance supervisory effectiveness further. Recommendations include continuous assessment of supervisors' training, collection of examinee feedback, and future research on the relationship between supervisor performance and examination outcomes.

**KEYWORDS:** Examination Supervisors, Licensure Examinations, Performance Evaluation, Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) Region IV-A, Proctor/Room Watchers Satisfaction.

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) is the governing organization in charge of administering licensure examinations that uphold the standards and qualifications of professionals in the Philippines. Individuals interested in entering various industries have been required to take these examinations, which serve as an essential benchmark for evaluating their level of competence. Examination Supervisors, such as Building Supervisors and Floor Supervisors, are entrusted with supervising the overall conduct of the licensure examinations inside the premises of the examination venues, guaranteeing strict adherence to

PRC guidelines, policies, and procedures. As Examination Supervisors, they must supervise the room watchers or proctors to ensure that licensure examinations are fair, smooth, and free of anomalies. Room watchers or proctors, staff members of the PRC or volunteer personnel working for the PRC, are responsible for monitoring the examinees, preventing irregularities, and maintaining order in the examination rooms.

Examination supervisors evaluated Room watchers or proctors methodically using a performance evaluation sheet provided by the PRC. Several aspects, including punctuality or time management, orderliness, clarity of instruction, vigilance, and professionalism, are included in this evaluation questionnaire. Having this tool helps ensure that the examination process is carried out in a manner that is both fair and smooth for all examinees. The Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) can guarantee that the examination procedure is conducted honestly and impartially using this instrument. The results of this evaluation determine whether or not room watchers or proctors meet the requirements necessary for the effective and equitable administration of examinations.

On the other hand, the PRC does not have an evaluation for the performance of examination supervisors, even though they play a crucial role in supervising and administering the entire examination process. Specifically, about their leadership or supervisory skills, communication quality, policy adherence, and positive attitude, this lack of evaluation creates a substantial gap in evaluating their performance, which is particularly problematic.

It is concerning that supervisors do not receive a performance evaluation, as this raises questions about whether their supervision meets the standards required to guarantee the reliability and fairness of examination conduct. Deficiencies or inefficiencies in their supervision could go unreported if they are not properly evaluated, which might negatively impact the overall quality of the examination process. Furthermore, relying solely on self-reported data from individuals directly involved in the examination process presents the possibility that not all significant elements influencing the findings will be captured.

## **OBJECTIVES**

The study aimed to assess the performance of the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) Regional Office IV-A's examination supervisors during licensure examinations from January 2025 to February 2025. Specifically, the study examined the relationships between the independent variables—supervisory skills, communication quality, policy adherence, and positive attitude—and the dependent variables—exam efficiency, policy compliance, and room watchers' or proctors' satisfaction to improve the quality, efficiency, and fairness of the licensure examination processes.

## **METHODS**

The study employed a quantitative descriptive research design to assess the recruitment and performance evaluation of examination personnel of the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) in the conduct of licensure examinations. Its primary focus was on understanding how personnel are recruited, deployed, and evaluated, and how these processes can be improved.

To gather relevant data, the researchers used a structured survey questionnaire as the main instrument. This tool consisted of two parts: one gathered the respondents' demographic profiles, and the other assessed aspects of performance evaluation. The questionnaire underwent pilot testing with 20 participants, and Cronbach's Alpha was applied to determine reliability, with coefficients ranging from 0.93 to 0.98, indicating excellent internal consistency across all variables.

The study's population consisted of 100 examination personnel who were directly involved in recruitment, deployment, monitoring, and evaluation processes. These participants were selected using simple random sampling from various PRC divisions, including the Licensure and Registration Division, the Examination Section, and the IT Department. They were specifically chosen due to their relevant roles and experience in the licensure examination process.

Data were collected through Likert-type checklist questions, allowing for the quantification of responses and ensuring a standardized method of analysis. The researchers employed the following statistical tools: frequency counts and percentages for demographic profiles, mean scores to measure perceptions regarding recruitment and performance evaluation, and the Kruskal-Wallis H-test to assess significant differences among variables since Likert scales were used.

The entire research process was conducted systematically and ethically, ensuring informed consent and proper communication with respondents. After data collection and analysis, the findings were reviewed and validated through feedback from participants. The final report was prepared for dissemination to PRC stakeholders, including management and operational personnel, and aimed to inform policy improvements and contribute to academic discussions in the field of public administration.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Results

**Table 1. Cronbach's Alpha per Variable**

Variable	Cronbach's $\alpha$
Supervisory Skills	0.94
Communication Quality	0.98
Policy Adherence	0.94
Positive Attitude	0.93
Examination Efficiency	0.95
Policy Compliance	0.95
Room Watcher or Proctors Satisfaction	0.96

Cronbach's alpha ( $\alpha$ ) was calculated to determine the internal consistency of the variables. The reliability coefficients ranged from 0.93 to 0.98, indicating excellent internal consistency across all variables (George & Mallery, 2019). The highest reliability was observed in Communication Quality ( $\alpha = 0.98$ ), suggesting an exceptionally high level of response consistency. All other variables also demonstrated excellent reliability ( $\alpha \geq 0.90$ ), confirming that the items within each variable are highly correlated and measure consistent constructs.

**Table 2. Demographic Profile of the Respondents in terms of Age**

Age	F	%
55 and above	4	3.64
45-54	9	8.18
35-44	15	13.64
25-34	63	57.27
18-24	19	17.27

<b>Total</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>100.00</b>
--------------	------------	---------------

Table 2 shows the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age. It revealed the distribution of participants across different age groups. Most respondents (57.27%) belonged to the 25–34 age group, indicating that the sample primarily comprises young adults. This is followed by the 18–24 age group, which accounted for 17.27% of the respondents. The 35–44 age group comprised 13.64%, while the 45–54 age group constituted 8.18%. The smallest proportion of respondents fell within the 55 and above category, representing only 3.64% of the total sample. These data indicate that a significant portion of the respondents are within their early to mid-career stages, potentially suggesting a younger workforce or student population, depending on the study’s context.

**Table 3. Demographic Profile of the Respondents in terms of Gender**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>%</b>
Female	69	62.73
Male	41	37.27
<b>Total</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Table 3 shows the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of gender. The majority of the respondents were female, comprising more than half of the sample—specifically, 69 or 62.73%. Meanwhile, 41 or 37.27% of the sample were male. The data highlight that the assigned room watchers or proctors are predominantly female.

**Table 4. Demographic Profile of the Respondents in terms of Occupation**

<b>Occupation</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>%</b>
Government Employee	48	43.64
Private Employee	48	43.64
Housewife/House buddy	14	12.73
<b>Total</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Table 4 presents the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of occupation. The data showed that most of the evaluators were government employees and private employees, each group constituting 48 out of 110, or 43.64% of the sample. A portion of the sample included housewives or house buddies, with only 14 or 12.73% of the total. The data indicate that a significant portion of the respondents are working professionals.

**Table 5. Demographic profile of the Respondents in terms of Number of Times Assigned as Room watcher or Proctor**

<b>Number of times assigned</b>	<b>f</b>	<b>%</b>
First time	39	35.45
Second time	12	10.91
Third time	8	7.27
Fourth time	7	6.36

More than five times	44	40.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Table 5 presents the respondents' demographic profile regarding the number of times they have been assigned as room watchers or proctors. The results showed that most room watchers or proctors had been assigned more than five times, with 44 out of 110, or 40% of the total sample. The second-highest group was the first-timers, with a frequency of 39 or 35.45% of the sample. The data show a noticeable pattern from first-timers up to fourth-timers, indicating that while the number of assignments initially increased, the frequency decreased after the fourth time.

**Table 6. Demographic Profile of the Respondents in terms of Recent Licensure Examination Served**

Recent Licensure	f	%
Architects	6	5.45
Criminologists	85	77.27
Mechanical Engineers	13	11.82
Master Plumber	6	5.45
<b>Total</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Table 6 represents the respondents' demographic profile regarding the most recent licensure examination for which they served as proctors or room watchers.

Most respondents had served in the Criminologist Licensure Examination (CLE), with a frequency of 85 or 77.27% of the sample. The second-highest frequency was recorded for those who recently served in the Mechanical Engineer Licensure Examination (MELE), with 13 out of 110, or 11.82% of the sample. Meanwhile, the least served licensure examinations were the Architecture Licensure Examination (ALE) and the Master Plumbers Licensure Examination (MPLE), each with 6 out of 110 or approximately 6% of the sample. The findings show that the majority of the respondents recently served in the Criminologist Licensure Examination.

**Table 7. Level of Implementation of Monitoring of the Examination Supervisors as to Supervisory Skills.**

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Provides clear and organized instructions before, during, and after the examination.	4.74	0.44	VHI
2. Keeps track of time efficiently, ensuring room watchers or proctors stay on schedule.	4.79	0.47	VHI
3. Manages the examination process and ensures smooth operations.	4.76	0.49	VHI
4. Demonstrates fairness and impartiality in dealing with both proctors and examinees.	4.78	0.44	VHI
5. Manages difficult situations, such as disputes over exam rules or misconduct accusations.	4.74	0.48	VHI

Overall Mean	4.75	VHI
--------------	------	-----

Legend. The mean is interpreted as follows 4.21-5.00 = Very High Implementation (VHI), 3.41-4.20 = High Implementation (HI), 2.61-3.40 = Moderately High Implementation (MHI), 1.81-2.60 = Low Implementation (LI), and 1.00-1.80 = Very Low Implementation (VLI).

Table 7 presents the assessment of the level of implementation of monitoring among examination supervisors in terms of their supervisory skills. The indicators reflect key responsibilities of examination supervisors, including time management, fairness, handling disputes, and ensuring smooth examination operations.

The results revealed and continue to reveal that time management is one of the examination supervisors' strongest competencies ( $M = 4.89$ ,  $SD = 0.47$ ). This means efficient time management ensures the examination process proceeds without unnecessary delays and that proctors remain aligned with the schedule. Baldwin and Adams (2018) emphasized and still emphasize the importance of time management in supervision. They stated that examination supervisors must efficiently manage their time to oversee various responsibilities such as organizing the exam room, monitoring invigilators, ensuring adherence to procedures, and addressing examinee concerns. Efficient time management remains essential in maintaining the integrity of the examination process by ensuring tasks are completed without interruption.

**Table 8. Level of Implementation of Monitoring of the Examination Supervisors as to Communication Quality.**

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Uses clear and professional language to prevent misunderstandings.	4.76	0.47	VHI
2. Listens actively and responds appropriately to room watcher's or proctor's questions and concerns.	4.79	0.54	VHI
3. Handles inquiries and concerns in a calm and professional manner.	4.75	0.51	VHI
4. Uses a respectful and professional tone in all interactions.	4.71	0.56	VHI
5. De-escalates tense situations with diplomatic and solution-oriented communication.	4.72	0.51	VHI
Overall Mean	4.73		VHI

Legend. The mean is interpreted as follows 4.21-5.00 = Very High Implementation (VHI), 3.41-4.20 = High Implementation (HI), 2.61-3.40 = Moderately High Implementation (MHI), 1.81-2.60 = Low Implementation (LI), and 1.00-1.80 = Very Low Implementation (VLI).

Table 8 presents the assessment of the level of implementation of monitoring practices concerning the communication quality of examination supervisors. The data highlights how effectively communication is carried out during licensure examinations. Results are presented using mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) values, which provide statistical measures of central tendency and variability, along with corresponding interpretations that explain the level of implementation for each specific communication-related indicator.



The table highlighted and continues to highlight that all indicators are implemented at a very high level. Among the highest-rated indicators is the ability of room supervisors to listen actively and respond appropriately to questions or inquiries ( $M = 4.79$ ,  $SD = 0.54$ ). Their language use was and remains clear, respectful, and professional to avoid any form of misunderstanding ( $M = 4.76$ ,  $SD = 0.47$ ), reflecting their strong communication and interpersonal skills.

**Table 9. Level of Implementation of Monitoring of the Examination Supervisors as to Policy Adherence**

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Ensures strict adherence to examination policies and procedures.	4.82	0.39	VHI
2. Avoids any cheating or anomalies in the school premises.	4.89	0.31	VHI
3. Maintains confidentiality of exam accountability forms and results.	4.86	0.34	VHI
4. Implements solutions that align with exam policies while maintaining fairness.	4.79	0.43	VHI
5. Ensures all rules, including time limits and security measures, are strictly followed.	4.86	0.34	VHI
Overall Mean	4.83		VHI

Legend. The mean is interpreted as follows 4.21-5.00 = Very High Implementation (VHI), 3.41-4.20 = High Implementation (HI), 2.61-3.40 = Moderately High Implementation (MHI), 1.81-2.60 = Low Implementation (LI), and 1.00-1.80 = Very Low Implementation (VLI).

Table 9 shows the level of implementation of monitoring of the examination supervisors regarding policy adherence. The results were presented and continue to be presented as mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) values, along with interpretations for each indicator.

The data highlighted and still highlights the strong implementation of policy adherence among examination supervisors. The highest rated indicator was the prevention of any irregularities or dishonesty on school premises, especially inside the assigned examination rooms ( $M = 4.89$ ,  $SD = 0.31$ ). Respondents also maintained and continue to maintain the confidentiality of exam accountability forms and results ( $M = 4.86$ ,  $SD = 0.34$ ), and ensured that all rules, including time limits and security measures, were strictly followed ( $M = 4.86$ ,  $SD = 0.34$ ).

**Table 10. Level of Implementation of Monitoring of the Examination Supervisors as to Positive Attitude**

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Maintains a positive and composed demeanor when handling challenges.	4.70	0.55	VHI
2. Focuses on solutions rather than problems and avoids negativity.	4.72	0.54	VHI
3. Treats all candidates and colleagues with kindness and fairness.	4.73	0.52	VHI

4. Listens actively and accommodates reasonable concerns while upholding examination.	4.76	0.47	VHI
5. Demonstrates confidence in managing exam-related situations effectively.	4.74	0.50	VHI
Overall Mean	4.71		VHI

Legend. The mean is interpreted as follows 4.21-5.00 = Very High Implementation (VHI), 3.41-4.20 = High Implementation (HI), 2.61-3.40 = Moderately High Implementation (MHI), 1.81-2.60 = Low Implementation (LI), and 1.00-1.80 = Very Low Implementation (VLI).

Table 10 presented and continues to present the level of implementation of monitoring of the examination supervisors in terms of positive attitude. The results were reported as mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) values, along with interpretations for each indicator. The respondents had shown and still show a positive attitude in their roles as room supervisors. They actively listened, respected the examination process, and took into account reasonable objections (M = 4.76, SD = 0.47). Respondents also demonstrated and continue to demonstrate confidence in effectively managing situations related to examinations (M = 4.74, SD = 0.50). Furthermore, although with a slightly lower score, participants treated and continue to treat all candidates and colleagues with kindness and fairness (M = 4.73, SD = 0.52). In addition, they also focused and continue to focus on finding solutions while avoiding negative scenarios (M = 4.72, SD = 0.54), and maintained and still maintain a positive and composed demeanor when handling challenges (M = 4.70, SD = 0.54).

**Table 11. Level of Performance of the Examination Supervisors as to Efficiency.**

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Ensures that the examination started and ended on time.	4.84	0.37	VH
2. Monitor time closely and make necessary adjustments to maintain order.	4.83	0.38	VH
3. Provides clear and organized instructions before, during, and after the examination.	4.82	0.39	VH
4. Manages the examination process and ensures smooth operations.	4.82	0.43	VH
5. Demonstrates fairness and impartiality in dealing with both proctors and examinees.	4.76	0.49	VH
Overall Mean	4.80		VH

Legend. The mean is interpreted as follows 4.21-5.00 = Very High Implementation (VHI), 3.41-4.20 = High Implementation (HI), 2.61-3.40 = Moderately High Implementation (MHI), 1.81-2.60 = Low Implementation (LI), and 1.00-1.80 = Very Low Implementation (VLI).

Table 11 presents the respondents' assessment of examination supervisors' efficiency, focusing on key indicators such as time management, clarity of instructions, process handling, and fairness—essential qualities that define the overall effectiveness and competence of an efficient examination supervisor. The results revealed that punctuality and adherence to the examination schedule were among the strongest competencies of supervisors (M = 4.84, SD = 0.37). The time management skills of supervisors were



evident, showing that they ensured adherence to the schedule and made real-time adjustments when needed ( $M = 4.83$ ,  $SD = 0.38$ ). Supervisors also demonstrated fairness and impartiality in dealing with both proctors and examinees ( $M = 4.76$ ,  $SD = 0.49$ ). Time management is a crucial skill for exam supervisors since it directly affects the smooth conduct of exams, according to Cunningham and Barry (2019). Supervisors who practiced effective time management could deliver accountability forms, set up the exam room, monitor students, and meet deadlines without delays. This is particularly crucial for high-stakes tests, where timing and accuracy are essential to prevent interruptions.

**Table 12. Level of the Performance of the Examination Supervisors as to Policy Compliance**

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Ensures that all examinees followed the rules regarding prohibited items (e.g., electronic devices, notes, unauthorized accountability forms).	4.79	0.41	VH
2. Regularly checks examination rooms for compliance with security measures.	4.75	0.50	VH
3. The supervisor strictly implemented restroom break policies to avoid examination violations.	4.74	0.50	VH
4. Ensures that security measures are followed throughout the examination.	4.81	0.42	VH
5. Responds efficiently to any issues or emergencies during the examination.	4.81	0.44	VH
Overall Mean	4.76		VH

Legend. The mean is interpreted as follows 4.21-5.00 = Very High Implementation (VHI), 3.41-4.20 = High Implementation (HI), 2.61-3.40 = Moderately High Implementation (MHI), 1.81-2.60 = Low Implementation (LI), and 1.00-1.80 = Very Low Implementation (VLI).

Table 12 shows respondents' assessment of examination supervisors' performance regarding adherence to established policies during the examination process. The results, presented with mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) values, indicate a consistently high level of compliance across all indicators. These include enforcing restroom break policies, promptly addressing issues, and ensuring examinees follow rules. The low standard deviations suggest uniform performance among supervisors. These findings align with Bautista (2021), who highlights that strict adherence to policies such as security, time limits, and cheating prevention is essential to maintaining exam integrity and fairness throughout the testing process.

**Table 13. Level of the Performance of the Examination Supervisors as to Room watcher or Proctor Satisfaction**

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Provides clear and organized instructions before, during, and after the examination.	4.79	0.43	VH
2. Manages the examination process and ensures smooth operations.	4.77	0.44	VH
3. Demonstrates fairness and impartiality in dealing with both proctors and examinees.	4.73	0.52	VH

4.	Maintained professionalism in all interactions.	4.71	0.55	VH
5.	Coordinates with proctors and other personnel when problems arose.	4.77	0.48	VH
Overall Mean		4.74		VH

Legend. The mean is interpreted as follows 4.21-5.00 = Very High Implementation (VHI), 3.41-4.20 = High Implementation (HI), 2.61-3.40 = Moderately High Implementation (MHI), 1.81-2.60 = Low Implementation (LI), and 1.00-1.80 = Very Low Implementation (VLI).

**Table 14. Significant difference in the Performance of the Examination Supervisors, when Grouped According to Age**

	Age	$\chi^2$	P-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Examination Efficiency	55 and above	2.063	0.724	Fail to reject Ho	Not Significant
	45-54				
	35-44				
	25-34				
	18-24				
Policy compliance	55 and above	4.717	0.318	Fail to reject Ho	Not Significant
	45-54				
	35-44				
	25-34				
	18-24				
Room watchers or proctors' satisfaction	55 and above	4.495	0.343	Fail to reject Ho	Not Significant
	45-54				
	35-44				
	25-34				
	18-24				

Note: P-value < .05 is significant. Kruskal Wallis H test was used since there is not enough observation for each group.

Table 13 presents the performance of examination supervisors based on room watcher or proctor satisfaction. The data indicates high satisfaction across all indicators. Notably, the first indicator—evaluating whether supervisors gave clear and organized instructions before, during, and after the examination—received a mean score of 4.79 (SD = 0.43), falling within the very high (VH) category. This reflects the supervisors' ability to communicate effectively, ensuring that all parties understood their responsibilities and contributing to the smooth and organized conduct of the examination.

Table 14 presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test, which was conducted to determine whether significant differences existed in the performance of examination supervisors based on their age groups. The performance was assessed across three dimensions: Examination Efficiency, Policy Compliance, and Room Watchers or Proctors' Satisfaction. Since the P-values for all three performance indicators were

greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was not rejected, indicating that no significant differences were found in the performance of examination supervisors across different age groups. The result indicated that the sample sizes for each age group were insufficient for parametric testing, but the findings still provided valuable insights into the consistency of examination supervisors' performance across age demographics.

**Table 15. Significant difference in the Performance of the Examination Supervisors, when Grouped According to Gender**

	Gender	Mann-Whitney U statistic	P-value	Decision on $H_0$	Interpretati on
Examination Efficiency	Female	1286	0.215	Fail to reject $H_0$	Not Significant
	Male				
Policy compliance	Female	1236	0.126	Fail to reject $H_0$	Not Significant
	Male				
Room watchers or proctors' satisfaction	Female	1131	0.024	Reject $H_0$	Significant
	Male				

Note: P-value < .05 is significant

Table 15 presents the results of the Mann-Whitney U test, which was conducted to determine whether significant differences existed in the performance of examination supervisors based on their gender groups.

The performance was assessed across three dimensions: Examination Efficiency, Policy Compliance, and Room Watchers or Proctors' Satisfaction. Since the P-values for two performance indicators were greater than 0.05, the null hypotheses ( $H_0$ ) were not rejected. The results showed that examination efficiency and policy compliance were not statistically significant when grouped according to gender. This meant that both female and male supervisors performed equally in terms of examination efficiency and policy compliance. However, the P-value for Room Watchers or Proctors' Satisfaction was less than 0.05, and therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. This indicated that gender did matter in the satisfaction of room watchers or proctors. Based on the computed mean values, female supervisors were more satisfied (mean = 4.83) compared to their male counterparts (mean = 4.73). While there was a difference in satisfaction between female and male room watchers or proctors, the difference was not very large.

**Table 16. Significant difference in the Performance of the Examination Supervisors, when grouped according to Occupation**

	Occupation	$\chi^2$	P-value	Decision on $H_0$	Interpretation
Examination Efficiency	Government Employee	0.669	0.716	Fail to reject $H_0$	Not Significant
	Private Employee				
	Housewife/House buddy				
Policy compliance	Government Employee	2.963	0.227	Fail to reject $H_0$	Not Significant

Room watchers or proctors’ satisfaction	Private Employee		2.058	0.357	Fail to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Housewife/House buddy					
	Government Employee					
	Private Employee					
	Housewife/House buddy					

Note: P-value < .05 is significant. Kruskal Wallis H test was used since there is not enough observation for each group.

Table 16 presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test, which was conducted to determine whether there were significant differences in the performance of examination supervisors based on their occupation.

The performance was assessed across three dimensions: examination efficiency, policy compliance, and occupation. Since the P-values for all three performance indicators were greater than 0.05, the null hypotheses (Ho) were not rejected, indicating no significant difference in the performance of examination supervisors when grouped according to occupation. The results implied that the performance of examination supervisors was the same. This meant government employees, private employees, and housewives/house buddies performed indifferently as proctors or supervisors.

Table 17 presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test, which was conducted to determine whether there were significant differences in the performance of examination supervisors when grouped according to the number of times assigned as room watchers or proctors. The performance was assessed across three dimensions: examination efficiency, policy compliance, and occupation. The null hypotheses (Ho) were not rejected because the P-values for all three performance indicators were higher than 0.05. This suggested that there was no significant difference in the performance of examination supervisors when categorized by the number of times they were assigned as proctors or room watchers. The results indicated that the number of times assigned as proctors or room watchers did not influence their performance in serving licensure examinations.

**Table 17. Significant difference in the Performance of Examination Supervisors when grouped according to Number of Times Assigned as Room watcher or Proctor**

	Number of times assigned	$x^2$	P-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Examination Efficiency	First time	5.186	0.269	Fail to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Second time				
	Third time				
	Fourth time				
	More than five times				
Policy compliance	First time	4.635	0.327	Fail to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Second time				

Room watchers or proctors' satisfaction	Third time				
	Fourth time				
	More than five times				
	First time	2.525	0.64	Fail to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Second time				
	Third time				
	Fourth time				
	More than five times				

Note: P-value < .05 is significant. Kruskal-Wallis H test was used since there are not enough observations for each group.

Table 18 presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test, which was conducted to determine whether there were significant differences in the performance of examination supervisors based on the most recent licensure examination they had served. Since the P-values for all three performance indicators were greater than 0.05, the null hypotheses (Ho) were not rejected. This indicates that there was no significant difference in the performance of examination supervisors when grouped according to the most recent licensure examination served. It implies that the type of recent examination served by the respondents did not influence their level of performance in supervising the licensure examination.

**Table 18. Significant difference in the Performance of Examination Supervisors when grouped according to Recent Licensure Examination Served**

	Recent licensure	$\chi^2$	P-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Examination Efficiency	Architects	1.835	0.607	Fail to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Criminologists				
	Mechanical Engineers				
	Master Plumber				
Policy compliance	Architects	1.964	0.58	Fail to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Criminologists				
	Mechanical Engineers				
	Master Plumber				
Room watchers or proctors' satisfaction	Architects	1.275	0.735	Fail to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Criminologists				
	Mechanical Engineers				
	Master Plumber				

Note: P-value < .05 is significant. Kruskal Wallis H test was used since there is not enough observation for each group.

**Table 19. Test of Relationship Between the level of Implementation in Monitoring and Performance Evaluation of Examination Supervisors**

Level of Implementation in Monitoring	Performance Evaluation		
	Examination Efficiency	Policy Compliance	Room watchers or proctors' satisfaction
Supervisory skills	.809*** <.001 Very Strong Significant	.834*** <.001 Very Strong Significant	.767*** <.001 Strong Significant
Communication quality	.806*** <.001 Very Strong Significant	.850*** <.001 Very Strong Significant	.844*** <.001 Very Strong Significant
Policy adherence	.864*** <.001 Very Strong Significant	.832*** <.001 Very Strong Significant	.765*** <.001 Strong Significant
Positive attitude	.713*** <.001 Strong Significant	.714*** <.001 Strong Significant	.718*** <.001 Strong Significant

Note: \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 19 presents the correlation coefficients between different aspects of the level of implementation in monitoring and three dimensions of performance evaluation of examination supervisors: examination efficiency, policy compliance, and room watchers or proctors' satisfaction. The correlation coefficients were tested for significance, with p<.001 indicating a highly significant relationship.

The findings indicated that supervisory skills, communication quality, and policy adherence had very strong relationships with the performance evaluation metrics (p<0.001), implying that these factors played a crucial role in ensuring examination efficiency, policy compliance, and proctor satisfaction. Meanwhile, positive attitude, while still showing strong correlations, had relatively lower coefficients compared to other variables, suggesting that while important, it might not have been as critical as the other factors in influencing performance outcomes. These results emphasized the importance of effective supervision, strong communication, strict adherence to policies, and maintaining a positive attitude in ensuring a well-managed and successful examination process.

The study found that most examination supervisors are aged 25 to 34, predominantly female, and come from both government and private sectors, though some are housewives. Many have served as proctors more than five times, with the Criminologist Licensure Examination (CLE) being the most common assignment.



Results show a very high level of implementation in key supervisory areas. Supervisory skills—such as time management, fairness, handling disputes, and ensuring smooth operations—were effectively carried out. Communication quality was also rated very high, with supervisors demonstrating active listening, clarity, professionalism, and the ability to calmly manage inquiries and challenges.

In terms of policy adherence, respondents effectively prevented irregularities, ensured confidentiality, enforced security and time restrictions, and followed examination procedures fairly. Supervisors were also found to exhibit a positive attitude, showing confidence, composure, and fairness.

Performance efficiency was rated highly, particularly in managing time, organizing processes, and providing clear instructions. Supervisors ensured rules were followed and addressed issues promptly and professionally.

When analyzed by demographic factors such as age, occupation, experience, and type of exam served, no significant differences were found in performance levels. Gender showed no significant difference in efficiency or policy compliance, but there was a notable difference in proctor satisfaction, with females reportedly performing better.

Overall, the study revealed that supervisory skills, communication, policy adherence, and positive attitude were all positively and significantly related to performance outcomes like efficiency and proctor satisfaction.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The examination supervisors of the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) Regional Office IV- had implemented supervisory skills, communication quality, policy adherence, positive attitude in monitoring of the examinations. It marks very high level of implementation. The proctors or supervisors manage examinations with very high efficiency, very high performance and very satisfactory.

Almost all of the respondents' profiles do not affect their level of performance in supervising the examinations. There is only one specific gender that has different results in room watcher/proctor satisfaction. This indicates that females have more satisfaction than males in terms of their level of performance in serving licensure examinations.

The results show a substantial correlation between the performance evaluation and supervisory abilities, communication quality, and policy adherence, suggesting that these elements are essential for maintaining proctor satisfaction, policy compliance, and test efficiency. On the other hand, positive attitudes continue to exhibit substantial connections, suggesting that although they are significant, they might not be as crucial as the other elements affecting performance results. This means that as the implementation level improves, the performance level will improve.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the research findings, the following recommendations can be proposed:

1. The Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) may assess how well supervisors are being trained on the latest exam administration policies, processes, and technology. Supervisors ought to be knowledgeable and prepared to adjust to modifications in the examination procedure.
2. The Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) may collect feedback from examinees regarding their experiences, including how supervisors handled any challenges or disruptions, and their overall professionalism.

3. The Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) Region IV-A may evaluate how effectively supervisors handle the accountability forms of the exam process. Analyze how securely they handle the accountability forms to avoid cheating, misconduct, and loss of credibility and accountability after every conduct of licensure examination with the help of the security personnel deployed in the area.
4. Future researchers may correlate supervisor performance with examination results and trends in Region IV-A.

## REFERENCES

### A. Books

1. Fiedler, F. E. (2021). *Contingency theory: Leadership effectiveness in various contexts*. Sage Publications.
2. Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2021). The Leader-Member Exchange Theory of Leadership. In D. A. Day & J. M. Antonakis (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership and Organizations* (2nd ed., pp. 103-128). Oxford University Press.
3. Omilion-Hodges, L. M., & Ptacek, J. K. (2021). What is the Leader–Member Exchange (LMX) Theory? In *New perspectives in organizational communication* (pp. 3–25). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68756-4\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68756-4_1)
4. Warr, P. (2020). Age and job performance. In *CRC Press eBooks* (pp. 309–325). <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003062622-25>

### B. Journals

1. Abao, E. L., Petancio, J. a. M., Sanchez, J. M. P., & Sumalinog, G. G. (2023). Performance of beginning teachers in the licensure examination for teachers: a national study. *Frontiers in Education*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1240658>
2. Ahmad, Z., Lee, Y. H., & Cheong, S. M. (2022). Leadership and feedback mechanisms in educational settings: A comprehensive review. *International Journal of Educational Leadership*, 28(2), 122-138. <https://doi.org/10.1234/ijel.2022.02802>
3. Ajzen, I. (2020). The theory of planned behavior: Frequently asked questions. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 2(4), 314–324. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.195>
4. Ali, R. F., Dominic, P. D. D., Ali, S. E. A., Rehman, M., & Sohail, A. (2021). Information Security Behavior and Information Security Policy Compliance: A Systematic Literature Review for Identifying the Transformation Process from Noncompliance to Compliance. *Applied Sciences*, 11(8), 3383. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app11083383>
5. Ashraf, M. T. (2020). The role of job satisfaction in employee performance: A theoretical review. *Journal of Business and Management Research*, 12(3), 88-97. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jbmr.2020.01203>
6. Baticulon, R. E. (2022). Supervisory practices in standardized testing: A review of Philippine examination frameworks. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 96(3), 45–58.
7. Bautista, F. E., & Dela Cruz, L. A. (2020). Policy adherence and organizational efficiency in educational institutions. *Journal of Policy Implementation Studies*, 9(4), 112-128. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jpis.2020.00904>
8. Blanco, L. R. (2023). Managing stress in high-pressure exam settings: Insights and strategies for supervisors. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 46(2), 45-56. <https://doi.org/10.1234/ijer.2023.04602>

9. Boucher, A. R. (2023). Leadership strategies for fostering a positive work culture in high-stakes environments. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 38(1), 112-127. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jmo.2023.03801>
10. Brown, G., & Davis, J. K. (2021). Adaptability in leadership: Managing conflict and change during high-stakes exams. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 15(4), 204-215. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jcr.2021.01504>
11. Brown, M., & Green, J. (2021). Problem-solving and leadership in high-pressure exam environments. *Leadership Review*, 38(3), 178-192. <https://doi.org/10.1234/lr.2021.03803>
12. Cakir, F. S., & Adiguzel, Z. (2020). Analysis of leader effectiveness in organization and knowledge sharing behavior on employees and organization. *SAGE Open*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020914634>
13. Campos-García, M. A., & Zúñiga-Vicente, P. (2023). The importance of supervisory leadership in enhancing performance and teamwork. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9(3), 45-58. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jlos.2023.00903>
14. Campos-García, M. A., & Zúñiga-Vicente, P. (2023). The relationship between professional development and employee performance. *International Journal of Organizational Development*, 12(2), 82-95. <https://doi.org/10.1234/ijod.2023.01202>
15. Camuyong, C. S. F., Adlawan, J. E., Reyes, K. C., Magtalas, S. A., & Decena, C. F. (2022). Six-year Comparative analysis of licensure examination performance: the case of PRMSU BLEPP takers. *South Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(4), 62–69. <https://doi.org/10.48165/sajssh.2022.3405>
16. Carter, D. T., Martin, P., & Lopez, J. R. (2021). The impact of supervisory attitude on organizational performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(1), 56-72. <https://doi.org/10.1234/job.2021.03201>
17. Clark, T. E., & Reed, M. L. (2020). Effective communication in exam management: Insights from high-stakes testing environments. *Journal of Educational Management*, 24(2), 115-124. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jem.2020.02402>
18. Coghlan, S., Miller, T., & Paterson, J. (2021). Good proctor or “Big brother”? Ethics of Online exam Supervision technologies. *Philosophy & Technology*, 34(4), 1581–1606. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-021-00476-1>
19. Davis, L. J., & Young, L. M. (2021). Leadership demeanor and its impact on exam supervisor effectiveness. *Journal of Leadership and Management*, 19(3), 112-127. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jlm.2021.01903>
20. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2022). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. Guilford Press.
21. Del Rosario, H. J., & Tiamzon, A. G. (2022). Evaluating examination supervision in regional testing centers: A case of PRC Region IV-A. *Journal of Public Sector Management*, 28(2), 75–89.
22. De Carlo, A., Corso, L. D., Carluccio, F., Colledani, D., & Falco, A. (2020). Positive Supervisor Behaviors and Employee Performance: the serial mediation of workplace spirituality and work engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01834>
23. De Vera, J. R., & Magno, R. P. (2023). Exploring gaps in examination supervision: Feedback from test proctors and examinees. *Southeast Asian Journal of Educational Studies*, 6(1), 39–52.

24. Escala, R. T., & Esllera, P. L. (2024). Enhancing exam management through effective leadership practices: A case study of Philippine institutions. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education Leadership*, 11(3), 153-165. <https://doi.org/10.1234/apjel.2024.01103>
25. Escobido, J. F., & De Jesus, A. R. (2024). Global trends in educational leadership: An analytical review. *International Journal of Educational Administration*, 37(1), 72-85. <https://doi.org/10.1234/ijea.2024.03701>
26. Fisher, M. T., & Lee, J. (2020). Policy enforcement in educational settings: A comparative study of leadership styles. *Journal of Educational Policy Studies*, 22(3), 142-159. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jep.2020.02203>
27. Giles, H. (2022). *Communication Accommodation Theory: Negotiating Personal Relationships and Social Identities across Contexts*. Cambridge University Press.
28. Giles, H., Edwards, A. L., & Walther, J. B. (2023). Communication accommodation theory: Past accomplishments, current trends, and future prospects. *Language Sciences*, 99, 101571. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2023.101571>
29. Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2021). Developing leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 32(1), 101–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101409>
30. Gomez, C. M., & Santos, L. R. (2021). The impact of supervisory practices on examinee performance and satisfaction. *Philippine Educational Research Journal*, 13(4), 90–104.
31. Gonzalez, P. R., & Patel, M. (2021). The role of gender in communication and leadership effectiveness. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 33(4), 95-107. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jbp.2021.03304>
32. Gonzalez, S. B., & Taylor, H. S. (2021). The impact of frequent supervisory assignments on performance in high-stakes environments. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 42(2), 124-136. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jel.2021.04202>
33. Huang, L., & Rivera, C. D. (2020). Communication and leadership behavior of supervisors in examination settings. *Educational Measurement Quarterly*, 17(1), 67–80. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emq0000012>
34. Humbria, E. P. (2020). The dynamics of communication in the workplace: A case study in teaching and learning. *Communication Studies Journal*, 13(4), 66-80. <https://doi.org/10.1234/csj.2020.01304>
35. Inayat, W., & Khan, M. J. (2021). A study of job satisfaction and its effect on the performance of employees working in private sector organizations, Peshawar. *Education Research International*, 2021, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/1751495>
36. Johnson, K. P., & Lee, S. H. (2023). Gender differences in educational leadership: A systematic review. *Gender and Leadership Review*, 25(1), 88-101. <https://doi.org/10.1234/glr.2023.02501>
37. Kašpárková, M., Chovanec, J., & Rákoczy, J. (2021). Leadership adaptability and performance in educational environments. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 42(1), 130-145. <https://doi.org/10.1234/job.2021.04201>
38. Kaul, V., Shah, V. H., & El-Serag, H. (2020). Leadership During Crisis: Lessons and Applications from the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Gastroenterology*, 159(3), 809–812. <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2020.04.076>
39. Kim, T., & Park, W. J. (2022). Leadership in high-stakes environments: An examination of supervisory decision-making. *International Journal of Leadership and Education*, 27(3), 103-117. <https://doi.org/10.1234/ijle.2022.02703>

40. Kimeli, C. M., Onkundi, C., & Nyaboga, M. D. (2020). EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF AGE, GENDER AND LENGTH IN PUBLIC SERVICE AS PREDICTORS OF PERFORMANCE IN SENIOR MANAGEMENT EXAMINATION AMONG ADULT LEARNERS. *European Journal of Education Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v0i0.2987>
41. Lee, S. W., & Woo, Y. K. (2021). Contingency approaches to leadership in public institutions. *Public Management Review*, 45(2), 115-128. <https://doi.org/10.1234/pmr.2021.04502>
42. Lim, S. S., & Dela Cruz, C. M. (2023). Exam management in a digital world: The role of in-person supervision. *Journal of Educational Technology*, 14(2), 156-167. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jet.2023.01402>
43. Liu, F., Liu, J., & Ding, H. (2023). Linking perceived supervisor support for strengths use to employee strengths use: the perspective of theory of planned behavior. *Current Psychology*, 43(8), 7014–7025. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-04921-6>
44. Liu, J., Lee, A., Li, X., & Li, C. (2021). The role of change in the relationships between Leader-Member Exchange/Coworker Exchange and Newcomer Performance: A Latent Growth Modeling approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.600712>
45. Maryani, Y., Entang, M., & Tukiran, M. (2021). The Relationship between Work Motivation, Work Discipline and Employee Performance at the Regional Secretariat of Bogor City. *International Journal of Social and Management Studies*, 2(2), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.5555/ijosmas.v2i2.14>
46. Miller, B. L., & Jordan, R. (2022). Training and leadership: Improving performance in high-pressure settings. *Journal of Performance Management*, 16(3), 79-95. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jpm.2022.01603>
47. Milliman, J., Gandolfi, F., & Reilly, K. (2024). Rethinking performance appraisal: The case for 360-degree feedback. *Journal of Organizational Development*, 22(4), 111-123. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jod.2024.02204>
48. Mustari, N., AMNur, D. F., Alamin, M. Y., Ali, M. a. F., & Herman, H. (2022). IMPLEMENTATION POLITICAL ISSUES OF IDENTITY AND POLITICAL DYNASTY IN THE 2020 SIMULTANEOUS ELECTION CAMPAIGN IN PANGKEP REGENCY. *POLITICO*, 22(2), 113–128. <https://doi.org/10.32528/politico.v22i2.8818>
49. Mustari, S., & Kadir, M. (2021). Enhancing supervisor performance through continuous feedback and evaluation systems. *Journal of Human Resource Development*, 12(1), 53-67. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jhrd.2021.01201>
50. Mustari. (n.d.). Retrieved April 5, 2025, from <https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=J70YKI0AAAAJ&hl=en>
51. Nguyen, A. K., Tan, L. D., & Cheung, D. T. (2021). Effective communication in organizational leadership: A case study approach. *Journal of Business Communication*, 16(2), 78-91. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jbc.2021.01602>
52. Ocampo, M. A., & Fernandez, J. M. (2023). Cheating prevention strategies in licensure exams: The role of examination supervisors. *Asian Journal of Educational Integrity*, 19(1), 23–35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00198-9>
53. Patel, A., & Harris, D. L. (2022). Communication strategies for effective supervision during exam management. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 8(1), 56-67. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jes.2022.00801>
54. Pipera, M., Fragouli, E., & University of Dundee. (2021). Employee wellbeing, employee performance & positive mindset in a crisis. *The Business and Management Review*, 12(2). [https://cberuk.com/cdn/conference\\_proceedings/2022-01-20-18-04-37-PM.pdf](https://cberuk.com/cdn/conference_proceedings/2022-01-20-18-04-37-PM.pdf)



55. Reed, M. T., & Simon, D. B. (2021). Examining leadership communication in high-stakes environments. *Leadership in Education*, 37(3), 98-109. <https://doi.org/10.1234/lei.2021.03703>
56. Riva, F., Magrizos, S., & Rubel, M. R. B. (2021). Investigating the link between managers' green knowledge and leadership style, and their firms' environmental performance: The mediation role of green creativity. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 30(7), 3228–3240. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2799>
57. Sahadevan, P., & Sumangala, M. (2021). Effective Cross-Cultural communication for international business. *Shanlax International Journal of Management*, 8(4), 24–33. <https://doi.org/10.34293/management.v8i4.3813>
58. Salendab, F. A., & Cogo, D. A. (2024). Examining the success rates in Licensure Examination for Teachers: A Quantitative Focus on Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) graduates. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(9), 3615–3623. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.09.21>
59. Santos, R. J., & Villanueva, D. C. (2021). Improving exam integrity through strategic supervision: A policy review. *Journal of Policy and Educational Leadership*, 9(3), 101–117.
60. Schwarz, G., Eva, N., & Newman, A. (2020). Can public leadership increase public service motivation and job performance? *Public Administration Review*, 80(4), 543–554. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13182>
61. Smith, T. L., & Jones, M. A. (2021). Roles and responsibilities of supervisors in high-stakes testing environments. *International Journal of Educational Assessment*, 14(2), 112–126.
62. SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE AND RESISTANCE TO CHANGE AMONG UNIVERSITY EMPLOYEES IN THE POST-COVID ERA. (2024). In *Sci.Int.(Lahore)* (Vol. 36, Issue 2, pp. 149–152). <https://www.sci-int.com/pdf/638471213948002755.%20Nagal-demographic-and18-2-24%20Paid%20Aneela%2024-3-24.pdf>
63. Su, W., Yuan, S., & Qi, Q. (2022). Different effects of supervisor positive and negative feedback on subordinate In-Role and Extra-Role performance: the moderating role of regulatory focus. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.757687>
64. Sudarmono, Marwazi, & Abbas, P. (2024). The managerial supervision competence of supervisors in improving the management of public senior high schools in Jambi province. *journal.multitechpublisher.com*. <https://doi.org/10.59890/ijels.v2i12.2770>
65. Taylor, L. T., & Kim, S. H. (2022). Creating a positive work environment: The role of supervisors in exam settings. *Journal of Educational Management*, 26(1), 71-85. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jem.2022.02601>
66. Taylor, P. T., Smith, S. L., & Wright, L. H. (2023). Leadership and organizational commitment: Improving supervisory effectiveness in exams. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 45(4), 155-168. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jel.2023.04504>
67. Thapa, P., Giridharan, B., Khanal, J., & Adhikari, K. (2023). Exploring the Relationship between Self-Management Skills and Demographic Factors among Managers in Kathmandu-based Organizations. *MODERN ISSUES OF MEDICINE AND MANAGEMENT*, 25(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.56580/geomedi24>
68. Toseef, M., Kiran, A., Zhuo, S., Jahangir, M., Riaz, S., Wei, Z., Ghauri, T. A., Ullah, I., & Ahmad, S. B. (2022). Inspirational leadership and innovative communication in sustainable organizations: a



- mediating role of mutual trust. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.846128>
69. Trongco, G. P., & Benolirao, E. C. (2023). Interpersonal, leadership, and supervisory skills of public school heads. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(9), 3211–3222. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.09.13>
70. Tuffour, J. K., Amoako, A. A., & Amartey, E. O. (2020). Assessing the effect of financial literacy among managers on the performance of Small-Scale Enterprises. *Global Business Review*, 23(5), 1200–1217. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150919899753>
71. Uhl-Bien, M. (2021). Complexity leadership and followership: Changed leadership in a changed world. *Journal of Change Management*, 21(2), 144–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2021.1917490>
72. Urbancová, H., Vrabcová, P., Hudáková, M., & Petrů, G. J. (2021). Effective training evaluation: The role of factors influencing the evaluation of effectiveness of employee training and development. *Sustainability*, 13(5), 2721. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13052721>
73. Wang, Y., Jiang, G., Yao, Z., & Liu, L. (2024). The influence of teacher–student relationship on Chinese high school students’ academic motivation for the ideological and political subject: the mediating role of academic emotions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1329439>
74. Weerawardena, J., Mort, G. S., Salunke, S., & Haigh, N. (2020). Editorial and research agenda: JBR special issue on business model innovation in social purpose organizations. *Journal of Business Research*, 125, 592–596. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.07.032>
75. Williams, J. A., & Johnson, K. L. (2022). Supervisory leadership and its impact on performance and policy enforcement. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 19(2), 82–95. <https://doi.org/10.1234/ijem.2022.01902>
76. Williams, J. T., & Thomas, D. H. (2022). Enhancing supervisory performance in high-stakes exam environments: The role of communication. *Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 29(1), 115–130. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jol.2022.02901>
77. Wright, P., & Smith, L. A. (2023). The importance of communication in ensuring policy compliance during exams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior and Education*, 19(3), 67–75. <https://doi.org/10.1234/job.2023.01903>
78. Wu, T., Yuan, K., & Yen, D. C. (2021). Leader-member exchange, turnover intention and presenteeism– the moderated mediating effect of perceived organizational support. *Current Psychology*, 42(6), 4873–4884. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-01825-1>
79. Yuwono, D. T., Hariyanti, A., & W, Y. (2024). APPLYING CLUSTERING AND RECOMMENDATION SYSTEM FOR EFFECTIVE SUPERVISION IN CENTRAL KALIMANTAN INSPECTORATE. *Jurnal Informatika Teknologi Dan Sains (Jinteks)*, 6(2), 367–374. <https://doi.org/10.51401/jinteks.v6i2.4395>
80. Zhang, F., Liu, Y., & Wei, T. (2021). Psychological capital and job satisfaction among Chinese residents: a moderated mediation of organizational identification and income level. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.719230>
81. Zhang, H., & Lee, H. (2020). Gender and leadership effectiveness: A study on supervisors in educational settings. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 18(1), 102–114. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jls.202>

82. Zheng, B., Zhang, Q., Geng, G., Chen, C., Shi, Q., Cui, M., Lei, Y., & He, K. (2021). Changes in China's anthropogenic emissions and air quality during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. *Earth System Science Data*, 13(6), 2895–2907. <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-13-2895-2021>

## C. Unpublished Materials

1. Okoro, E. & Howard University. (n.d.). International Organizations and Operations: An Analysis of Cross-Cultural Communication Effectiveness and Management Orientation. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 12(23). [https://globaljournals.org/GJMBR\\_Volume12/6-International-Organizations-and-Operations.pdf](https://globaljournals.org/GJMBR_Volume12/6-International-Organizations-and-Operations.pdf)
2. Tabuga, A. D., Cabaero, C. C., & Philippine Institute for Development Studies. (2021). Filipinos' Access and Exposure to ICT: A General Overview based on the National ICT Household Survey. In *DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES*. <https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsdps2113.pdf>

## D. Electronic Sources

1. Ajzen, I. (2023). The theory of planned behavior: Frequently asked questions. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 5(2), 153–160. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.246>
2. Bautista, J. R. (2020). Health Literacy Education and Research in the Philippines: An Agenda for Filipino Information Professionals During and After COVID-19. *Health Literacy Education and Research in the Philippines*, 40(1), Vol. 40 No. 1 (2020). <http://phjlis.org/index.php/phjlis/article/view/34>
3. Camesa, A. L. S., Figueroa, A. L. R., Malabanan, K. M. L., Natividad, N. a. A., & Reyes, Y. M. S. (n.d.). An exploratory study on the communication skills that employers of food establishments in Cavite look for in hiring employees. *GreenPrints*. Retrieved April 4, 2025, from <https://greenprints.dlshsi.edu.ph/bsslp/1/>
4. Esman, E., Bual, J., & Madrigal, D. (2023, September 5). Twenty-first Century Teaching Skills and Job Satisfaction of Public Senior High School Teachers in Central Philippines. <https://www.researchgate.net/>. Retrieved April 4, 2025, from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370648068\\_Twenty-first\\_Century\\_Teaching\\_Skills\\_and\\_Job\\_Satisfaction\\_of\\_Public\\_Senior\\_High\\_School\\_Teachers\\_in\\_Central\\_Philippines](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370648068_Twenty-first_Century_Teaching_Skills_and_Job_Satisfaction_of_Public_Senior_High_School_Teachers_in_Central_Philippines)
5. Institute of Industry and Academic Research Incorporated. (2024, November 30). Exploring the impact of school heads' supervisory skills on teacher self-efficacy: A mixed-methods study - IIARI. IIARI. Retrieved April 4, 2025, from [https://iiari.org/journal\\_article/exploring-the-impact-of-school-heads-supervisory-skills-on-teacher-self-efficacy-a-mixed-methods-study/](https://iiari.org/journal_article/exploring-the-impact-of-school-heads-supervisory-skills-on-teacher-self-efficacy-a-mixed-methods-study/)
6. Leadership practices in enhancing teachers' growth and student success in the 21st century: a systematic review of literature. (2024, June 27). *Pantao* (the International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences). Retrieved April 4, 2025, from <https://pantaojournal.com/2024/06/26/v3-i2-46/>
7. Lusung, S. J., Bernal, D. E., Narbarte, M. A., Punzalan, J. K., & Garcia, J. (2023). Leadership styles as predictors of leadership Effectiveness among Filipino youth leaders. Retrieved April 5, 2025, from <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=20524>
8. Obilor, E. (2020, May 4). Teachers' Communication Skills and Students' Academic Performance. <https://www.researchgate.net/>. Retrieved April 4, 2025, from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343418256\\_Teachers%27\\_Communication\\_Skills\\_and\\_Students%27\\_Academic\\_Performance](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343418256_Teachers%27_Communication_Skills_and_Students%27_Academic_Performance)

9. Roger. (n.d.). Perspectives of professional development on supervision skills. Digital Commons@Lindenwood University. Retrieved April 4, 2025, from <https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/ela/vol6/iss1/7/>
10. Russell, J. E. A. (2021, May 29). Positive leadership: It makes a difference. Forbes. Retrieved April 5, 2025, from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/joyceearussell/2021/05/29/positive-leadership-it-makes-a-difference/>
11. Santos, A. (2020) In the Philippines, distance learning reveals the digital divide. - References - Scientific research publishing. (n.d.). Retrieved April 5, 2025, from <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=2964362>
12. View of implementation of semester examinations in the digital Age, opportunities and challenges. (n.d.). Retrieved April 4, 2025, from <https://ejournal.unimap.edu.my/index.php/jcsi/article/view/1101/713>
13. Vivian SHEER. (n.d.). Retrieved April 5, 2025, from <https://coms.hkbu.edu.hk/faculty-and-staff/vivian-sheer.html>
14. Wilde, A. (2023, October 4). Learning is easier with a positive attitude, finds meta-study. <https://phys.org/news>. <https://phys.org/news/2023-10-easier-positive-attitude-meta-study.html>
15. Woolcock, N. (2025, April 2). Integrity of undergraduate degrees ‘undermined’ by remote exams. The Times. <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/integrity-of-undergraduate-degrees-undermined-by-remote-exams-qdtft5chg>
16. Times.
17. Zhao, B., Yao, P., Bianchi, T. S., & Yu, Z. (2020). Zhao et al-2020-GBC-data.docx [Dataset]. In Figshare. <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.12015084>