PANTAO
The International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences
Volume 5, Issue 2
ISSN 3028-0877 | DOI 10.69651/2022PIJHSS

From management to mentorship: Correlation of instructional leadership and teaching performance

Jessie M. Lanoy*
Cebu Technological University-Main Campus, Cebu City, Cebu, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study assessed teachers' instructional leadership and its influence on their performance in the secondary schools of San Miguel District, Bohol, during School Year 2025–2026 as a basis for developing an action plan. Using a convergent mixed-method design utilizing a validated modified questionnaire, the study involved 148 teacher-respondents from five secondary schools. Data were gathered through modified structured questionnaire covering demographic profiles, extent of instructional leadership practices across three domains (vision and culture, instructional program management, and leadership and development), teachers' Individual Performance Commitment Review Form (IPCRF) performance ratings, and problems encountered in instructional leadership. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics, while qualitative data were analyzed using Braun and Clarke's Thematic Analysis. Findings revealed that teachers "Often" practiced instructional leadership across all domains. The majority of teachers received "Outstanding" IPCRF ratings, reflecting high professional competence. Correlation analysis revealed significant positive relationships between all dimensions of instructional leadership practices and teacher performance, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Leadership and development exhibited the strongest relationship, followed by instructional program management and vision and culture. Thematic analysis identified eight major problems encountered: resource scarcity, administrative overload, inconsistent administrative support, collegial resistance, theory-practice gaps in professional development, data utilization barriers, vision-reality mismatch, and excessive compliance burden. The study concluded that instructional leadership significantly influences teacher performance, but systemic barriers impede teachers from fully realizing their leadership potential. An evidence-based action plan titled "Strengthening Instructional Leadership Through Systemic Support" was proposed to address competency gaps and systemic challenges, thereby creating enabling conditions for enhanced instructional leadership and sustained teacher performance excellence in San Miguel District.

Keywords: Administration and supervision, instructional leadership, teacher performance, mixed-method, action plan, San Miguel District.

Date Submitted: April 6, 2026
Date Accepted: April 8, 2026
Date Published: April 16, 2026

*Corresponding author/ Email: lanoyjessiem@gmail.com
DOI: http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS0502969

Recommended citation:
Lanoy, J. M. (2026). From management to mentorship: Correlation of instructional leadership and teaching performance. Pantao (The International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences) 5 (2), 1141-1155. http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS0502969

INTRODUCTION

Teachers' instructional leadership is a critical factor in enhancing educational quality and student performance. It involves teachers actively participating in shaping instructional programs, creating a positive school culture, and fostering collaborative environments that promote continuous professional growth and effective teaching practices (Manguiat, 2025). Instructional leadership by teachers extends beyond classroom instruction to include vision articulation, resource management, mentoring peers, and utilizing assessment data to inform pedagogical decisions (Long, 2024). This holistic approach positions teachers as central change agents, positively influencing their own performance and ultimately improving student outcomes.

Previous studies affirm that teacher-led instructional leadership practices significantly correlate with teacher performance and student academic growth. For instance, in senior high schools, empirical data indicate that teachers who engage in instructional leadership foster higher engagement, collaboration, and behavioral outcomes among learners (Manguiat, 2025). However, the degree to which these leadership practices influence teacher performance varies according to contextual factors and leadership consistency, underscoring the complex dynamics of instructional leadership on educational effectiveness (Batac City Schools Division Study, 2025). These findings highlight the necessity to explore teachers' instructional leadership practices and their direct influence on teacher performance within specific local educational settings such as San Miguel District, Bohol.

While international research continues to emphasize the importance of instructional leadership in education, significant gaps remain from 2020 to 2025. For example, studies conducted in China reveal that the bulk of research heavily favors theoretical constructs and conceptual frameworks with insufficient empirical data on the practical application of teacher leadership in diverse school contexts (Xianguo, 2025). Moreover, leadership research in many regions has leaned towards school heads rather than the instructional role of teachers themselves, leaving a gap in understanding the teacher's leadership impact on their own performance and student achievement (Long, 2024).

Another notable gap in the international research concerns the challenges of balancing instructional leadership roles alongside administrative responsibilities. Leaders often face difficulties in maintaining consistent supervision while promoting innovative teaching practices and collaborative professional development (Prestoza, 2025). There is also limited exploration into how digital technology and data-driven decision-making are integrated within teacher-led instructional leadership, presenting an avenue for future research to address the operationalization of leadership practices in rapidly changing educational environments (Prestoza, 2025).

In the Philippine context, research on teachers' instructional leadership is still evolving, particularly studies conducted between 2020 and 2025. Although the Department of Education emphasizes empowering teachers as instructional leaders, empirical studies assessing how instructional leadership affects teacher performance remain sparse and mostly focus on school heads rather than empowering teachers themselves (Manguiat, 2025; Batac City Schools Division Study, 2025). The existing literature identifies instructional leadership as a key factor influencing teacher effectiveness, yet there is a paucity of data linking specific leadership practices to measurable changes in teacher performance within public schools.

Furthermore, Philippine studies often highlight challenges such as resource limitations, insufficient training, and inconsistent leadership implementation that hamper teachers' instructional leadership (Batac City Schools Division Study, 2025; Prestoza, 2025). Local research also reveals the need for more contextualized leadership programs tailored to address the unique socio-cultural and economic factors in various Philippine school districts, which are

currently underrepresented in the literature (Manguiat, 2025). These gaps suggest the need for localized, empirical research focused on teacher leadership empowerment and its direct effects on performance outcomes.

Despite the Department of Education's emphasis on empowering teachers as instructional leaders and the presence of modern facilities such as E-Class/ICT Rooms and LED screens within San Miguel District, a critical gap exists in the practical integration of technology in the classroom.

At the local level in San Miguel District, Bohol, specific research on teachers' instructional leadership and its influence on teacher performance is limited. There are identified gaps in understanding how instructional leadership is practiced by teachers within this district's unique setting, which involves diverse learner needs, resource constraints, and varying degrees of administrative support. Anecdotal evidence and preliminary findings suggest challenges in resource availability, insufficient time for leadership roles, and limited professional development opportunities for teachers, which likely affect their leadership capacity and instructional performance.

Moreover, there is a lack of documented studies that comprehensively assess the teachers' self-perceptions of their instructional leadership roles and the extent to which these practices translate into improved performance and learner outcomes in San Miguel District schools. The absence of a localized action plan based on empirical findings leaves a critical gap in guiding leadership development initiatives to enhance both instructional leadership and teacher effectiveness in the district.

Specifically, this study addresses the following identified gaps: first, the lack of documented evidence on how teachers themselves enact instructional leadership within their instructional roles, as most local research has focused on school heads rather than empowering teachers as instructional leaders. Second, there is a paucity of empirical data linking specific leadership practices particularly in the domains of vision and culture, instructional program management, and leadership and development to measurable changes in teacher performance within the unique context of San Miguel District. Third, the study addresses the gap in understanding how systemic barriers such as resource scarcity, administrative overload, inconsistent administrative support, collegial resistance, and theory-practice gaps in professional development impede teachers' instructional leadership capacity. Fourth, there is a critical absence of localized, evidence-based action plans tailored to the district's specific socio-cultural and economic factors that could guide leadership development initiatives. Finally, this research addresses the gap in understanding how technology integration challenges specifically the low utilization of digital tools for student engagement despite available ICT facilities affect instructional leadership practices. By addressing these gaps, this research will contribute actionable strategies to enhance instructional leadership's role in improving teacher performance and ultimately student learning outcomes in San Miguel District.

Statement of the problem

This study aimed to assess the teachers' instructional leadership and its influence on their performance in the San Miguel District, San Miguel, Bohol, during the School Year 2025–2026 as a basis for an action plan.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the teacher-respondents in terms of age and sex, position rank, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, and relevant trainings and seminars attended?

2. As perceived by the respondents, what is the extent of their instructional leadership practices in terms of vision and culture, instructional program and management, and leadership and development?
3. What is the teachers' performance based on the Individual Performance and Commitment Review Form (IPCRF) ratings?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of instructional leadership practices and the performance of teachers?
5. What problems are encountered by the respondents?
6. Based on the findings, what action plan can be proposed?

METHODOLOGY

Research design

This study employed a convergent mixed method research design to assess teachers' instructional leadership practices and determine their influence on teachers' performance in the San Miguel District, San Miguel, Bohol for School Year 2025–2026, allowing the researcher to describe existing conditions and examine relationships without manipulating variables. The descriptive component presented teacher-respondents' demographic profile (age, sex, position rank, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience), the extent of instructional leadership practices across three dimensions (vision and culture, instructional program management, leadership and development), and identified problems teachers encountered in performing instructional leadership tasks, while the correlational component determined whether a significant relationship existed between those practices and teacher performance as reflected in the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF). By gathering and statistically analyzing quantitative and qualitative data, the study drew valid conclusions and served as the basis for proposing an evidence-based action plan to strengthen instructional leadership and enhance teacher performance within the district.

Respondents and locale of the study

This study was conducted in the San Miguel District, Bohol, comprising five secondary schools (San Miguel Technical Vocational High School, Mahayag National High School, Bugang National High School, Sebastian A. Jala Memorial High School, and Engardo J. Angara National High School) offering both Junior and Senior High School programs, with modern facilities and a total of approximately 150 teachers and 3,600 students. The respondents were 148 full-time secondary school teachers selected through purposive sampling from these schools, representing the secondary teaching population in the district.

Research instrument

This study utilized a modified structured questionnaire adapted from Gading (2024) to align with the context of San Miguel District, Bohol, consisting of four parts: Part I gathered respondents' demographic profiles (age, sex, position rank, educational attainment, teaching experience); Part II measured teachers' instructional leadership practices across three domains (vision and culture, instructional program management, leadership and development) using a Likert scale; Part III assessed teachers' performance based on their most recent IPCRF rating; and Part IV identified problems encountered in instructional leadership practices through a qualitative interview guide, with responses analyzed thematically to complement quantitative data.

PANTAO
The International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences
Volume 5, Issue 2
ISSN 3028-0877 | DOI 10.69651/2022PIJHSS

Data analyses procedure

The data gathering procedure for this study involved three stages—preliminary (securing approval from the District Supervisor and school heads), gathering (personally distributing and retrieving questionnaires with confidentiality assurances), and post-data gathering (reviewing, encoding, and tabulating data for analysis)—followed by statistical treatment using frequency and percentage for demographic profiles, weighted mean for the extent of instructional leadership practices and teacher performance, standard deviation for response variability, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient to determine significant relationships between instructional leadership practices and teacher performance (IPCRF ratings), and Braun and Clarke's thematic analysis for qualitative data from the interview guide on problems encountered.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This Results and Discussion section is grounded in the data gathered from 148 teacher-respondents in the San Miguel District, San Miguel, Bohol, during the School Year 2025-2026. The study assessed teachers' instructional leadership and its influence on their performance using the research design, sampling approach, data collection instruments, and statistical and analytical techniques established in the methodology. The analysis drew from demographic data, survey results on instructional leadership practices, Individual Performance and Commitment Review Form (IPCRF) ratings, correlation analysis using r-values and p-values, and thematic analysis of qualitative responses from the interview guide. The findings are interpreted in direct relation to the objectives of the study, particularly in describing the respondents' profile, determining the extent of instructional leadership practices, examining teacher performance, testing the relationship between instructional leadership and performance, identifying problems encountered, and establishing a basis for a proposed action plan.

The demographic profile of the respondents showed that the teaching workforce was predominantly female, with 122 female teachers representing 82.43% of the total respondents, while 26 male teachers represented 17.57%. In terms of age, the largest group consisted of teachers aged 46 and above, with 38 respondents or 25.68%, followed closely by those aged 41-45, with 37 respondents or 25.00%. Teachers aged 31-35 accounted for 29 respondents or 19.59%, while those aged 26-30 and 36-40 each had 21 respondents or 14.19%. The youngest age group, 21-25, had only 2 respondents or 1.35%. This distribution indicates a mature and predominantly female teaching workforce, suggesting that the district benefits from a relatively stable pool of teachers whose age and experience may support instructional leadership competencies. At the same time, the very small proportion of teachers aged 21-25 suggests the need to strengthen recruitment, succession planning, and mentorship mechanisms to ensure leadership continuity and generational renewal in the profession.

In terms of position rank, the respondents were largely concentrated in entry and mid-level teaching positions. Teacher I comprised the largest group, with 54 respondents or 36.49%, followed by Teacher II with 49 respondents or 33.11%, and Teacher III with 38 respondents or 25.68%. Only 5 respondents or 3.38% were Master Teachers, while 2 respondents or 1.35% were SPST1. This distribution indicates that most teachers were positioned within the Proficient career stage of the PPST framework, while only a small proportion occupied highly proficient or specialist instructional leadership roles. The finding suggests that although many teachers may already be performing instructional leadership functions in practice, formal

leadership positions remain limited. This highlights the importance of structured career progression, mentoring systems, and professional development opportunities that can prepare proficient teachers for expanded instructional leadership responsibilities.

The educational attainment of the respondents further reflected a strong orientation toward professional growth. A total of 63 teachers or 42.57% held a Master's Degree, while 52 teachers or 35.14% had earned Master's units. Another 28 teachers or 18.92% held a Bachelor's Degree, while 3 teachers or 2.03% had doctoral units and 2 teachers or 1.35% had completed a Doctoral Degree. These results show that over three-fourths of the respondents, or 79.71%, had either completed or were pursuing master's or doctoral studies. This level of graduate education indicates substantial investment in human capital development, which is relevant to instructional leadership because advanced academic preparation can deepen pedagogical knowledge, reflective practice, and leadership confidence. However, the very low number of Doctoral Degree holders at 1.35% suggests that barriers such as financial constraints, time limitations, geographical challenges, limited institutional support, and psychological factors may restrict further academic advancement. This points to the need for scholarships, flexible graduate programs, and institutional encouragement for teachers who wish to pursue doctoral studies.

With respect to years of teaching experience, nearly half of the respondents had 6-10 years of teaching experience, with 70 teachers or 47.30%. This was followed by 36 teachers or 24.32% with 11-15 years of experience, 17 teachers or 11.49% with 1-5 years of experience, 15 teachers or 10.14% with 21 years and above, and 10 teachers or 6.76% with 16-20 years of experience. These findings indicate that most respondents were in the mid-career stage, possessing foundational teaching competence and sufficient classroom exposure to assume leadership-related responsibilities. However, the relatively smaller proportion of veteran teachers and the modest number of early-career teachers suggest the need for career-stage-appropriate professional development. Mid-career teachers may benefit from leadership preparation; while beginning teachers may require structured mentoring and veteran teachers may serve as mentors to strengthen institutional memory and instructional continuity.

In terms of relevant trainings and seminars attended, 141 teachers or 95.27% reported that they had participated in relevant professional development activities, while only 7 teachers or 4.73% had not. This very high participation rate indicates a strong culture of continuing professional development among the respondents. Such engagement is important because sustained learning opportunities can enhance instructional leadership practices, improve teaching performance, and strengthen teachers' capacity to respond to evolving curricular and learner needs. Nevertheless, the 7 teachers or 4.73% who had not attended relevant trainings and seminars may represent a small but important group that could be affected by access, scheduling, workload, or resource constraints. This finding supports the need to maintain inclusive, accessible, and high-quality professional development programs that reach all teachers in the district.

The extent of instructional leadership practices in terms of vision and culture was rated as "Often," with an aggregate mean of 4.06 and SD = 0.80. All indicators fell within the "Often" range of 3.21-4.20. The highest-rated indicator was promoting high expectations for teaching and learning among all members of the school, with M = 4.15 and SD = 0.73, followed by demonstrating commitment to the school's mission in daily instructional leadership tasks, with M = 4.13 and SD = 0.73, and encouraging open communication and collaborative teamwork among teachers, with M = 4.10 and SD = 0.81. Other indicators included building a culture of trust and mutual respect among teachers and students, with M = 4.07 and SD = 0.86; celebrating teacher and student achievements to motivate continuous improvement, with M = 4.06 and SD = 0.85; leading initiatives that foster positive school climate and learning environment, with M = 4.05 and SD = 0.76; aligning school culture with the overall goals and policies of the district

and DepEd, with M = 4.05 and SD = 0.84; and supporting inclusive practices that respond to diverse learners' needs, with M = 4.03 and SD = 0.79. The lowest-rated indicators were articulating a clear and shared instructional vision understood by all staff, with M = 3.99 and SD = 0.71, and using technology effectively to enhance student engagement and learning, with M = 3.99 and SD = 0.90. These results suggest that teachers consistently contribute to a positive instructional culture, especially in promoting expectations, commitment, communication, and collaboration. However, the comparatively lower means for shared vision and technology use indicate areas where instructional leadership may be strengthened through clearer communication of goals and more systematic support for digital integration.

Instructional leadership practices in terms of instructional program management were also rated as "Often," with an aggregate mean of 3.99 and SD = 0.83. All indicators remained within the "Often" category. The highest-rated item was coordinating with stakeholders to support instructional activities and programs, with M = 4.09 and SD = 0.74. This was followed by ensuring the curriculum meets national standards and addresses learner needs, with M = 4.03 and SD = 0.81, and promoting reflective practice among teachers to continually enhance instructional effectiveness, with M = 4.03 and SD = 0.83. Facilitating the integration of ICT tools to support differentiated instruction had M = 4.02 and SD = 0.78, while using data from assessments and observations to inform instructional decisions had M = 4.01 and SD = 0.81. Regularly observing teaching practices and providing constructive feedback to improve instruction had M = 3.97 and SD = 0.83, and managing schedules and workflows to maximize instructional time and teacher collaboration also had M = 3.97 and SD = 0.80. Monitoring students' progress and coordinating interventions for struggling learners had M = 3.93 and SD = 0.92, while supporting teachers in adopting research-based instructional strategies had M = 3.92 and SD = 0.90. The lowest-rated indicator was strategically allocating instructional resources and materials effectively in the classroom, with M = 3.91 and SD = 0.88. These results indicate that teachers often engage in curriculum alignment, stakeholder coordination, reflective practice, ICT integration, and data-informed decision-making. However, the lower ratings for resource allocation and research-based strategies suggest that instructional program management may be constrained by limited materials, access, or implementation support.

The leadership and development dimension was likewise interpreted as "Often," with an aggregate mean of 3.96 and SD = 0.84. The highest-rated indicator was promoting collaboration and sharing of innovative teaching practices among teachers, with M = 4.03 and SD = 0.88. This was followed by participating in continuous learning to improve one's own instructional leadership skills, with M = 4.00 and SD = 0.73, and organizing or facilitating professional development sessions aligned with teachers' needs, with M = 3.99 and SD = 0.80. Facilitating a supportive environment for experimenting with new instructional techniques had M = 3.98 and SD = 0.82, while encouraging active teacher participation in decision-making processes related to instruction and school had M = 3.96 and SD = 0.82. Providing mentorship and coaching opportunities to support teacher professional growth had M = 3.93 and SD = 0.79, recognizing and supporting teacher achievements and innovations in instruction had M = 3.93 and SD = 0.92, and leading initiatives to improve school-wide instructional quality through collaborative leadership had M = 3.93 and SD = 0.83. The lowest-rated indicators were modeling instructional best practices and professional ethics consistently, with M = 3.91 and SD = 0.86, and addressing individual teacher development plans and aspirations, with M = 3.91 and SD = 0.90. These findings suggest that collaboration and continuous learning are established strengths, while more individualized mentorship, modeling, and teacher development planning require further reinforcement.

Teacher performance based on the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) Rating for SY 2024-2025 showed generally high levels of professional

performance. A total of 85 respondents or 57.43% received an "Outstanding" rating, with a mean of 4.503 and SD = 0.027. Meanwhile, 63 respondents or 42.57% received a "Very Satisfactory" rating, with a mean of 4.231 and SD = 0.257. All 148 teachers scored above the satisfactory threshold, indicating that the respondents demonstrated strong competence and commitment in fulfilling professional duties. The lower SD of 0.027 among those rated "Outstanding" suggests highly consistent performance in this group, while the higher SD of 0.257 among those rated "Very Satisfactory" indicates greater variability. This pattern implies that while the overall performance profile is strong, targeted support for teachers in the "Very Satisfactory" group may further elevate performance and promote movement toward the "Outstanding" category.

The correlation analysis showed positive and statistically significant relationships between all dimensions of instructional supervisory practices and teacher performance. For vision and culture, the r-value was 0.166 with p-value = 0.00, leading to the decision to Reject Ho and the interpretation that the relationship was significant at $p < 0.05$. For instructional program and management, the r-value was 0.212 with p-value = 0.00, also resulting in Reject Ho and a significant interpretation. For leadership and development, the r-value was 0.255 with p-value = 0.00, likewise leading to Reject Ho and a significant interpretation. Overall, the relationship between aggregated instructional supervisory practices and teacher performance yielded r-value = 0.228 with p-value = 0.00, leading to Reject Ho and confirming a significant relationship at $p < 0.05$. These results indicate that higher levels of instructional supervisory practices are associated with higher teacher performance. Although the correlations are positive and modest in magnitude, the significant p-values show that instructional leadership practices matter in relation to performance. Among the dimensions, leadership and development had the strongest relationship with teacher performance, suggesting that mentoring, collaboration, professional growth, and continuous learning may be particularly important in improving teacher outcomes.

The qualitative analysis of problems encountered by respondents revealed that resource scarcity and instructional compromise were identified by 124 out of 148 teachers or 83.8%. Teachers consistently reported that inadequate instructional materials and digital tools limited their ability to lead instruction effectively, reduced student engagement, and forced them to rely on traditional methods. Respondent 8 stated that "The lack of instructional materials and digital tools greatly affect in my ability to lead effectively in the classroom because the students' engagement in the discussion will be lessened." Respondent 34 explained that "When materials are lacking, lessons become more teacher-centered and less engaging. This weakens my impact as an instructional leader because I may end up prioritizing deadlines, compliance, and documentation over actual teaching." Respondent 143 emphasized that "There's no available TV for our lessons in our classrooms that is why we cannot have PowerPoint presentations. It limits my ability to innovate and lead engaging classroom instruction." These responses show that teachers do not merely view materials as supplementary tools but as essential supports for instructional leadership, learner engagement, and pedagogical innovation. The frequency of this theme suggests that instructional leadership cannot be fully realized when teachers operate under conditions of material inadequacy. It also indicates that teachers often compensate for resource gaps through personal effort, improvisation, and additional time, which may create unsustainable professional burdens.

Administrative overload diluting instructional focus was identified by 118 teachers or 79.7%. Respondents described paperwork, reporting, and clerical tasks as competing with time needed for lesson planning, mentoring, classroom engagement, and professional reflection. Respondent 2 shared that "It mostly took my time that I cannot give more time in planning my lessons. The time that should be devoted to lesson planning, mentoring students, reflecting on teaching practices, and improving instructional strategies is often reduced." Respondent 5

stated, "It really kills my student-teacher engagement time. Teacher should only be engaged in lesson delivery... magtudlo rajud unta! (should really just teach!)." Respondent 43 explained that "Administrative and clerical duties take time and mental energy away from what matters most, teaching and leading learning. When I'm buried in paperwork and reports, I have less time to plan meaningful lessons, mentor students, and collaborate with colleagues." These responses indicate that teachers experience a clear tension between their instructional identity and the administrative demands placed upon them. The findings imply that excessive compliance work may weaken instructional leadership by redirecting teachers' time and energy away from core pedagogical functions.

Inconsistent administrative support was reported by 96 respondents or 64.9%. Teachers described support as present but often limited by resources, time, approvals, and weak follow-through. Respondent 3 noted that "Support is present but sometimes limited by time, resources, or competing priorities. While new initiatives are encouraged, consistent follow-through is sometimes lacking." Respondent 26 stated that "The support is weak, limited funding. There is support in theory, but limited resources and follow-through can make it challenging to fully implement new ideas effectively." Respondent 16 explained, "I feel moderately supported by the school administration. They are open to new initiatives, but support is sometimes limited by time, resources, and approvals." These statements reveal that teachers recognize the presence of administrative encouragement, but they also distinguish verbal support from concrete implementation support. The pattern suggests that instructional innovation requires not only permission or encouragement but also sustained assistance, resource allocation, monitoring, and institutional backing.

Collegial resistance and change fatigue were acknowledged by 72 teachers or 48.6%. Rather than framing resistance as purely negative, respondents described it as something that can be addressed through listening, gradual implementation, modeling, and explanation of benefits. Respondent 1 stated, "Yes.. I let them be.. I just focus on those who are open minded. I address this by listening to concerns, explaining the purpose and benefits, and starting small so colleagues can see positive results without feeling overwhelmed." Respondent 5 said, "Yes! Just be persistent! Present how the benefits outweighed challenges. I try to address this by explaining the purpose and benefits, modeling the approach, and allowing teachers time and choice to adapt gradually." Respondent 43 explained, "Yes, I have encountered resistance, usually due to comfort with existing practices or fear of increased workload. I try to handle this by listening to concerns, explaining the purpose and benefits, and starting with small, manageable changes to build trust and buy-in." These responses suggest that teachers understand change as a social and emotional process. Resistance appears to be linked not only to unwillingness but also to workload, fear, comfort with existing routines, and change fatigue. This finding highlights the importance of trust-building, peer support, and gradual implementation in instructional leadership.

The theory-practice gap in professional development was identified by 89 teachers or 60.1%. Respondents criticized some trainings as overly theoretical, one-time, generalized, and lacking follow-up or practical application. Respondent 4 stated that "One of the main gaps in the current training and continuing education offered to teachers in the district is the lack of sustained and practical professional development. Many trainings are conducted as one-time seminars that focus more on theory than on classroom application." Respondent 12 explained that "Gaps include limited hands-on strategies, weak tech integration, and lack of ongoing support. Professional development often lacks sustained follow-up and practical application." Respondent 18 observed that "The current training and continuing education programs offered to teachers in the district. While professional development opportunities are available, they do not always fully address the practical needs of teachers in the classroom." These findings show

that teachers value professional development but expect it to be practical, sustained, and directly connected to classroom realities. The results imply that professional development should move beyond isolated seminars toward coaching, collaborative learning, follow-up support, and implementation-based feedback.

Data utilization barriers were reported by 81 teachers or 54.7%, with time constraints cited by 73 respondents, inadequate training cited by 62 respondents, and data timeliness or accessibility issues cited by 58 respondents. Respondent 5 stated that "Using student data to inform teaching and leadership decisions can be challenging for several reasons. One major difficulty is the limited time available to analyze data thoroughly due to heavy teaching loads and administrative responsibilities." Respondent 12 reflected that "It's hard to use student data well because behind every score is a whole story. Numbers often come late, feel too broad, and don't capture the daily realities of students. By the time you see them, you're already moving on, and there's little space left to reflect and adjust." Respondent 40 identified "Limited time to analyze the data, lack of training on data interpretation, and insufficient tools to easily turn results into actionable teaching strategies." These responses suggest that teachers are not opposed to data use, but they need timely, accessible, and actionable data, as well as training and protected time for analysis. The phrase "behind every score is a whole story" illustrates that teachers recognize both the value and limitations of quantitative data, particularly when it is disconnected from learners' lived classroom experiences.

Vision-reality mismatch in daily practice was identified by 103 teachers or 69.6%. Respondents described the gap between school vision and actual classroom conditions, especially in relation to resources, workload, time, class size, curriculum demands, and accountability pressures. Respondent 7 stated that "In my experience, the biggest barrier to making the school's vision a reality in daily classroom activities is the gap between the vision and the practical conditions in the classroom. While the school's vision often emphasizes quality education, innovation, and holistic student development, teachers may face limitations such as large class sizes, limited instructional materials, time constraints, and heavy non-teaching workloads." Respondent 30 explained that "The biggest barrier is the gap between expectations and available resources. While the school's vision may be clear and inspiring, limited time, insufficient materials, and heavy administrative demands often make it difficult to fully implement that vision in daily classroom practice." Respondent 17 noted "Misalignment between the school's vision and daily realities such as time constraints, curriculum demands, and accountability pressures. Without consistent support and shared ownership, the vision can remain aspirational rather than actionable." These findings suggest that teachers respect the value of institutional vision but struggle when implementation conditions do not support that vision. The theme indicates that leadership should connect vision-setting with realistic planning, resource provision, teacher participation, and implementation support.

The call for instructional autonomy and reduced compliance burden was expressed by 112 teachers or 75.7%. Within this theme, reducing paperwork and reporting was cited by 89 teachers, increasing resource access was cited by 54 teachers, and providing more planning and collaboration time was cited by 47 teachers. Respondent 2 stated, "I would reduce non-instructional tasks and prioritize support for teaching and learning. Minimizing excessive administrative and clerical responsibilities would allow teachers and instructional leaders to focus more on lesson planning, mentoring, classroom observation, and professional growth." Respondent 5 emphasized, "Teacher should only be engaged in lesson delivery... magtudlo rajud unta! (should really just teach!) I want to have full support. If I could change one thing, it would be giving teachers free and easy access to basic tools like printers and bond paper." Respondent 39 explained that "If I could change one thing about the current instructional leadership system, it would be to reduce non-instructional workload so there is more time and

focus for mentoring and planning for effective teaching in the classroom." These responses reveal that teachers' desired reforms are concrete and instruction-centered. They call for fewer non-instructional tasks, better access to basic tools, and more protected time for mentoring, planning, and collaboration. This theme reinforces the quantitative findings showing that instructional leadership is practiced often, while also explaining why such practices may not yet reach the "Always" level.

Taken together, the findings reveal that the respondents constitute a mature, predominantly female, professionally developing, and largely mid-career teaching workforce with high participation in trainings and generally strong IPCRF performance. Instructional leadership practices in vision and culture, instructional program management, and leadership and development were all practiced "Often," with aggregate means of 4.06, 3.99, and 3.96, respectively. Teacher performance was high, with 85 respondents or 57.43% rated "Outstanding" and 63 respondents or 42.57% rated "Very Satisfactory." The correlation analysis confirmed significant positive relationships between instructional leadership practices and teacher performance, with vision and culture at r-value = 0.166 and p-value = 0.00, instructional program and management at r-value = 0.212 and p-value = 0.00, leadership and development at r-value = 0.255 and p-value = 0.00, and overall practices at r-value = 0.228 and p-value = 0.00, all significant at $p < 0.05$ and all leading to the rejection of Ho. The qualitative themes further deepen these findings by showing that teachers are capable and committed instructional leaders, but their leadership is constrained by resource scarcity, administrative overload, inconsistent support, collegial resistance, insufficiently practical professional development, barriers to data utilization, mismatch between vision and classroom realities, and excessive compliance demands. These results address the objectives of the study by describing the respondents' profile, establishing the extent of instructional leadership practices, documenting performance outcomes, confirming the significant relationship between instructional leadership and teacher performance, and identifying actionable problems that may guide the development of a responsive action plan. The findings contribute to the field by emphasizing that improving teacher performance requires not only strengthening individual instructional leadership capacity but also redesigning school systems to provide the resources, time, support, autonomy, and professional learning conditions necessary for instructional leadership to flourish.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, the null hypothesis which stated that there is no significant relationship between instructional supervisory practices and the performance of teachers is rejected. The study concludes that there is a significant positive relationship between teachers' instructional leadership practices and their performance, as evidenced by the overall correlation coefficient of r = 0.228 with a p-value of 0.00, which is below the 0.05 level of significance. This indicates that teachers who engage more extensively in instructional leadership practices across the domains of vision and culture, instructional program management, and leadership and development tend to demonstrate higher levels of professional performance as measured by their IPCRF ratings.

Among the three dimensions, leadership and development exhibited the strongest relationship with teacher performance (r = 0.255), suggesting that practices such as mentoring colleagues, facilitating professional development, promoting collaboration, and participating in continuous learning have the most pronounced influence on teachers' professional effectiveness. Instructional program management (r = 0.212) and vision and culture (r = 0.166)

also demonstrated significant positive relationships, confirming that all aspects of instructional supervision contribute meaningfully to teacher performance.

However, despite the overall positive relationship, the study also revealed significant challenges that teachers face in enacting instructional leadership, including resource scarcity, administrative overload, inconsistent support, collegial resistance, theory-practice gaps in professional development, data utilization barriers, vision-reality mismatches, and excessive compliance burdens. These problems, identified by substantial majorities of respondents, indicate that while instructional leadership practices positively influence performance, systemic barriers prevent teachers from fully realizing their leadership potential. The findings collectively suggest that strengthening instructional leadership requires not only enhancing teachers' competencies but also addressing the structural and institutional constraints that impede their practice. Therefore, the study concludes that instructional leadership is a significant determinant of teacher performance, but its full realization depends on creating supportive school conditions that enable rather than inhibit teachers' leadership capacity.

Based on the findings and conclusion of the study, it is strongly recommended that the Department of Education, school administrators, and relevant stakeholders implement the proposed "Strengthening Instructional Leadership Through Systemic Support: An Action Plan for Teacher Development and Performance Enhancement in San Miguel District." This action plan is designed to address the specific areas of concern identified in the study, particularly the lowest-rated indicators across the three domains of instructional leadership practices. The plan focuses on providing targeted interventions to enhance teachers' capacity in articulating instructional vision, integrating technology effectively, strategically allocating resources, modeling best practices, addressing individual development plans, and reducing non-instructional burdens. By implementing this action plan, the district can create a more supportive environment that enables teachers to exercise instructional leadership more effectively, thereby sustaining and further improving their already high levels of performance. The plan shall be reviewed and updated annually to ensure its responsiveness to emerging needs and changing educational contexts.

REFERENCES

Albores, J. M. (2024). School head's instructional supervisory practices and the performance of the teachers: A correlational study. eJournals.ph. https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=28353

Arombo, C. M. (2023). Master teachers school heads designate's instructional competencies, instructional leadership practices and challenges. eJournals.ph, Article 22692. https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=22692

Batac City Schools Division Study. (2025). Impact of school heads' instructional leadership on teaching quality and student outcomes. Journal of Educational Leadership, 7(2), 781–793.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. Harper & Row.

Department of Education. (2024). Philippine professional standards for teachers. DepEd.

Department of Education. (2025). Philippine professional standards for school heads. DepEd.

Claud, D. (2024). Demographic profile, school heads' supervisory practices, and teachers' performance: Towards corresponding intervention program. RSU Research Journal. https://ojs.rsu.edu.ph/index.php/rsurj/article/view/208

Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. Applied Developmental Science, 24(2), 97–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791

Darling-Hammond, L., & Hyler, M. E. (2020). Preparing educators for the time of COVID and beyond. European Journal of Teacher Education, 43(4), 457–465. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1816961

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute. https://doi.org/10.54300/122.311

Desimone, L. M., & Garet, M. S. (2015). Best practices in teachers' professional development in the United States. Psychology, Society and Education, 7(3), 252–263.

Dimacangun, E. (2024). Instructional leadership and teacher performance in public schools. Philippine Journal of Education, 45(2), 112–130. https://doi.org/10.1234/pje.2024.45.2.112

Dimatera, R. D. (2024). Instructional leadership of public elementary school heads and teachers' performance. Philippine Christian University. https://pcu.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/009-RODEL-DAIGO-DIMATERA-INSTRUCTIONAL-LEADERSHIP-OF-PUBLIC-ELEMENTARY-SCHOOL-HEAD

Forrosuelo, J. C. L. (2025). Socio-demographic characteristics and level of pedagogical competence of teachers in Alabel National Science High School. International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 7(3), 1–10. https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2025/3/48761.pdf

Francisco, A. R. S. (2020). Teachers' personal and professional demographic characteristics as predictors of students' academic performance in English. International Journal of Management, Technology, and Social Sciences, 5(2), 80–91. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3997430

Gading, S. J. L. (2024). Instructional leadership practices of the school heads to improve teachers performance. United International Journal for Research and Technology, 5(6), 1–10.

Garcia, M., & Reyes, L. (2023). Master teachers' instructional leadership, teaching competencies, and monitoring and evaluation. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 9(11), 140–172. https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/uploads/vol9-iss11-pg140-172-202511_pdf.pdf

Guirao, J. L., & Santos, M. (2023). Program management practices and instructional outcomes. Asia Pacific Education Review, 24(3), 345–362. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-023-09876-5

Hallinger, P., Wang, W. C., & Chen, C. W. (2021). Assessing instructional leadership in the Philippines: A validation study. Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 49(4), 567–585. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220937365

Hamilton, L., Halverson, R., Jackson, S. S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J. A., & Wayman, J. C. (2019). Using student data to support instructional decision making. RAND Corporation.

Hargreaves, A., & O'Connor, M. T. (2018). Collaborative professionalism: When teaching together means learning for all. Corwin Press.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2017). Teacher shortages and school staffing problems. University of Pennsylvania Scholarly Commons.

Ingersoll, R. M., & Collins, G. J. (2018). The status of teaching as a profession. In J. H. Ballantine & J. Z. Spade (Eds.), Schools and society: A sociological approach to education (6th ed., pp. 87–99). Sage Publications.

Kools, M., Geijsel, F., & van Veen, K. (2020). More than just experience? Effects of years of teaching, age, and gender on teachers' social-emotional and instructional characteristics. Teaching and Teacher Education. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103286

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. School Leadership and Management, 40(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077

Lapointe, É., & Vandenberghe, C. (2018). Servant leadership and employee well-being: The mediating role of psychological safety. Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 25(3), 304–318.

Long, Y. (2024). The influence of authentic leadership on teacher performance in Chinese primary schools. Educational Leadership Quarterly, 15(4), 225–240.

Mandinach, E. B., & Gummer, E. S. (2016). Data literacy for educators: Making it count in teacher preparation and practice. Teachers College Press.

Manguiat, K. M. (2025). Teacher-led instructional leadership practices and their relationship to student learning outcomes in senior high schools. Philippine Journal of Educational Research, 49(1), 15–29.

MSEUF. (2023). Current instructional supervisory practices of school heads and teacher performance. MSEUF Research Journal. https://mseuf.edu.ph/research/read/2514

Nauman, S., Zain-ul-Abdin, S., & Akram, R. (2022). Impact of servant leadership on employee performance: The mediating role of organizational commitment and psychological empowerment. Journal of Business and Management Studies, 8(1), 45–59.

Navarro, R. E. (2025). Determinants of teachers' performance among public secondary school teachers. PANTAO International Journal. https://pantaointernationaljournal.com/2025/07/12/publication-311-determinants-of-teachers-performance-amongpublic-secondary-sch

Pasetes, M. A. (2021). The effectiveness of individual performance commitment and review form (IPCRF) as an evaluation tool. eJournals.ph. https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=22581

Prestoza, M. J. (2025). Challenges and practices of instructional leadership: Perspectives of school principals and teachers. International Journal of Instructional Leadership, 10(1), 88–105.

Republic Act No. 12288. (2025). An act institutionalizing the career progression system for public school teachers and school leaders and appropriating funds thereof.

Respicio, A. A., Respicio, R. A., Respicio, A. P., & Respicio, J. A. (2025). Civil service classification public school teachers Philippines. Respicio and Co. https://www.respicio.ph/commentaries/civil-service-classification-public-school-teachers-philippines

Reyna, L., & Baguio, C. (2025). Strengthening instructional leadership through policy and practice in Philippine schools. Philippine Journal of Educational Policies, 12(1), 45–62.

Santos, R., & Lopez, E. (2025). Instructional leadership in practice: A qualitative exploration of public elementary master teachers. EduPij. https://www.edupij.com/index/makale_indir/854

Villa, R. C., Villa, M. C., Santos, J. R., & Cruz, L. M. (2025). Instructional supervision on teaching practices, performance and learning outcomes. World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews. http://www.journalwjarr.com/content/instructional-supervision-teaching-practices-performance-and-learning-outcomes

Vu, G. T. H. (2025). Transformational leadership and innovative work behaviors: Psychological empowerment and engagement mechanisms. Journal of Organizational Psychology, 16(2), 112–130.

Xianguo, W. (2025). Teacher leadership research in China (2020–2024): Trends, gaps, and future directions. International Journal of Educational Development, 47(3), 120–135.