

Mentoring and Coaching Practices, Needs, and Challenges Encountered By School Heads

Flores M. Gabayoyo

Guimaras State University

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.11030069>

Received: 22 March 2026; Accepted: 28 March 2026; Published: 11 April 2026

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to determine the level of mentoring and coaching practices, needs, and challenges encountered by school heads in the Schools Division of Guimaras, Province of Guimaras, Philippines during the School Year 2018-2019. The subjects of the study were the school heads in the entire province of Guimaras. They were equated according to school size, job performance, length of service, educational attainment and municipality. The study utilized the descriptive research design that determined the level of mentoring and coaching practices, needs, and challenges encountered by school heads. The statistical tools used were the frequency count, percentage, mean, Mann-Whitney U-test, Kruskal-Wallis H-test, and Spearman rho. The levels of significance for inferential statistics were set at 0.05 alpha. The findings of the study revealed that majority of the respondents were from small school size, outstanding in job performance, have long (21 years and above) length of service, bachelors degree with MA units, and from the municipality of Nueva Valencia. There is a very high level of mentoring and coaching practices of school heads when taken as a whole and when categorized according to school size, job performance, length of service, educational attainment, and municipality. There is a moderate level of mentoring and coaching needs among school heads when taken as a whole and when categorized according to school size, job performance, length of service, educational attainment, and municipality. There is a high level of mentoring and coaching challenges encountered by school heads when taken as a whole and when categorized according to school size, job performance, length of service, educational attainment, and municipality. There are no significant differences in the level of mentoring and coaching practices of school heads when categorized according to school size, job performance, length of service, educational attainment, and municipality. There are significant differences in the level of mentoring and coaching challenges encountered by school heads when categorized according to school size and length of service. However, there were no significant differences in the level of mentoring and coaching challenges encountered by school heads when categorized according to job performance, educational attainment, and municipality. There are no significant differences in the level of mentoring and coaching needs of school heads when categorized according to school size, job performance, length of service, educational attainment, and municipality. There are significant relationships in the level of mentoring and coaching practices and needs and mentoring and coaching challenges encountered and needs. There are no significant relationships in the level of mentoring and coaching practices and challenges encountered by the school heads.

Keywords: mentoring, coaching, practices, needs, challenges, encountered, school heads

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Education undergoes reforms from time to time with the purpose of making changes in the practices of teaching students. In-service trainings are often conducting to really find out the most relevant strategy that could improve the quality of learners that graduate every school year.

Coaches and Mentors believed that people have the inner resources to achieve improvements in their practices through coaching and/or mentoring processes. Coaching and mentoring approaches in education aim to build the knowledge and skills of teachers and educational leaders (Northern Territory Principals Association, 2016).

Mentoring refers to the relationships where more experienced individuals like school principals share their skills and knowledge with other, less experienced practitioners. There are formal and informal structures that support mentoring. A mentor provides direction, guidance, education, influence, and support to others who are less experienced, with the aim of supporting the mentee's development. Mentors observe the classroom teaching of their mentee's on a regular basis, and vice versa: the mentees observe their mentors' classes so they can learn and work on identified aspects of their teaching. This approach is also used as a way of distributing excellent teaching and learning across the system (Northern Territory Principals Association, 2016).

Coaching relates primarily to performance improvement, often short-term in a specific skills area. The goals, or at least the intermediate or sub-goals, are typically set with or at the suggestion of the coach. While the learner has primary ownership of the goal, the coach has primary ownership of the process. In most cases, coaching involves direct extrinsic feedback.

Mentoring is an indefinite relationship based activity with several specific but wide ranging goals. It does not have to be a formal process. The mentor is the facilitator who works with either an individual or a group of people over an extended time period the agenda is open and continues to evolve over the longer term. Mentoring seeks to build wisdom – the ability to apply skills, knowledge, experience to new situations and processes.

Coaching focuses on meeting very specific objectives within a set period of time. Coaching is mainly concerned with performance and the development of certain skills.

However, there are needs and challenges encountered by school heads that obstruct their desire to attain improvement in the quality of teachers in the field. These needs are often in line with teaching and learning which are particularly in instructional materials. On the other hand, there are also challenges they have encountered that have to be met in order to perform smoothly in mentoring and coaching.

The researcher, being a teacher for a long time and a school head presently has observed that there is really a need to enhance mentoring and coaching practices among school heads to teachers who need improvement in their job performance. Sometimes this is not possible because there are needs that have to be satisfied and challenges in mentoring and coaching practices that have to be encountered. These are constraints that prevent the achievement of the purpose of education. In line with these observations, the researcher would try to determine the level of mentoring and coaching practices together with their needs and challenges encountered, hence, this study.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to determine the level of mentoring and coaching practices, needs, and challenges encountered by school heads in the Schools Division of Guimaras, Province of Guimaras, Philippines during the School Year 2018-2019.

Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the level of mentoring and coaching practices of school heads in the Schools Division of Guimaras when taken as a whole group and when classified according to variables school size, job performance, length of service, educational attainment and municipality?
2. What is the level of needs of school heads in the Schools Division of Guimaras when taken as a whole group and when classified according to variables school size, job performance, length of service, educational attainment and municipality?
3. What is the level of challenges encountered by school heads in the Schools Division of Guimaras when taken as a whole group and when classified according to variables school size, job performance, length of service, educational attainment and municipality?
4. Are there significant relationships between the level of mentoring and coaching practices, challenges encountered, and needs of school heads?

5. Do the variables school size, job performance, length of service, educational attainment and municipality significantly predicts the level of mentoring and coaching practices of school heads?
6. Do the variables school size, job performance, length of service, educational attainment and municipality significantly predicts the level of needs of school heads?
7. Do the variables school size, job performance, length of service, educational attainment and municipality significantly predicts the level of challenges encountered by school heads?

METHODS

This study employed a descriptive research design to determine the level of mentoring and coaching practices, needs, and challenges encountered by school heads in the Schools Division of Guimaras, Province of Guimaras, Philippines during the School Year 2018–2019. The respondents consisted of 97 school heads, representing the entire population, coming from various municipalities including Nueva Valencia, Buenavista, San Lorenzo, Jordan, and Sibunag. They were classified according to school size, job performance, length of service, educational attainment, and municipality. Stratified random sampling was utilized to ensure proportional representation of respondents across these categories, thereby enhancing the representativeness of the sample. Data were gathered using a researcher-made questionnaire composed of two parts: Part I captured the demographic profile of the respondents, while Part II measured the levels of mentoring and coaching practices, needs, and challenges using a 5-point Likert scale. The instrument underwent content and face validation by a panel of experts using established criteria, and reliability testing yielded a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.847, indicating high reliability. Prior to data collection, necessary permissions were secured from relevant authorities, and questionnaires were personally administered and retrieved by the researcher with the assistance of research aides. The collected data were processed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, and mean were used to summarize the data, while inferential statistics including t-test, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Mann-Whitney U Test, Kruskal-Wallis Test, and Spearman's rho were employed to determine significant differences and relationships among variables at a 0.05 level of significance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Level of Mentoring and Coaching Practices of School Heads as an Entire Group

Table 1 shows the level of mentoring and coaching practices of school heads when taken as an entire group, the researcher using the mean of the items of the questionnaire. When taken as a whole, the level of mentoring and coaching practices of school heads ($M=4.49$) were found to be very highly practiced.

The highest mean was giving teachers the chance to meet and learn about different people in school ($M=4.75$) followed by the second highest mean of encouraging positive attitude to learning ($M=4.74$) were both found to be very highly practiced but with mean difference of 0.01.

Owing the aforementioned result, it could be concluded that school heads as a whole were positive on letting their teachers build camaraderie and companionship with the stakeholders in school. They do not hinder their teachers of the chance of meeting and learning about people in school and even outside the school. They were of very high practice on encouraging teachers to build a positive attitude towards learning. They coach and mentor their teachers that no matter how hard it was, it is, and it will be to deal with learners, they have to believe that their learners would really learn from them.

The lowest mean was conducting mentoring and coaching to older teachers ($M=4.03$) was found to be highly practices except for the second lowest mean developing new or improved existing skills ($M=4.23$) which was found to be very highly practiced but with mean difference of 0.20.

Based on the result, conducting mentoring and coaching to older teachers were found to be highly practiced yet got the lowest index.

This may be the tendency when these older teachers were literally older than the school heads. School heads were practicing mentoring and coaching to them but since it got the lowest index, it is recommended that school heads should continue to conduct mentoring and coaching to these teachers. Coaching and mentoring of school heads is not based on the age gap. It is on the trainings, seminars, workshops, conferences, and others that make school heads entitled of coaching and mentoring even the old ones.

Table 1. Level of Mentoring and Coaching Practices of School Heads as an Entire Group

As a school head, I ...	Mean	Description	Rank
1. conduct mentoring and coaching to older teachers	4.03	Highly Practiced	20
2. develop new or improved existing skills	4.23	Very Highly Practiced	19
3. try to help teachers focus on what they are learning	4.43	Very Highly Practiced	13
4. help teachers who want to change career path	4.27	Very Highly Practiced	18
5. help improve skills and abilities of teachers	4.58	Very Highly Practiced	9
6. show ways on how to go through difficult issues	4.48	Very Highly Practiced	12
7. help those who want to respond better to alternative teaching methods	4.38	Very Highly Practiced	14.5
8. increase teachers' commitment to the school and its goals and objectives	4.65	Very Highly Practiced	6
9. help improve teachers' communication within the school organization	4.52	Very Highly Practiced	10.5
10. help develop a better organizational culture	4.59	Very Highly Practiced	8
11. allow teachers to gain a greater insight into the school's performance	4.73	Very Highly Practiced	3
12. give teachers the chance to meet and learn about different people in school	4.75	Very Highly Practiced	1
13. set clear objectives in advance to be agreed by teachers	4.65	Very Highly Practiced	6
14. make a plan of action in advance	4.34	Very Highly Practiced	16
15. provide teachers with opportunities to gain new skills and personal development	4.70	Very Highly Practiced	4
16. offer learning opportunities geared to individual needs	4.52	Very Highly Practiced	10.5
17. encourage positive attitude to learning	4.74	Very Highly Practiced	2
18. provide flexibility in the learning process	4.65	Very Highly Practiced	6
19. allow protégés to select what and how they learn	4.31	Very Highly Practiced	17
20. encourage discussion of novel ideas about teaching	4.38	Very Highly Practiced	14.5
Mean	4.49	Very Highly Practiced	

Scale: 4.21 – 5.00 Very Highly Practiced (VHP); 3.41 – 4.20 Highly Practiced (HP); 2.61 – 3.40 Moderate Practiced (MP); 1.81 – 2.60 Low Practiced (LP); 1.00 – 1.80 Very Low Practiced (VLP)

Level of Mentoring and Coaching Practices of School Heads in terms of School Size, Job Performance, Length of Service, Educational Attainment, and Municipality.

Table 2 shows the level of mentoring and coaching practices of school heads when classified according to school size, job performance, length of service, educational attainment, and municipality. When taken as a whole, the level of mentoring and coaching practices of school heads (M=4.50) were found to be very highly practiced.

As to the school size, respondents from small (400 and below enrolment) school size (M=4.51) and respondents from big (more than 400 enrolment) school size (M=4.47) were both found to be very highly practiced but with mean difference of 0.04.

According to the result of the study, school heads from small school size have higher index that those from big school size. This may be so because school heads from small schools have few teachers to be mentored and coached while big school has a lot of teachers. Another reason for this was that school heads of big schools have the tendency to perform more functions than those of small schools.

As to the job performance, outstanding respondents ($M=4.52$) and respondents with very satisfactory rating ($M=4.45$) were both found to be very highly practiced but with mean difference of 0.07.

Respondents categorized as to job performance were found to be of very high practiced in the mentoring and coaching. Mentoring and coaching ability was one of the indicators in rating a school head. Outstanding school heads have higher index than very satisfactory respondents. It was an expected result already. Garnering an outstanding rating on job performance means that among all ratings given, they were expected to have the highest index to prove their job performance.

As to the length of service, respondents' with short (20 years and below) length of service have a mean of ($M=4.50$) very highly practiced while respondents with long (21 years and above) length of service have a mean of ($M=4.49$) very highly practiced.

As to the educational attainment, MA with Ph.D. units respondents have a mean of ($M=4.68$) very highly practiced, Bachelors Degree with MA unit respondents have a mean of ($M=4.50$) very highly practiced, Masters Degree respondents have a mean of ($M=4.44$), and respondents with Ph.D./Ed.E. have a mean of ($M=4.17$) highly practiced.

It was evident that respondents with MA with Ph.D. units have the highest index among the classification of educational attainment and with very highly practiced mentoring and coaching. School heads with this level of educational attainment were very particular with mentoring and coaching their teachers in school.

Respondents with Ph.D./Ed.E. degree have the lowest index yet described with highly practiced in the mentoring and coaching. A reason maybe was that doctorate degree school heads have heavier task and responsibilities given to them that as much as they wanted to mentor and coach their teachers, time constraint was hindering them from doing it. According to Spiderman "Great power comes with great responsibility" and as for school heads great educational attainment comes also great functions to be performed.

As to municipality, respondents from the municipality of Buenavista have a mean of ($M=4.59$) very highly practiced, respondents from the municipality of Nueva Valencia have a mean of ($M=4.54$) very highly practiced, respondents from the municipality of Sibunag have a mean of ($M=4.46$) very highly practiced, respondents from the municipality of San Lorenzo have a mean of ($M=4.43$) very highly practiced, and respondents from the municipality of Jordan have a mean of ($M=4.37$) very highly practiced.

The municipality of Buenavista has the highest index and was described as very highly practiced in mentoring and coaching. Buenavista was believed to be the center of Education in the Schools Division of Guimaras. Bearing this title, school heads would want Buenavista to have the best mentored and coached teachers. Jordan was also described to be very highly practiced mentoring and coaching but with the lowest index. The municipality of Jordan was the nearest municipality in the office of the Schools Division of Guimaras for it is lying in the same municipality. This may be the reason why Jordan got the lowest index for school heads in this municipality were the ones immediately called by the office whenever their assistance will be needed.

According to Woolfolk (2013), mentoring in teaching as one of the cognitive apprenticeship use in the classroom helps make all instruction appropriate and effective to know students and develop trusting relationship with them. The knowledge gained about the students help in adopting teaching and positive relationship helps students stay engaged in teaching. This supports the finding that school heads have every highly practiced mentoring in the school system.

The result of this study corroborates with the study of SREB staff (2017) entitled "Good Principals Aren't Born – They're Mentored: Are We Investing Enough to Get the School Leaders We Need?" which states that mentors

were experienced school principals and a large majority believed that they were capable of modeling practices that would improve student achievement.

Table 2. Level of Mentoring and Coaching Practices of School Heads when Classified According to Length of Service, School Size, Job Performance, Educational Attainment, and Municipality

Variables	Mean	Description
As a Whole Group	4.49	Very High Practiced
School Size		
Small (below 400)	4.51	Very High Practiced
Big (above 400)	4.47	Very High Practiced
Performance		
Outstanding	4.52	Very High Practiced
Very Satisfactory	4.45	Very High Practiced
Length of Service		
Short (20 years and below)	4.50	Very High Practiced
Long (21 years and above)	4.49	Very High Practiced
Educational Attainment		
Bachelors Degree w/ MA units	4.50	Very High Practiced
Masters Degree	4.44	Very High Practiced
MA w/ Ph.D units	4.68	Very High Practiced
Ph.D/Ed.D	4.17	High Practiced
Municipality		
Jordan	4.37	Very High Practiced
San Lorenzo	4.43	Very High Practiced
Buenavista	4.59	Very High Practiced
Sibunag	4.46	Very High Practiced
Nueva Valencia	4.54	Very High Practiced

Scale of Means: 4.21 – 5.00 Very Highly Practiced; 3.41 – 4.20 Highly Practiced; 2.61 – 3.40 Moderate Practiced; 1.81 – 2.60 Low Practiced; 1.00 – 1.80 Very Low Practiced

Level of Needs of School Heads Taken as an Entire Group

Table 3 shows the level of needs when taken as an entire group using the mean of the items of the questionnaire. It has a total mean of (M=3.63) high needs.

The highest mean was school heads improved library facilities to encourage research (M=4.04) high needs while the second highest mean was school heads diagnose the needs for learning-learners feel a need to learn (M=4.02) high needs.

Owing the aforementioned result, there was a high needs for school heads to improved library facilities to encourage research among their teachers as well as with the learners. Conducting a research was a real struggle on the part of the teachers and of the learners. Several factors were hindering them too. School heads all over the Schools Division Guimaras should take time and think of ways to improved library facilities. They could also tap some private persons and other stakeholders to make this possible.

The lowest mean was knowledge to be given special attention for enhancement and assessing learners' progress (M=3.44) high needs while the second lowest mean was an explanation of what mentoring and coaching can or cannot achieve (M=3.45) high needs.

Results revealed that school heads have high needs on the knowledge to be given special attention for enhancement. It is recommended that they seek for help from their teachers in identifying this knowledge that needs to be given attention. As to explanation of what mentoring and coaching can or cannot achieve, it is further

recommended that they attend seminars and conferences in relation to mentoring and coaching so that the need for explanation of what mentoring and coaching can or cannot achieve would be lessened.

The results revealed that school heads assigned in different municipalities in the Schools Division of Guimaras had a very high level of needs in the mentoring and coaching practices. This means that they have the same orientation regarding this service required of them to improve educational practice of teachers.

Table 3. Level of Mentoring and Coaching Needs of School Heads when Taken as an Entire Group

How often do you encounter the following needs in your mentoring and coaching practices?	Mean	Description	Rank
1. knowledge to be given special attention for enhancement.	3.44	High Needs	19.5
2. skills/abilities to be given special attention for enhancement.	3.51	High Needs	12
3. academic activities to be encourage in school.	3.51	High Needs	12
4. new instructional materials for use in the classroom.	3.64	High Needs	9
5. updated supplementary classroom learning references	3.71	High Needs	6.5
6. information technology to develop creativity	3.78	High Needs	4
7. improved library facilities to encourage research.	4.04	High Needs	1
8. sufficient information about the benefits of mentoring and coaching	3.72	High Needs	5
9. an explanation of what mentoring and coaching can or cannot achieve	3.45	High Needs	18
10. clarity about how and when the mentoring and coaching programmes could be used	3.51	High Needs	12
11. assessing learners' progress	3.44	High Needs	19.5
12. differentiating learners learning	3.50	High Needs	14.5
13. interaction with colleagues and parents	3.50	High Needs	14.5
14. receiving appropriate advice on school culture	3.63	High Needs	10
15. overloading with tasks beyond classroom teaching	3.70	High Needs	8
16. learning-a learning environment based on mutual respect and trust establishing a climate conducive to	3.81	High Needs	3
17. diagnosing the needs for learning-learners feel a need to learn	4.02	High Needs	2
18. designing a pattern of learning experiences—learning process uses learners experiences	3.71	High Needs	6.5
19. evaluating the learning outcomes and re-diagnosing learning needs—have a sense of progress towards goals	3.47	High Needs	17
20. formulating program objectives that will satisfy the needs or goals of the learning experience	3.49	High Needs	16
Mean	3.63	High Needs	

Scale of Means: 4.21 – 5.00 Very High Needs, 3.41 – 4.20 High Needs; 2.61 – 3.40 Moderate Needs, 1.81 – 2.60 Low Needs, 1.00 – 1.80 Very Low Needs

Level of Needs of School Heads when Classified According to School Size, Job Performance, Length of Service, Educational Attainment and Municipality

Table 4 shows the level of needs when classified according to school size, performance, length of service, educational attainment and municipality. The level of mentoring and coaching needs among school heads as a whole was (M=3.27) moderate needs.

As to school size, small schools have a mean of (M=3.36) moderate needs while big schools have a mean of (M=3.01) moderate needs.

Both classifications of schools have moderate needs for mentoring and coaching yet small school size have higher index. This may imply that respondents from small schools have higher needs for mentoring and coaching than school heads who were assigned in big schools.

As to job performance, outstanding respondents have a mean of (M=3.37) moderate needs while respondents with very satisfactory performance have a mean of (M=3.06) moderate needs.

As to length of service, respondents with long length of service have a mean of (M=3.49) high needs while respondents with short length of service have a mean of (M=2.96) moderate needs.

Due to more functions and responsibilities attached to being an outstanding school head in job performance, it was identified that they have higher needs to do the mentoring and coaching to their teachers.

As to educational attainment, Master with Ph.D. unit respondents have a mean of (M=3.39) moderate needs, Ph.D./Ed.E. respondents have a mean of (M=3.67) moderate needs, Bachelors Degree with MA units respondents have a mean of (M=3.28) moderate needs, while Master Degree respondents have a mean of (M=3.19) moderate needs.

This may imply that Ph.D./Ed.E. respondents and Master with Ph.D. unit respondents have higher level of needs in performing the mentoring and coaching than the other classification of educational attainment. This may be so due to several factors like time constraint, more functions and responsibilities and others.

As to municipality, respondents from the municipality of Sibunag have a mean of (M=3.37) moderate needs, respondents from the municipality of Buenavista have a mean of (M=3.32) moderate needs, respondents from the municipality of Jordan have a mean of (M=3.30) moderate needs, respondents from the municipality of San Lorenzo have a mean of (M=3.25) moderate needs, and respondents from the municipality of Nueva Valencia have a mean of (M=3.19) moderate needs.

Table 4. Level of Needs of School Heads According to School Size, Length of Service, Job Performance, Educational Attainment and Municipality.

Variables	Needs	Description
As a Whole Group	3.27	Moderate Needs
School Size		
Small (below 400)	3.36	Moderate Needs
Big(above 400)	3.01	Moderate Needs
Performance		
Outstanding	3.37	Moderate Needs
Very Satisfactory	3.06	Moderate Needs
Length of Service		
Short (20 years and below)	2.96	Moderate Needs
Long (21 years and above)	3.49	High Needs
Educational Attainment		
Bachelors Degree w/ MA units	3.28	Moderate Needs
Masters Degree	3.19	Moderate Needs
MA w/ Ph.D units	3.39	Moderate Needs
Ph.D./Ed.E	3.67	Moderate Needs
Municipality		
Jordan	3.30	Moderate Needs
San Lorenzo	3.25	Moderate Needs
Buenavista	3.32	Moderate Needs
Sibunag	3.37	Moderate Needs
Nueva Valencia	3.19	Moderate Needs

Scale of Means: 4.21 – 5.00 Very High Needs, 3.41 – 4.20 High Needs; 2.61 – 3.40 Moderate Needs, 1.81 – 2.60 Low Needs, 1.00 – 1.80 Very Low Needs

Level of Challenges Encountered by School Heads when Taken As An Entire Group

Table 5 shows the level of challenges encountered by school heads when taken as an entire group using the mean of the items of the questionnaire. When taken as a whole it has a total mean of (M=3.79) highly challenging.

The highest mean was inadequate library facilities (M=3.92) highly challenging while the second highest mean was diversity of the learners (M=3.77) highly challenging.

The lowest mean was teachers lack teaching experience (M=2.74) moderately challenging while the second lowest mean was non-existing income-generating projects and lack of funds for INSET of teachers (M=2.75) moderately challenging.

The results revealed that school heads when taken as a whole group had encountered high level of challenges in the mentoring and coaching practices. These challenges encountered may be in the lack of instructional materials that we used by those involved in this service, failure to integrate ICT during lectures due to the unavailability of the equipment and physical facility where this will be conducted.

The result of this study supports the study of Simpson, et. Al (2016) entitled “Assessing the Challenges Heads of Department Encounter in Instructional Supervision in Ghana. A Case of Selected Senior High Schools in Kwabre East District” which states that the study conversely sees those challenges as very essential and can considerably affect the performances of the HoDs and the school as a whole. Perhaps those respondents who believe that such challenges cannot have negative impact on them have very good leadership quality, have contacts outside the school and thus can lobby for their departments things needed.

Table 5. Level Of Challenges Encountered by School Heads when taken as an Entire Group

Items	Mean	Description	Rank
1. Diversity of the learners	3.77	Highly Challenging	2.5
2. Lack of physical facilities	3.45	Highly Challenging	4
3. Lack of financial support	3.14	Moderately Challenging	15
4. Limited school campus	3.19	Moderately Challenging	13
5. Old books and references	3.18	Moderately Challenging	14
6. Inadequate instructional materials	2.93	Moderately Challenging	17
7. Non-existing income-generating projects	2.84	Moderately Challenging	18
8. Uncooperative stakeholders	3.21	Moderately Challenging	12
9. Inadequate information technology	3.35	Moderately Challenging	5
10. Lack of computer units	3.23	Moderately Challenging	11
11. Scholarship grants are lacking	3.24	Moderately Challenging	10
12. Low mental intelligence among pupils	2.69	Highly Challenging	20
13. Teachers lack teaching experience	2.74	Moderately Challenging	19
14. School head lacks management skill	3.12	Moderately Challenging	16
15. Dilapidated school buildings	3.31	Moderately Challenging	6
16. Lack of construction materials	3.25	Moderately Challenging	9
17. Inadequate special funds	3.29	Moderately Challenging	7
18. Lack of funds for INSET of teachers	3.77	High Challenging	2.5
19. Inadequate library facilities	3.92	High Challenging	1
20. Discipline of the learners	3.27	Moderately Challenging	8
Total Mean	3.79	Highly Challenging	

Scale of Means: 4.21 – 5.00 Very Highly Challenging; 3.41 – 4.20 Highly Challenging; 2.61 – 3.40 Moderately Challenging; 1.81 – 2.60 Less Challenging; 1.00 – 1.80 Not Challenging

Level of Challenges Encountered By School Heads When Classified According To School Size, Performance, Length Of Service Educational Attainment, And Municipality

Table 6 shows the level of challenges encountered by school heads when classified according to school size, job performance, length of service, educational attainment and municipality. When taken as a whole it has a mean of (M=3.63) highly challenging.

As to school size, small schools have a mean of (M=3.65) highly challenging while big schools have a mean of (M=3.59) highly challenging.

As to performance, outstanding respondents have a mean of (M=3.63) highly challenging while respondents with very satisfactory have a mean of (M=3.64) highly challenging.

As to the length of service, respondents with short length of service have a mean of (M=3.54) highly challenging while respondents with long length of service have a mean of (M=3.70) highly challenging.

As to educational attainment, respondents with Bachelors Degree With MA units have a mean of (M=3.58) highly challenging, respondents with Master Degree have a mean of (M=3.58) highly challenging, while respondents with Master with Ph.D unit have a mean of (M=3.92) highly challenging.

As to municipality, respondents from the municipality of Jordan have a mean of (M=3.53) highly challenging, respondents from the municipality of San Lorenzo have a mean of (M=3.49) highly challenging, respondents from the municipality of Buenavista have a mean of (M=3.87) highly challenging, respondents from the municipality of Sibunag have a mean of (M=3.72) highly challenging, while respondents from the municipality of Nueva Valencia have a mean of (M= 3.57) highly challenging.

Table 6. Level of Challenges Encountered by School Heads when Classified According to School Size, Length of Service Job Performance, Educational Attainment and Municipality.

Variables	Mean	Description
As a Whole Group	3.63	Highly Challenging
School Size		
Small (below 400)	3.65	Highly Challenging
Big(above 400)	3.59	Highly Challenging
Performance		
Outstanding	3.63	Highly Challenging
Very Satisfactory	3.64	Highly Challenging
Length of Service		
Short (20 years and below)	3.54	Highly Challenging
Long (21 years and above)	3.70	Highly Challenging
Educational Attainment		
Bachelors Degree w/ MA units	3.58	Highly Challenging
Masters Degree	3.58	Highly Challenging
MA w/ Ph.D units	3.92	Highly Challenging
Municipality		
Jordan	3.53	Highly Challenging
San Lorenzo	3.49	Highly Challenging
Buenavista	3.87	Highly Challenging
Sibunag	3.72	Highly Challenging
Nueva Valencia	3.57	Highly Challenging

Scale of Means: 4.21 – 5.00 Very Highly Challenging; 3.41 – 4.20 Highly Challenging; 2.61 – 3.40 Moderately Challenging; 1.81 – 2.60 Less Challenging; 1.00 – 1.80 Not Challenging

Relationship between the Mentoring and Coaching Practices, Challenges, and Needs of School Heads

Result showed that there was no significant relationship between mentoring and coaching practices and mentoring and coaching challenges of the school heads, the Spearman r was 0.181 and a p value was 0.076. The p -value was greater than 0.05 level of significance which means that there was no significant relationship in the mentoring and coaching practices and mentoring and coaching challenges among school heads. The school heads that were found high on their mentoring and coaching practices had high mentoring and coaching challenges. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there was no significant relationship in the mentoring and coaching practices and mentoring and coaching challenges among school heads was not rejected.

There was a significant relationship between the mentoring and coaching practices and mentoring and coaching needs of the school heads, the Spearman r (rho) was 0.246 and a p -value was 0.015. The p -value was lesser than 0.05 level of significance which means that there was a significant relationship in the mentoring and coaching practices and mentoring and coaching needs of the school heads. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there was no significant relation between the mentoring and coaching practices and mentoring and coaching needs of the respondents was rejected.

There was a significant relationship found between the mentoring and coaching challenges and mentoring and coaching needs of the school heads, the Spearman rho was .468 while the p -value was 0.000. The p -value was lesser than the 0.05 level of significance which means that there was a significant relationship in the mentoring and coaching challenges and mentoring and coaching needs of the school heads. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there was no significant relationship between the mentoring and coaching challenges and mentoring and coaching needs of the school heads was rejected.

There was a significant relationship between the mentoring and coaching needs and mentoring and coaching practices of the school heads, the Spearman rho was 0.246 and a p value was 0.015. The p -value was greater than 0.05 level of significance which means that there was a significant relationship in the mentoring and coaching needs and mentoring and coaching practices among school heads.

Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there was no significant relationship between the mentoring and coaching needs and mentoring and coaching practices of the school heads was rejected.

Table 7. Relationship among the mentoring and coaching practices, challenges needs of School Heads

		mentoring and coaching practices	mentoring and coaching challenges	mentoring and coaching needs
Mentoring and Coaching practices	Spearman rho	1.000	.181	.246*
	p-value.		.076	.015
	N	97	97	97
Mentoring and coaching challenges	Spearman rho	.181	1.000	.468**
	p-value.	.076	.	.000
	N	97	97	97
Mentoring and coaching Needs	Spearman rho	.246*	.468**	1.000
	p-value.	.015	.000	.
	N	97	97	97

* $p < 0.05$ level of significance

Predictors to the Mentoring and Coaching Practices among School Heads

Result showed that there were no significant predictors to the mentoring and coaching practices among school heads when classified according to job performance ($b=0.146$, $p=0.188$), length of service ($b=0.041$, $p=0.704$), school size ($b=0.031$, $p=0.762$), educational attainment ($b=0.022$, $p=0.834$) and municipality ($b=0.177$, $p=0.105$). The p -value was greater than 0.05 level of significant meant that the variables job performance, length of service, school size, educational attainment and municipality were not significant predictors to mentoring and coaching practices among school heads. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that the profile variables

job performance, length of service, school size, educational attainment and municipality were not significant predictors to mentoring and coaching practices of school heads were not rejected .

Table 8. Predictors to the Mentoring and Coaching Practices Among School Heads

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.610	.257		17.959	.000
	performance	-.119	.089	-.146	-1.327	.188
	length of service	-.032	.084	-.041	-.382	.704
	school size	-.027	.090	-.031	-.304	.762
	educational attainment	-.007	.034	-.022	-.210	.834
	municipality	.046	.028	.177	1.640	.105

a. Dependent Variable: mentoring and coaching

*p<0.05 level of significance

Predictors to the Mentoring and Coaching Challenges among School Heads

There were no significant predictors in the mentoring and coaching challenges of the school heads when classified according to job performance (b=0.128, p=0.202), educational attainment (b=0.064, p=0.508) and municipality (b=0.007, p=0.941). The p-value was greater than 0.05 level of significance which means that the variables job performance, educational attainment and municipality were not significant predictors to the mentoring and coaching challenges among school heads. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that the profile variables job performance, educational attainment and municipality were not significant predictors to mentoring and coaching challenges of school heads were not rejected.

As to the variables length of service and school size, there were significant predictors found in the mentoring and coaching challenges of school heads, length of service (b=0.358, p=0.000) and school size (b=0.242, p=0.012). The p-value was less than 0.05 level of significance which means that the variables length of service and school size were significant predictors in the mentoring and coaching challenges among school heads. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that the profile variables length of service and school size were not significant predictors to mentoring and coaching challenges of school heads was rejected.

Table 9. Predictors to the Mentoring and Coaching Challenges among School Heads

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.134	.437		7.166	.000
	performance	-.196	.152	-.128	-1.286	.202
	length of service	.524	.144	.358	3.647	.000
	school size	-.395	.154	-.242	-2.573	.012
	educational attainment	.038	.058	.064	.665	.508
	municipality	-.004	.048	-.007	-.075	.941

a. Dependent Variable: challenges

*p<0.05 level of significance

Predictors to the Mentoring and Coaching Needs among School Heads

There were no significant predictors in the mentoring and coaching needs of the school heads when classified according to job performance (b=0.032, p=0.773), length of service (b=0.137, p=0.211), school size (b=0.046, p=0.661), educational attainment (b=0.119, p=0.270) and municipality (b=0.037, p=0.731).

The p-value was greater than 0.05 level of significance which means that the variables job performance, length of service, school size, educational attainment and municipality were not significant predictors to mentoring and coaching needs among school heads.

Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that the profile variables job performance, length of service, school size, educational attainment and municipality were not significant predictors to the mentoring and coaching needs of the school heads were not rejected.

Table 10. Predictors to the Mentoring and Coaching Needs among School Heads

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.089	.523		5.903	.000
	performance	.053	.182	.032	.290	.773
	length of service	.217	.172	.137	1.260	.211
	school size	-.081	.184	-.046	-.441	.661
	educational attainment	.077	.069	.119	1.109	.270
	municipality	.020	.058	.037	.346	.731
a. Dependent Variable: needs						

*p<0.05 level of significance

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study the researcher drew the following conclusion:

There is a very high level of mentoring and coaching practices of school heads in the Schools Division of Guimaras and when classified according to school size, performance, length of service, educational attainment and municipality.

There is a moderate level of mentoring and coaching needs among school heads in the Schools Division of Guimaras and when classified according to school size, performance, length of service, educational attainment and municipality.

There is a high level of mentoring and coaching challenges among school heads in the Schools Division of Guimaras and when classified according to school size, performance, length of service, educational attainment and municipality.

There are significant relationships in the level of mentoring and coaching practices and needs and mentoring and coaching challenges and needs. There are no significant relationships in the level of mentoring and coaching practices and challenges.

There are no significant predictors to the mentoring and coaching practices among school heads when classified according to job performance, length of service, school size, educational attainment, and municipality.

There are no significant predictors in the mentoring and coaching needs of the school heads when classified according to job performance, length of service, school size, educational attainment, and municipality.

There are no significant predictors in the mentoring and coaching challenges of the school heads when classified according to job performance, educational attainment and municipality. However, there are significant predictors found in the mentoring and coaching challenges of school heads, length of service and school size.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusion the researcher recommends:

1. The school heads should develop new or improved existing skills of their teachers through regular meeting and introduction of new methods and strategies and guidelines of DepEd.
2. School heads should also guide and help teachers who want to change career path such as from classroom teaching to administrative or support staff to learning.
3. The teachers should introduce and have knowledge on environmental education concepts well enough and sharing the best practices to their colleagues.
4. School heads should give focus on mentoring and coaching to new teachers for they still lack teaching experience and how to manage the class
5. School heads should spin off the non-existing income-generating projects in the school and identify new IGPs that can be sustained.
6. The school administrator should conduct seminars and workshops on mentoring and coaching using information and communication technology such as facebook, emails twitters etc. to connect with teachers.
2. The Department of Education should include the mentoring and coaching to teachers and peer mentoring by providing schools the proper materials such as work books and laptop computers for easy access to communication.
3. The researcher recommends parallel studies that deals with the mentoring and coaching practices, challenges and needs in a wider scale in order to repudiate or supports the findings of the study.

REFERENCES

1. Aguilar (2017). What's the Difference Between Coaching and Mentoring? https://blogs.edweek.org/teachers/coaching_teachers/2017/07/whats_the_difference_between_c.html, retrieved, January 2019
2. Alegado (2018). The challenges of teacher leadership in the Philippines as experienced and perceived by teachers. *International Journal of Education and Research* Vol. 6 No. 6 June 2018. <http://www.ijern.com/journal/2018/June-2018/22.pdf>, retrieved, January 2019
3. Decolongon (2015). An Exploratory Study of Mentoring Practices in the Philippines. <https://www.pahrodf.org.ph/events/learning-events/hr-symposium/2015/01/ppt-exploratory-research-on-mentoring-practices-in.pdf>, retrieved, January 2019
4. Department of Education - Bureau of Human Resource and Organizational Development. Results-based Performance Management System MANUAL for Teachers and School Heads, retrieved, November 2018
5. Emily, et. Al (2015). The Challenges Facing Secondary School Principals As Human Resource Managers (Hrms) In Line Of Duty: A Case Of Nandi County, Kenya. <http://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/The-Challenges-Facing-Secondary-School-Principals-As-Human-Resource-Managers-Hrms-In-Line-Of-Duty.pdf>, retrieved, November 2018
6. Fang, Y. and K. Kant. *Fundamentals of Management: Concepts and Principles*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 2011. retrieved, November 2018
7. Hobson (2013). Mentoring and Coaching for New Leaders. <http://www.rtuni.org/uploads/docs/mentoring-and-coaching-for-new-leaders-summary.pdf>, retrieved, November 2018
8. <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/practice>, retrieved, January 2019
9. Johnson (2008). Mentoring at-risks Youth” by Johnson at East Tennessee State University in 2006. *Dissertation Abstracts International (DAI)*, Vol. 67, No. 11, May 2008, p. 4051-A). retrieved, November 2018

10. Lopez (2016). Classroom Supervisory Practices and Their Relationship to Teacher Effectiveness As Perceived by Secondary Teachers. SMCC Higher Education Research Journal ISSN Print: 2449-4402 · ISSN online: 2467-6322 Volume 2 April 2016. http://sherj.smccnasipit.edu.ph/articles/Vol2_April2016/Lopez.pdf, retrieved, January 2019
11. Moore (2008). Effectiveness of Mentoring on the Retention of Urban Middle School Teachers. Capella University. Dissertation Abstract International (DAI), Vol. 69, No. 2, August, 2008. retrieved, November 2018
12. Olive (2013). The Challenges Faced By Primary School Principals In Curriculum Management: A Case Of Region C In Gauteng Province. http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/10626/dissertation_kyahurwa_o.pdf?sequence=1, retrieved, November 2018
13. Priti, et. al (2013). A Descriptive Study on the Challenges faced by a School Principals. <http://www.isca.in/IJSS/Archive/v2/i5/6.ISCA-IRJSS-2013-057.pdf>, retrieved, November 2018
14. Santrock, John W. Child Development. 11th ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 2007. retrieved, November 2018
15. Simpson, et.al (2016). Assessing the Challenges Heads of Department Encounter in Instructional Supervision in Ghana. A Case of Selected Senior High Schools in Kwabre East District. Journal of Education and Practice www.iiste.org ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper) ISSN 2222-288X (Online) Vol.7, No.36, 2016 <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1126532.pdf>, retrieved, November 2018
16. Smith, et. al. (2014). Improving Teaching Through Coaching, Mentoring And Feedback: A Review Of Literature. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271705666>, retrieved, January 2019
17. SREB staff (Good Principals Aren't Born — They're Mentored: Are We Investing Enough to Get the School Leaders We Need? <https://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Documents/Good-Principals-Arent-Born-Theyre-Mentored.pdf>, retrieved, January 2019
18. Staran (2008). Impact of Executive Coaching on Job Performance from the Perspective of Executive Women. Capella University in 2007. Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 68, No 5, November, 2008, p. 1783-A. retrieved, November 2018
19. Thomposon (2008). Faculty Mentoring: An Informal Approach to Staff Development for Online Learning. East Carolina University in 2007. Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 68, No. 10, April, 2008, p. 4231-A. retrieved, November 2018
20. Whitebook (2016). Mentoring and Coaching: Distinctions in Practice. <http://csce.berkeley.edu/mentoring-and-coaching-distinctions-in-practice/>, retrieved, November 2018
21. Woolfolk (2013). Educational Psychology. retrieved, November 2018