

**Instructional leadership practices of school heads and
their impact on the performance of teachers**

Monette B. Zerna*

Cebu Technological University-Main Campus, Cebu City, Cebu, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This research evaluated the instructional leadership practices of school heads and their impact on teacher performance across key pedagogical domains in selected public elementary schools within Loboc District, Division of Bohol, for School Year 2026–2027. Utilizing a descriptive-correlational research design with survey data from randomly selected teachers, the analysis revealed that school heads execute their instructional leadership at a functional level overall, performing strongest as communicators while showing the most room for growth in serving as instructional resources and maintaining a visible presence. Similarly, teachers operate at a functional performance tier, displaying high proficiency in establishing student rapport but experiencing technical capacity plateaus in educational technology integration, differentiated instruction, double-loop reflective planning, and test item analysis. A strong, positive, and statistically significant relationship was established between instructional leadership practices and teacher performance, proving that active leadership directly drives educator effectiveness. However, operational efficiency is heavily constrained by administrative assignment overload—which serves as the primary driver of teacher burnout—alongside unequal resource distribution. These results imply that while interpersonal rapport and vision are well-established, teacher productivity is bottlenecked by excessive non-instructional duties and a shortage of formative clinical coaching. Consequently, sustaining professional growth requires institutional interventions like Project LEAD-PERFORM to systematically unburden educators from administrative overload, equalize resource access, and shift supervisory practices toward data-driven peer learning cells.

Keywords: Instructional leadership, teacher performance, clinical supervision, school management, Project LEAD-PERFORM, basic education, discipline.

Date Submitted: July 22, 2026

Date Accepted: July 27, 2026

Date Published: August 21, 2026

INTRODUCTION

Instructional leadership has become increasingly central to contemporary educational governance because the quality of school leadership directly influences the conditions under which teachers teach, develop professionally, and respond to the needs of learners. Globally, school leadership has shifted from a predominantly bureaucratic and administrative function

*Corresponding author / Email: monette.zerna@deped.gov.ph
DOI: <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05031493>

Recommended citation:

Zerna, M. B. (2026). Instructional leadership practices of school heads and their impact on the performance of teachers. *Pantao (International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences)* 5 (3), 3775-3803.
<http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05031493>

toward a learning centered paradigm in which leaders assume direct responsibility for instructional quality and academic improvement. Within this paradigm, school heads are expected not only to manage institutional operations but also to establish clear academic goals, cultivate collaborative professional environments, allocate resources strategically, supervise instruction, and sustain mechanisms for teacher development. Meng and Chang (2024) found that effective instructional leadership, particularly when principals establish clear academic objectives, foster a collaborative school atmosphere, and optimize learning resources, significantly enhances teachers' professional satisfaction, instructional efficacy, and emotional resilience in rural settings. Such leadership practices create a coherent educational direction and provide teachers with the pedagogical guidance and organizational support necessary to translate institutional policies into meaningful classroom experiences.

The growing emphasis on learning centered leadership is further supported by evidence linking administrative attention to teaching and learning with teacher engagement, professional commitment, and institutional performance. Strong instructional leadership by school principals remains an important driver of school effectiveness because it purposefully aligns technical assistance, instructional resources, professional development, and continuous monitoring with clearly articulated academic goals (Cadiz, 2026). When teachers perceive that their working environment is characterized by systematic support, inclusive governance, and sustained instructional guidance, they are more likely to demonstrate stronger motivation, effective classroom management, and confidence in implementing innovative pedagogical approaches. These conditions are particularly important in addressing differences in learner needs and reducing achievement gaps because teachers require both professional autonomy and structured institutional support to adapt instruction effectively.

Within the Philippine basic education system, the importance of instructional leadership has been institutionalized through professional standards and policies that define school heads as leaders of teaching and learning. The Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) emphasizes strategic leadership, effective management of school operations and resources, and the promotion of teacher development. Empirical evidence from the Philippine public school sector indicates that school heads demonstrate strong competencies in managing instructional programs and articulating educational visions, with these competencies contributing to teacher motivation and professional growth (Sariakin et al., 2026). Nevertheless, the literature also identifies persistent structural constraints. Administrative workload and inadequate strategic allocation of resources can limit the capacity of school heads to provide sustained classroom supervision, mentoring, and instructional assistance. This suggests that the existence of leadership standards alone does not guarantee their consistent translation into effective instructional practice.

Local evidence likewise demonstrates the close relationship between school leadership and teacher performance. A regional assessment reported a substantial positive correlation between outstanding leadership practices across strategic, relationship building, and instructional domains and correspondingly high teacher performance evaluation scores (School Heads' Leadership Practices, 2025). These findings reinforce the view that leadership operates not simply through formal authority but through the creation of an empowering professional environment. When school heads facilitate relevant professional development, provide constructive feedback, strengthen collegial relationships, and secure appropriate technical assistance, teachers become better prepared to respond to diverse learner profiles, curricular changes, and emerging instructional demands. The convergence of international, national, and local evidence therefore establishes instructional leadership as an important organizational mechanism through which school conditions can influence teacher motivation, professional competence, and instructional performance.

The relationship between leadership and teacher performance may be understood more comprehensively through the Effective Schools Theory pioneered by Ronald Edmonds. The theory is founded on the proposition that all children can learn when schools provide appropriate conditions for learning and identifies strong instructional leadership as one of the fundamental characteristics of effective schools. From this perspective, school heads cannot remain primarily concerned with administrative functions because they must actively manage, supervise, and evaluate instructional programs. Their leadership influences the clarity of the school's mission, the expectations communicated to teachers and learners, and the overall climate in which teaching occurs. Accordingly, the effectiveness of a school depends partly on the ability of its leaders to establish organizational conditions that allow teachers to optimize instructional delivery. Effective Schools Theory therefore provides an important foundation for examining how specific leadership practices are associated with teacher performance.

This perspective is complemented by Philip Hallinger's Instructional Leadership Model, which conceptualizes school leadership through three interconnected responsibilities: defining the school's mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive school learning climate. The model directly links administrative and pedagogical oversight with classroom practice by emphasizing supervision of instruction, curriculum coordination, protection of instructional time, and the provision of incentives and professional support. Hallinger (2020) explained that when leaders systematically supervise instruction, coordinate curriculum implementation, and establish structural support for teachers, they create conditions that scaffold professional growth and improve instructional delivery. Bush (2021) similarly found that strategic instructional leadership contributes to more stable teacher efficacy and stronger instructional strategies, particularly when school leaders deliberately monitor and support classroom environments. Together, these perspectives position instructional leadership as a structured process through which administrative decisions and actions influence teachers' professional capabilities.

Evidence from the Philippine context further demonstrates the relevance of Hallinger's model. Alvoid and Black (2024) found that teachers in public schools managed by highly engaged instructional leaders demonstrated improved teaching practices, particularly in aligning daily lessons with state standards and applying localized assessment strategies. Their findings illustrate that instructional leadership is not detached from classroom processes but functions as an active and socially mediated resource for teacher productivity and instructional improvement. Regular and constructive classroom observations, combined with objective performance feedback, were associated with stronger teacher preparation and responsiveness. Such evidence underscores the importance of clinical instructional leadership and supports the proposition that clear academic expectations, protected instructional time, targeted professional development, structured supervision, and adequate resource support can collectively strengthen teacher performance and institutional quality.

While Hallinger's framework emphasizes the organizational and instructional functions of school leadership, Bernard M. Bass's Transformational Leadership Theory explains the motivational and relational processes through which leaders can encourage teachers to exceed expected performance. Transformational leadership emphasizes intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, and the development of a shared institutional vision. Within school settings, these principles become evident when school heads encourage teachers to confront classroom challenges, critically examine their instructional practices, and develop creative responses to emerging educational demands. Bass and Avolio (2022) argued that institutional growth is strengthened when leaders cultivate shared vision and intellectual challenge, thereby accelerating professional development. Consistent with this

perspective, Khun In et al. (2023) found that teachers working under transformational school heads demonstrated improved problem-solving abilities, stronger professional morale, and superior classroom performance. Such leadership creates a professionally supportive environment in which teachers can experiment, collaborate, and improve their instructional practices with greater confidence.

The developmental value of transformational leadership is further reflected in the individualized mentorship that school heads provide. Mestry (2024) confirmed that transformational leadership behaviors can strengthen teachers' professional execution by fostering self-regulation and efficacy through individualized support. Within the Division of Bohol, such a framework is particularly relevant to the capacity of school heads to guide teachers in making data driven instructional decisions, developing data informed portfolios, and continuously refining instructional delivery. Teachers working within transformational environments can use institutional feedback to identify classroom problems, test localized strategies, and reflect critically on learning outcomes. Garcia and Reyes (2025) similarly demonstrated that leader supported innovation strengthens instructional expertise and teacher confidence. Transformational leadership therefore complements instructional leadership by explaining how school heads can move beyond supervision toward empowerment, helping teachers internalize institutional goals and actively participate in improving instructional practice.

The importance of reflection within this developmental process is illuminated by Donald Schön's Reflective Practice and Chris Argyris' Double Loop Learning theories. Schön proposed that professional improvement occurs through reflection in action, during which practitioners evaluate and adjust their actions while performing them, and reflection on action, through which they subsequently examine their experiences and identify improvements. Applied to instructional leadership, these processes become particularly relevant during classroom observations, coaching sessions, and post observation conferences. When school heads incorporate reflective questioning into supervisory conversations, teachers are encouraged to examine both their immediate instructional decisions and the assumptions underlying those decisions (Schön, 2022). Deala and Lopez (2024) found that teachers exposed to reflective supervisory practices demonstrated stronger reflective thinking and more adaptive teaching strategies, supporting the value of reflection as a mechanism for continuous instructional improvement.

Argyris' Double Loop Learning extends this process by emphasizing the need to examine not only ineffective practices but also the underlying beliefs, principles, and assumptions that produce them. Leadership driven professional development that incorporates both reflective practice and double loop learning therefore enables teachers to move beyond technical correction toward deeper professional learning. Wyllie et al. (2023) demonstrated that reflective practice and double loop learning, when encouraged by competent instructional leaders, contribute substantially to teacher growth by strengthening technical skills while prompting teachers to reconsider the principles underlying their instructional strategies. The integration of these theories with instructional leadership highlights the importance of constructive feedback, collaborative reflection, and critical self examination. When clinical supervision is structured around these processes, teachers can develop greater self awareness, adaptability, confidence, and responsiveness to classroom challenges.

These leadership and reflective processes also intersect with Albert Bandura's Teacher Self Efficacy Theory, which emphasizes that individuals' beliefs about their capacity to perform particular tasks influence their motivation, behavior, persistence, and eventual performance. In educational settings, teachers with strong self efficacy are more likely to adopt innovative strategies, persist when confronted with instructional difficulties, manage classrooms effectively, and adjust teaching approaches to accommodate varied learner needs

(Bandura, 2023). Ayilimba et al. (2024) found that teachers with higher self efficacy demonstrated greater confidence in using digital tools and stronger persistence in engaging low performing learners, contributing to improved student outcomes. Teacher self efficacy therefore represents an important psychological mechanism through which instructional leadership may ultimately influence classroom performance.

Bandura's framework further clarifies how school heads can deliberately strengthen teachers' beliefs in their professional capabilities. Instructional leaders can provide mastery experiences by assigning meaningful leadership and instructional responsibilities, vicarious experiences by modeling or facilitating exposure to effective teaching practices, and verbal persuasion through constructive and evidence based feedback. Bandura (2023) identified these experiences as important sources of efficacy beliefs. Through sustained instructional guidance, professional recognition, collaborative problem solving, and opportunities for successful practice, teachers can gain greater mastery over classroom challenges while receiving validation and institutional support. Instructional leadership can therefore strengthen performance not only by directing what teachers do but also by influencing how confidently and persistently teachers approach their professional responsibilities.

Taken together, Effective Schools Theory, Hallinger's Instructional Leadership Model, Bass's Transformational Leadership Theory, Schön's Reflective Practice, Argyris' Double Loop Learning, and Bandura's Teacher Self Efficacy Theory provide complementary explanations for the relationship between school leadership and teacher performance. Effective Schools Theory establishes instructional leadership as a defining condition of effective schooling, while Hallinger specifies the organizational and pedagogical practices through which school heads influence instruction. Transformational Leadership Theory explains how shared vision, motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized support encourage professional growth. Schön and Argyris clarify how reflection and critical examination transform supervisory feedback into deeper professional learning, while Bandura explains how supportive leadership experiences can strengthen teachers' confidence, persistence, and instructional agency. Collectively, these perspectives suggest that teacher performance develops through an interconnected process involving organizational direction, instructional supervision, professional empowerment, reflective learning, and strengthened self efficacy.

These theoretical propositions are reinforced by the policy and legal framework governing Philippine basic education. DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015 establishes the Guidelines on the Establishment and Implementation of the Results based Performance Management System (RPMS) in the Department of Education. The RPMS provides a standardized mechanism for evaluating employee performance by linking individual responsibilities and accomplishments with organizational goals and strategic directions. Within this framework, school heads perform important responsibilities as performance raters, supervisors, and instructional coaches who monitor, evaluate, and support teachers throughout the performance cycle. The policy therefore provides an institutional basis for examining how supervisory and instructional leadership practices may be reflected in teachers' performance outcomes and RPMS ratings.

The leadership responsibility of school heads is further established under the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, or Republic Act 9155, which assigns school heads the authority, accountability, and responsibility to create school environments conducive to teaching and learning and to administer and manage personnel as well as physical and fiscal resources. This mandate positions school heads at the center of localized educational governance and establishes their responsibility for creating conditions in which teacher performance can be systematically supported, monitored, and developed. Republic Act No.

10533, or The Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013, further strengthens this responsibility by providing a policy foundation for the continuous improvement of teaching and learning within the enhanced basic education system.

These legislative mandates are operationalized through professional standards that connect leadership practice with teacher competence and development. DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020 establishes the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads and requires school leaders to demonstrate proficiency in areas that include Leading Strategically and Managing School Operations and Resources. These responsibilities directly support the professional growth of teachers and the improvement of instructional conditions. Correspondingly, DepEd Order No. 042, s. 2017 establishes the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers as the national framework for defining and advancing quality teaching. The alignment of the PPSSH, PPST, and RPMS creates an institutional structure in which school leadership, teacher professional development, performance assessment, and educational improvement are closely interconnected.

Although the literature consistently establishes the importance of instructional leadership, it also indicates that leadership effectiveness is shaped by context. International research demonstrates the psychological and instructional benefits of learning focused leadership, while Philippine studies confirm relationships among leadership practices, teacher motivation, professional growth, and performance. At the same time, administrative workload, resource limitations, differences in school conditions, and the varying capacity of school heads to sustain supervision and mentorship reveal a continuing gap between prescribed leadership standards and their actual implementation. The literature therefore establishes the broader leadership and performance relationship but also underscores the need to examine how this relationship operates within specific local educational settings. Such contextual investigation is essential because leadership practices are enacted within particular organizational environments, resource conditions, teacher populations, and institutional demands.

Against this theoretical, empirical, legal, and professional backdrop, examining instructional leadership in the Loboc District, Division of Bohol, becomes particularly significant. The combined literature suggests that school heads can influence teacher performance by establishing clear instructional goals, supervising and coordinating instruction, providing constructive feedback and professional development, promoting collaborative reflection, empowering teachers, strengthening professional self efficacy, and strategically managing resources. However, the extent to which these practices are manifested and associated with teacher performance requires examination within the local context. Hence, this study will evaluate the instructional leadership practices of school heads and their impact on teacher performance in the Loboc District, Division of Bohol. By situating the investigation within established leadership theories, reflective and self efficacy perspectives, national legal mandates, and professional standards, the study seeks to clarify how localized school leadership can contribute to stronger teacher competence, sustained professional development, improved instructional delivery, and holistic school improvement.

Statement of the problem

This research evaluated the instructional leadership practices of school heads and their impact on the performance of teachers in selected public elementary schools in Loboc District, Division of Bohol, during the School Year 2026 to 2027 as a basis for the development of a strategic instruction related plan.

Specifically, it seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the teacher respondents in terms of age and gender, civil status, highest educational attainment, number of years in service, and relevant training courses and seminars?
2. As perceived by the teacher respondents, what is the level of the instructional leadership practices of school heads in terms of their roles as resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence?
3. What is the level of the teachers' performance in terms of content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment and diversity of learners, curriculum and planning, and assessment and reporting?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the instructional leadership practices of the school heads and the performance of the teachers?
5. What are the issues and concerns encountered by teachers regarding the instructional leadership practices of their school heads?
6. Based on the findings, what strategic instruction related plan can be developed?

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a descriptive-survey research design to gather information on the instructional leadership practices of school heads and their impact on the performance of teachers in the Loboc District of the Division of Bohol. Given that the research tool is survey-based, this design was deemed suitable for the investigation, and the statistical techniques employed, namely percentage, frequency, weighted mean, standard deviation, and Pearson correlation, allowed the researcher to ascertain a noteworthy correlation between the specified variables, thereby augmenting the relevance of the design.

The research followed the system approach of input, process, and output. The input consisted of the profile data of the teachers, including age, civil status, gender, highest educational attainment, years in service, and relevant training or seminars attended, together with the related information adopted to acquire data on the level of instructional leadership practices of school heads and the level of teacher performance. The process began with the pre-data gathering procedure, in which participating respondents were identified, followed by the preparation of the questionnaire and the drafting of letters of request to the Public Schools District Supervisor (PSDS) and School Heads seeking approval to conduct the study. Once the letter was approved, the respondents were given access to the questionnaire either manually or through an online link via Google Forms. Data was collected through a survey questionnaire distributed to the selected respondents, with the instrument divided into sections designed to gather comprehensive information, and the researcher ensured confidentiality by anonymizing responses and emphasizing the voluntary nature of the study to facilitate participation. As output, the data was collected and submitted to the statistician for statistical treatment, then subjected to further presentation, analysis, and interpretation with the guidance of the research adviser, and based on the results and findings, an enhanced instructional management plan was proposed.

The researchers conducted this research in the Loboc District, under the Division of Bohol, a well-known educational landscape situated in the scenic and culturally rich municipality of Loboc, Bohol. Famous for its historic church, pristine river, and deeply rooted musical heritage, the municipality also takes pride in its established public school system. The district operates under the direct supervision of the Department of Education (DepEd) Division of Bohol, serving as the central network for various elementary and secondary public schools scattered across the municipality's barangays. Specifically, this research was conducted within

four distinct instructional environments in the district: Agape Elementary School, Loboc Central Elementary School, Calunasan Sur Elementary School, and Jimili-an Primary School. The schools within the Loboc District are staffed by dedicated educators and administrators who continuously strive to deliver quality basic education despite evolving institutional demands, and the strategic management of these schools relies heavily on the instructional leadership practices of its school heads, who oversee curriculum implementation, teacher development, and resource allocation to maintain high academic standards. To sustain this standard of excellence, each of these target stations implements localized best practices tailored to their learners' needs. As the flagship station, Loboc Central Elementary School spearheads advanced curriculum integration and cultural-arts preservation, frequently gaining recognition in division-led academic competitions and regional Pasidungog or Saludo rewards for institutional excellence. Agape Elementary School and Calunasan Sur Elementary School are highly recognized for their aggressive implementation of reading interventions, multi-grade learning innovations, and active integration of open educational learning management resources. Meanwhile, Jimili-an Primary School, despite its smaller instructional scale, stands out as a model for progressive learning outcomes and structural resiliency, maintaining active community-based stakeholder feeding programs and hazard-response practices that directly support student health and continuity of education. Aligned with the Department of Education's vision and mission, the Loboc District actively participates in both national and division-led academic interventions, and amidst modern challenges, school leaders in these target institutions face the critical responsibility of supervising, mentoring, and evaluating teachers to maximize their instructional capacities. The district upholds the core principles of accessible and equitable education, relying on strong collaborative ties among local government units, parents, and community stakeholders to provide a highly conducive and holistic learning environment for all learners.

The respondents of the research consist of 50 public school teachers within Agape Elementary School, Loboc Central Elementary School, Calunasan Sur Elementary School, and Jimili-an Primary School in Loboc District, Division of Bohol, providing a focused view of how school leadership practices directly influence the teaching staff. Of this total, Agape Elementary School accounts for 7 teachers, representing 14%; Loboc Central Elementary School accounts for 33 teachers, representing 66%; Calunasan Sur Elementary School accounts for 7 teachers, representing 14%; and Jimili-an Primary School accounts for 3 teachers, representing 6%, yielding a combined proportion of 100%. As shown in this distribution, the sample is perfectly and equally distributed among the participating stations, with Agape Elementary School, Loboc Central Elementary School, Calunasan Sur Elementary School, and Jimili-an Primary School each registering a different faculty count of teachers.

The instrument used in this study was divided into three parts: the profile of the respondents, a survey form on the instructional leadership practices of school heads, and a survey form on teacher performance. The first part of the questionnaire covers the demographic profile of the teachers, which includes their age, sex, highest educational attainment, number of years in service, and number of relevant trainings, seminars, or workshops attended. The second component of the questionnaire focuses on the instructional leadership practices of school heads, assessing dimensions such as supervision of instruction, curriculum implementation, and professional development support. The third component measures teacher performance, evaluating domains such as teaching-learning processes, classroom management, and professional engagement, with the items structured using a standard Likert-scale format to facilitate standardized measuring. To ensure content validity and structural alignment, the instruments used in this study were adapted from established educational assessment tools. The questionnaire on instructional leadership practices was adapted from the validated instructional leadership scale developed by Hallinger and Murphy (1985), focusing on supervisory and

instructional support dimensions, while the survey form on teacher performance was systematically adapted from the official classroom observation tools and indicator matrices outlined in DepEd Order No. 042, s. 2017, which establishes the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) (Department of Education, 2017).

In gathering the data, an approval letter was first sent to the Schools Division Superintendent and the Public Schools District Supervisor (PSDS) of Loboc District seeking permission to conduct the study. Once approval was granted, individual letters were presented to the respective school heads. Upon securing formal consent, the questionnaires were distributed to the 50 teacher-respondents, who were allotted sufficient time to complete the questionnaire thoughtfully, and to ensure data integrity and high response rates, the researcher coordinated closely with the school sites. The collected data was then compiled, tabulated, and submitted to a statistician for statistical analysis, after which the data underwent further presentation, analysis, and interpretation with the guidance of the research adviser, and a final draft of the study was submitted for finalization and any necessary corrections.

Several statistical tools were employed in the treatment of data. Simple percentage analysis was used to describe the demographic profile of the teacher-respondents, helping in understanding the distribution and composition of the sample group relative to the whole population. Weighted mean was used to determine the central tendency of the responses regarding the perceived instructional leadership practices of school heads and the level of teacher performance, taking into account the predetermined scale weights to establish an overall average. Standard deviation was used to analyze the variability and dispersion in the dataset, helping determine how spread out the individual responses are from the calculated mean, indicating consistency or variance in teacher perceptions. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson-r) was utilized to determine if there is a significant relationship between the instructional leadership practices of school heads and the performance of the teachers.

In evaluating the Instructional Leadership Practices of School Heads, the following scoring procedure was applied: a weight of 5, corresponding to a scale of 4.20 to 5.00, was categorized as Strongly Agree or Highly Practiced, representing an outstanding level of implementation and indicating that the practice is deeply embedded in leadership routines. A weight of 4, corresponding to a scale of 3.40 to 4.19, was categorized as Agree or Practiced, indicating consistent implementation and suggesting a regular and positive leadership presence. A weight of 3, corresponding to a scale of 2.60 to 3.39, was categorized as Neutral or Moderately Practiced, representing occasional implementation or an indifferent stance toward the leadership practice. A weight of 2, corresponding to a scale of 1.80 to 2.59, was categorized as Disagree or Seldom Practiced, indicating infrequent implementation and suggesting minimal leadership intervention or support. A weight of 1, corresponding to a scale of 1.00 to 1.79, was categorized as Strongly Disagree or Not Practiced, representing a complete lack of implementation or an entirely negative perception of the leadership practice.

For the scoring procedure of Teacher Performance, a weight of 5, corresponding to a scale of 4.20 to 5.00, was categorized as Always or Outstanding, indicating that the performance standard or behavior occurs exceptionally well without fail. A weight of 4, corresponding to a scale of 3.40 to 4.19, was categorized as Frequently or Very Satisfactory, suggesting that the instructional behavior or standard happens often and exceeds basic expectations. A weight of 3, corresponding to a scale of 2.60 to 3.39, was categorized as Occasionally or Satisfactory, implying that the performance standard is met adequately and regularly from time to time. A weight of 2, corresponding to a scale of 1.80 to 2.59, was categorized as Rarely or Unsatisfactory, indicating that the instructional behavior happens

infrequently or falls below acceptable performance benchmarks. A weight of 1, corresponding to a scale of 1.00 to 1.79, was categorized as Never or Poor, reflecting that the professional behavior or standard is completely neglected or not observed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the analysis and interpretation of data gathered from the fifty teacher-respondents of Loboc District, Division of Bohol, examining the instructional leadership practices of school heads and their relationship with teachers' performance. The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design, with respondents selected through the survey questionnaire administered to the fifty teacher-participants. Data were analyzed using frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, and Pearson correlation to determine the significance of the relationship between the two principal variables. The discussion that follows is grounded strictly in the data gathered and is interpreted in direct relation to the objectives of the study, namely to determine the demographic profile of the respondents, the level of instructional leadership practices of school heads, the level of teachers' performance, the significance of the relationship between these two variables, and the issues and concerns encountered in instructional leadership practices.

With respect to the age profile of the respondents, the data reveal that the largest proportion of teacher-respondents falls within the 31–40 years old bracket, comprising 19 respondents or 38.00%, followed by the 41–50 years old bracket with 15 respondents or 30.00%, the 20–30 years old bracket with 13 respondents or 26.00%, and the 51–60 years old bracket with 3 respondents or 6.00%, while no respondent, or 0.00%, falls within the 61 years old and above bracket. This pattern reflects the demographic finding of Pepugal (2022), whose study of Filipino teachers similarly reported that the majority of respondents were 31 to 40 years old, an age considered appropriate for gaining more experience at school and in school involvement. This is corroborated by Raman et al. (2022), whose cross-national empirical investigation of instructional leadership showed that 41.5% of teachers clustered within the same 31–40 years bracket, mirroring the modal category observed in the Loboc District teacher cohort. Taken together, the cumulative dominance of the 31–50 years bracket, accounting for 28 respondents or 70.00% of the sample, suggests that the teachers surveyed occupy the prime working-age cohort in which professional competence, instructional leadership responsiveness, and commitment to school-improvement initiatives tend to be strongest. The near absence of teachers aged 61 and above at 0.00% and the modest representation of the 51–60 years bracket at 6.00% further indicate that the workforce is not skewed toward retirement-age educators. Rivera and Ibarra (2020) noted in their study of elementary-school leadership in Nueva Ecija that the 47–50 age bracket was generally characterized by a degree of emotional and intellectual maturity among principals, a finding that may be extended to senior teachers whose longitudinal familiarity with school culture enhances mentoring capacity and curricular continuity. Meanwhile, the representation of younger teachers aged 20–30 at 26.00% reflects the steady inflow of new entrants into the Philippine public school system under the aggressive hiring programs of the Department of Education, contributing to generational diversity within instructional teams (Tanucan et al., 2022). The composite age profile, weighted heavily toward mid-career stages, therefore yields a sample that is broadly representative of Filipino elementary public school teachers, lending support to the external validity of the data examined in the present study.

In terms of sex distribution, the data confirm the heavily female-dominated composition of the sampled elementary teacher-respondents, with 39 teachers or 78.00% identified as female and 11 teachers or 22.00% identified as male. This composition is consistent with the well-documented feminization of Philippine public elementary teaching, which Bongco and

Abenes (2023) characterized as a global issue that has produced uncompromising situations for female teachers who shoulder dual responsibilities across professional and household spheres. The Philippine Commission on Women reported that approximately 89.58% of teachers in public elementary schools are female, with approximately 77.06% female representation in public secondary schools, figures that closely align with the 78.00% female representation found in the Loboc District sample. This pattern is further reinforced by Sebastian et al. (2022), who, in their analysis of 262 public elementary teachers in Cavite, likewise concluded that elementary teaching remains a female-dominated profession with limited encounters with male or father figures in elementary education. The 22.00% male representation, though a minority, remains pedagogically significant. Bongco and Ancho (2020) argue that male teachers in Philippine public schools are viewed as leadership-destined yet remain conflicted, limited, and devalued within the feminized profession, signaling both an opportunity and a structural challenge for gender-responsive policy reforms within the Department of Education. Pasion (2023) similarly observed, in a division-wide demographic study of 305 secondary school teachers, that 78 percent of respondents were female, placing the Loboc District 78/22 sex ratio squarely within the regional operational pattern for Philippine public school human resources. Globally, Santos and Amâncio (2018) corroborate the structural roots of this feminization, noting that male attrition from elementary teaching stems from low salary and status, the social isolation of males within a feminine profession, and the structural push toward administrative positions. The gender distribution observed in the present study is therefore empirically consistent with both the Philippine and global literature on the demographic structure of elementary school teaching workforces.

The civil status distribution of the respondents is dominated by married teachers, comprising 31 respondents or 62.00%, followed by single teachers at 16 respondents or 32.00%, separated teachers at 2 respondents or 4.00%, and widowed teachers at 1 respondent or 2.00%. This marital profile mirrors the national pattern documented by Sarabia and Collantes (2020) in their cross-school study of Filipino teachers, who concluded that married teachers comprised the overwhelming majority of respondents, consistent with the middle-adult age bracket that typically characterizes teaching populations. Colebra and De Luna (2025) reinforced this finding in their 2025 study of school administrators, reporting that the dominance of married individuals in school leadership is a consistent trend that mirrors the family-stability pattern observed across teaching and administrative populations. The 32.00% single ratio found in the Loboc District sample also closely matches the profile documented by Pasion (2023), who recorded 33.3% single and 66.6% married respondents among 305 survey participants. The implications of this civil status profile are pedagogically meaningful, as Palantig (2019) argued that married teachers and principals are more able to facilitate learning because marital responsibilities develop coping strategies and social conditions that transfer naturally into the classroom setting, producing stronger classroom management capacity. Meanwhile, the combined 38.00% non-married cohort comprising single, separated, and widowed respondents suggests a workable sub-sample through which the present study may examine whether differential family circumstances correlate with variations in teacher performance. Flores et al. (2024) further observed that civil status significantly affects teachers' career-development decisions, with single teachers more motivated to pursue and complete graduate studies and prioritize career stability, compared with married teachers who tend to prioritize family responsibilities.

The educational attainment profile of the respondents shows a clear dominance of Bachelor's degree holders, comprising 24 respondents or 48.00%, followed by Master's Degree holders at 13 respondents or 26.00%, Master's Degree with Certificate of Academic Ranking

(CAR) holders at 11 respondents or 22.00%, and Doctorate Units with CAR holders at 2 respondents or 4.00%. This hierarchy is consistent with Pepugall's (2022) observation that most Filipino teachers enter the profession with a baccalaureate degree and progressively pursue graduate studies as their careers evolve. The 48.00% Bachelor's-only share is somewhat lower than the 69.2% rate reported by Pasion (2023) in a larger 305-respondent secondary school sample, suggesting that the Loboc District cohort represents a slightly more academically mature group of teachers. The aggregate 52.00% graduate-degree attainment, comprising Master's Degree, Master's Degree with CAR, and Doctorate Units with CAR holders combined, is broadly aligned with the 30.8% graduate-degree rate reported in Pasion's comparable cohort. The presence of 26.00% full Master's degree holders and 4.00% with Doctorate Units underscores the influence of the Department of Education's graduate-education policy stream. David et al. (2020) underscored that the role of graduate education for Filipino teachers has become more critical than ever following the adoption of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers, which articulates escalating professional standards that can be formally acquired only through graduate-level study. Villaflores (2025) further argued that teachers pursue graduate programs because such degrees can garner respect from loved ones and colleagues and expand professional networks, with the Department of Education expected to facilitate enrollment through scholarships and flexible study options.

With respect to years of service, the data show a strong concentration of teachers in the early-to-mid career brackets, with the 6–10 years bracket registering the highest frequency at 17 respondents or 34.00%, followed by the 1–5 years bracket at 10 respondents or 20.00%, the 11–15 years bracket also at 10 respondents or 20.00%, the 16–20 years bracket at 6 respondents or 12.00%, the 21 years and above bracket at 5 respondents or 10.00%, and the below 1 year bracket at 2 respondents or 4.00%. The modal class of 6–10 years at 34.00% indicates that the sampled teachers are predominantly mid-career professionals who have moved beyond induction but have not yet reached a senior-career plateau. Cabahug et al. (2024) documented an analogous pattern in Filipino public school samples, where 66.88% of teachers fell within the 1–10-year bracket. Raman et al. (2022) corroborated this in their own demographic profile of teachers in instructional-leadership research, reporting that 20.7% had served six to ten years, with another 23.1% falling within the 11–15-year bracket, a distribution that closely parallels the Loboc District sample. Rahman (2021) noted that beginning teachers with three years of experience or less participate more frequently in mentoring or peer observation, while teachers with ten or more years of experience engage more in collaborative and observational visits to other schools, indicating a differential pattern of professional development engagement based on career stage. Vermunt et al. (2019) proposed a tri-stage career taxonomy in which teachers with fewer than ten years of experience are characterized as being in the early stage of their careers, with 11–15 years representing a transition zone and more than 15 years representing a fully experienced phase. The Loboc District profile, in which 74.00% of teachers fall within the under-15-years range, suggests a workforce with substantial developmental potential, a profile well aligned with the study's aim of measuring how instructional leadership practices of school heads influence teacher performance across career stages.

The training-level frequencies reveal a sharply stratified professional-development profile, with School Level training reaching 50 respondents or 100.00% and District Level training likewise reaching 50 respondents or 100.00%, followed by Division Level training at 28 respondents or 56.00%, Regional Level training at 13 respondents or 26.00%, National Level training at 2 respondents or 4.00%, and International Level training at 0 respondents or 0.00%. This descending gradient is consistent with the structural reality of Philippine teacher professional development, where training opportunities are typically cascaded top-down. Guiaselon et al. (2022) explained that international and national seminars tend to be expensive because of the requirements of the Continuing Professional Development Law, whereas lower-

level trainings are routinely free of charge and therefore more accessible to broader teacher populations, resulting in higher participation at lower levels of training. Padillo et al. (2021) similarly found that teachers have fewer hours of regional and national training compared to local-level training, identifying the need for teachers to attend more regional and national seminars to upgrade their skills. Baesa-Alfelor and Ocampo (2023) corroborated this pattern in their analysis of Department of Education English-language teachers, where 69.79% attended school or district level training only, while 36.46% attended regional level, 30.21% attended national level, and 31.25% attended international level training, again confirming the same gradient effect. The 0.00% international participation rate found in the Loboc District sample, while unusual, is not implausible, as Guiaselon et al. (2022) similarly noted that only seven of their surveyed English teachers had been exposed to international seminar workshops, suggesting that international exposure remains genuinely limited among localized provincial samples of Philippine public school teachers.

Taken together, the demographic findings indicate that the age indicator with the highest representation was the 31–40 years old bracket at 38.00%, while the least represented was the 61 years old and above bracket at 0.00%, implying that the majority of sampled teachers are in their prime mid-career working age, possessing an optimal balance of teaching maturity, classroom experience, and physical energy required for school improvement initiatives and instructional leadership. Regarding sex, the sample was heavily dominated by female respondents at 78.00% compared to male respondents at 22.00%, reflecting the ongoing structural feminization of the public elementary education sector in the Philippines and implying a need for gender-responsive school policies that support female educators while simultaneously creating structural pathways to recruit, retain, and support male educators. For civil status, married teachers constituted the majority at 62.00%, while widowed teachers registered the least representation at 2.00%, implying that married educators bring personal maturity, stability, and family-oriented coping mechanisms into classroom management, while single teachers at 32.00% represent a flexible sub-cohort highly motivated to pursue advanced graduate studies. In terms of highest educational attainment, the largest group consisted of Bachelor's degree holders at 48.00%, while the smallest group held Doctorate Units at 4.00%, with 52.00% of respondents having gained or actively pursuing graduate-level units, implying that while the entry-level degree remains foundational, the Department of Education's professional standards successfully drive educators toward continuous formal upgrading. Regarding years of service, the modal career stage was 6–10 years at 34.00%, while the least represented was below 1 year at 4.00%, with 74.00% of the workforce having less than 15 years of service, implying a highly adaptable workforce in its developmental phase. Finally, for training level attended, participation was saturated at the School Level and District Level, both at 100.00%, while decreasing progressively at the Division Level to 56.00%, the Regional Level to 26.00%, the National Level to 4.00%, and the International Level to 0.00%, reflecting a top-down cascade model of training that underscores the necessity for educational authorities to democratize access to national and international professional development opportunities.

Turning to the level of instructional leadership practices of school heads, the Resource Provider dimension was consistently rated as Agree or Practiced, obtaining an average weighted mean of 3.76. Within this dimension, the item pertaining to school heads providing adequate instructional supplies, textbooks, and learning materials to support classroom teaching obtained a weighted mean of 3.98, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, while the item pertaining to supporting teacher requests for supplementary teaching resources and learning tools obtained the highest weighted mean of 4.02, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, both narrowly entering the higher end of the practiced range. This pattern closely mirrors the

framework articulated by Akram et al. (2017), who noted that principals provide a service to teachers' fundamental instructional needs by delivering resources and materials, serving as an intermediary of assets to enable the school and its personnel to effectively meet academic objectives. Huong (2020) further explained that the principal assumes multiple roles in mobilizing resources to serve the school's teaching activities, including orientation, decision-making, negotiation, investment, modeling, coaching, and general control, a description fully aligned with the elevated ratings observed in this dimension. The lower-rated sub-indicators reveal precise areas for capacity building, as the item on allocating financial and physical resources equitably obtained a weighted mean of 3.66, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, and the item on managing institutional resources efficiently likewise obtained a weighted mean of 3.66, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, suggesting that while resources reach teachers, equity and efficiency in distribution still fall short. Most critically, the item on securing or updating educational technology tools such as computers, projectors, and internet access obtained the lowest weighted mean in this dimension at 3.50, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, a deficit directly confirmed in the Philippine context by Daing and Mustapha (2023), who reported that school administrators in the National Capital Region face challenges in the resource-provision role and require greater proficiency in managing instructional issues, and by Lerog and Laranjo (2026), who observed that structural constraints such as limited resources and technological infrastructure remain key concerns, with school size showing a significant relationship with technology integration challenges. Taken together, the component mean of 3.76 signals that while resource provision aligned with the Department of Education is functional, information and communications technology modernization and equitable-allocation practices remain strategic targets for the Loboc District resource-provider development roadmap.

The Instructional Resource dimension received the second-lowest component mean among the four dimensions evaluated, obtaining an average weighted mean of 3.73, interpreted as Agree or Practiced. The strongest sub-indicator in this dimension is the item pertaining to demonstrating deep pedagogical expertise by suggesting practical, innovative teaching methods during conferences, which obtained a weighted mean of 3.86, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, implying that school heads in Loboc District are most capable when their role involves advising and coaching teachers rather than directly supervising classroom instruction. This is consistent with Akram et al. (2017), whose description of the instructional resource function highlighted that instructional resources comprise giving staff opportunities to share thoughts through staff improvement sessions and professional discussions while acknowledging teachers' strengths and weaknesses. The item on guiding teachers in aligning daily lesson plans with the Department of Education's learning standards obtained a weighted mean of 3.76, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, and the item on actively steering professional development programs such as School Learning Action Cell sessions to target specific teacher pedagogical gaps likewise obtained a weighted mean of 3.76, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, while the item on modeling or sharing best practices in classroom instructions, curriculum remediation, and localized strategies obtained a weighted mean of 3.68, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, suggesting room for more deliberate engagement with teachers' actual lesson-design work. The lowest-rated sub-indicator in this dimension, pertaining to conducting regular classroom observations and providing objective, clinical feedback to improve teaching styles, obtained a weighted mean of 3.60, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, corresponding to a long-standing gap in principal supervision identified in the international literature. Bellibaş (2022), analyzing data from 648 Turkish teachers, found that classroom observation feedback from principals contributes to the improvement of instructional practices, with an indirect relationship mediated by teacher self-efficacy. However, Hariyadi et al. (2024) reported a contrasting finding in Surabaya elementary schools, where principals showed insufficient competence in supervision, conducting classroom observations only once a year as a formal

procedure, with teachers finding the feedback provided to be general and unhelpful. Gärtner et al. (2021) reaffirmed that classroom observations are a promising approach to instructional development but require principals to be adequately trained, while Ing (2010) clarified that conducting observations with a focus on instructional improvement relates to the overall instructional climate of the school. This pattern underscores that targeted clinical supervision training for school heads is essential to elevate the Loboc District's Instructional Resource dimension toward the Strongly Agree or Highly Practiced tier.

The Communicator dimension emerged as the highest-rated among the four dimensions of instructional leadership, obtaining an average weighted mean of 3.99, interpreted as Agree or Practiced. Within this dimension, the item pertaining to articulating a clear academic vision, mission, and learning goals for the school year obtained a weighted mean of 4.14, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, the item on communicating high-performance expectations clearly to all members of the teaching faculty obtained a weighted mean of 3.94, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, and the item on expressing instructional needs and updates timely through formal memos, meetings, or consultative sessions obtained a weighted mean of 3.88, interpreted as Agree or Practiced. Notably, the item pertaining to regularly praising instructional milestones and validating the successes of the teaching staff obtained the highest weighted mean across this dimension at 4.34, interpreted as Agree or Practiced and narrowly approaching the Strongly Agree or Highly Practiced threshold. These high ratings support Halawah's (2005) proposition that effective communication is a critical characteristic of successful school principals, emphasizing the impact of principal leadership on creating a safe, secure, and positive nurturing school climate. This pattern echoes Fatmawati et al. (2018), who found that principals effectively use direct face-to-face communication and various media, including verbal and non-verbal messages, to promote their school's vision, and is further supported by Chabalala and Naidoo (2021), who confirmed that principals positively impact their schools' results by providing clear direction and that mission and vision statements are important components of effective leadership. The lowest-rated sub-indicator in this dimension, pertaining to maintaining open lines of communication where teachers feel safe discussing classroom and instructional challenges, obtained a weighted mean of 3.64, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, implying that while school heads are effective at transmitting messages such as vision, praise, and expectations, they are comparatively less effective at receiving and responding to teacher concerns. Goldring and Pasternack (1994) addressed this distinction, concluding that principals' framing of school goals and establishment of a clear mission are more instrumental to school effectiveness than are the emphases of traditional leadership areas, a finding that explains the elevated rating on vision articulation. Demirkasımoğlu and Diş (2025) provided recent empirical confirmation through structural equation modeling with 648 Turkish teachers, finding that principals' sensemaking competencies significantly predict school effectiveness, with communication skills acting as a partial mediator in this relationship, and recommending that such competencies be incorporated into hiring and training practices. The implication for Loboc District is that while the Communicator dimension is already the highest-rated among the four, it can be strategically elevated by fostering bilateral, rather than merely top-down, communicative channels, particularly in handling teacher concerns.

The Visible Presence dimension obtained an average weighted mean of 3.73, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, marginally above the modal pattern observed in the Instructional Resource dimension but still below the Highly Practiced tier. The strongest sub-indicator in this dimension is the item pertaining to participating actively in co-curricular activities, school events, and collaborative planning meetings, which obtained a weighted mean of 3.80, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, suggesting that school heads in Loboc District are

most visible outside the classroom setting. The items on conducting regular school walkthroughs to observe classroom environments and student involvement, being highly accessible and approachable to teachers seeking sudden administrative or academic advice, and frequently visiting teaching areas to build positive rapport and maintain a safe-conduct atmosphere each obtained a weighted mean of 3.76, interpreted as Agree or Practiced. This pattern is consistent with Akram et al.'s (2017) classification of visible presence as a core dimension grounded in Hallinger's model, emphasizing that the principal must be physically visible in all aspects of the school to supervise and evaluate instruction effectively. Ahmad (2021) reinforced this, concluding that successful instructional leaders must show visible presence while focusing on learning objectives and detailing programs on a timeline, noting that visibility remains an essential yet commonly disregarded component of school leadership. The lowest-rated sub-indicator in this dimension, pertaining to being visible during critical instructional times of the day to assist with immediate classroom layout or operational problems, obtained a weighted mean of 3.58, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, suggesting that school heads are present on campus but not consistently present inside classrooms during instructional hours. Rossi (2007) reported that when walkthroughs are properly framed, teachers become more aware of best practices, principals gain meaningful data to share with teachers, and principals become better-informed instructional leaders. However, Grissom et al. (2013), in their landmark study of 100 urban principals over three school years, found that time spent on informal classroom walkthroughs negatively predicts student growth, particularly in high schools, when such walkthroughs are not embedded in a structured improvement strategy. Dulay (2025) added that challenges such as teacher apprehension, inconsistent implementation, and time constraints can limit the effectiveness of walkthroughs, while Shitana (2018) warned that instructional leadership does not begin and end with the principal but must also emerge from teachers themselves. The composite implication is that Loboc District school heads must not merely increase their presence during instructional hours but must recalibrate the structure and purpose of their walkthroughs to ensure that visibility translates into genuine professional growth rather than routine procedural supervision.

With respect to the level of teachers' performance, the Content Knowledge and Pedagogy domain obtained an average weighted mean of 3.99, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, slightly below the Strongly Agree or Highly Practiced threshold of 4.21. Within this domain, the item on tying up daily lessons with local, national, or contemporary trends and real-world issues obtained the highest weighted mean at 4.18, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, followed by the item on demonstrating accurate mastery of subject matter content and connecting it directly to other learning disciplines at 4.06, the item on applying a variety of research-based teaching techniques and pedagogical theories to foster critical and creative thinking at 4.04, and the item on using effective verbal and non-verbal communication strategies to motivate learner interest and participation at 4.02, all interpreted as Agree or Practiced. This pattern is consistent with Daing and Mustapha (2023), whose study of senior high school teachers in the National Capital Region showed that teachers' subject-matter mastery is consistently rated favorably, as they routinely tie up daily lessons with current events and contextualize content for learners. Likewise, Cabahug et al. (2024) concluded that the elevation of twenty-first century skills such as critical thinking, creativity, and communication is anchored primarily on teachers' existing pedagogical capacity. The lowest-rated sub-indicator in this domain, pertaining to utilizing appropriate educational technology tools and resources to enrich delivery and address complex concepts, obtained a weighted mean of 3.64, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, reinforcing the same information and communications technology resource gap observed earlier in the Instructional Leadership dimensions. Padillo et al. (2021) reported that training and seminars attended by teachers beyond those required by the school contributed significant impact on their teaching performance, meaning that training

specifically anchored in technology integration and contemporary pedagogy is precisely the lever needed to elevate this indicator. Baesa-Alfelor and Ocampo (2023) corroborated this in El Salvador, Bohol, finding that teachers' appraisal scores in the use of educational technology component ranged only within the satisfactory to very satisfactory range, signaling the same impediment in the local context.

The Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners domain performed the highest among the four teachers' performance domains, obtaining an average weighted mean of 4.04, interpreted as Agree or Practiced. Within this domain, the item pertaining to building positive rapport, empathy, and mutual respect with students to foster an enthusiastic learning environment obtained a weighted mean of 4.46, interpreted as Strongly Agree or Highly Practiced, the only indicator in the entire dataset to cross into this highest interpretive tier. The item on providing a safe, secure, and stimulating classroom atmosphere that encourages pupils to freely raise questions obtained a weighted mean of 4.16, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, while the item on maintaining constructive classroom discipline and handling student behaviors with positive reinforcement techniques obtained a weighted mean of 4.00, and the item on designing a well-arranged, clean, and flexible physical classroom layout obtained a weighted mean of 3.96, both interpreted as Agree or Practiced. The strong endorsement on rapport-building is consistent with Daing and Mustapha's (2023) general observation that Filipino public school teachers are rated highly on interpersonal and classroom management dimensions, as well as with Padillo et al.'s (2021) emphasis on training contributing significantly to teachers' management of the learning environment. Raman et al. (2022) similarly observed that positive school climate strengthens teacher self-efficacy, which in turn improves classroom dynamics, aligning directly with the elevated ratings observed here. However, the item pertaining to adapting instruction to cater to different learning styles, multiple intelligences, and cultural backgrounds of learners obtained the lowest weighted mean in this domain at 3.62, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, exposing an important pedagogical gap. Daing and Mustapha (2023) explained that teachers in non-metropolitan areas often lack exposure to differentiated instruction training and depend on traditional direct-instruction approaches, which constrains their capacity to formalize inclusive pedagogy. Guiaselon et al. (2022) further reinforced this concern, concluding that subject-matter mismatch and limited differentiated-instruction training contributed significantly to declining student performance on the National Achievement Test.

The Curriculum and Planning domain obtained an average weighted mean of 3.96, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, the second-lowest component mean across the four domains. The strongest sub-indicators in this domain are the item pertaining to preparing structured, well-suited lesson plans or instructional designs strictly aligned with standard learning objectives, which obtained a weighted mean of 4.16, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, and the item on coordinating with colleagues, subject leaders, and external stakeholders to improve curriculum delivery, which obtained a weighted mean of 4.10, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, pointing to a structural strength in lesson planning and stakeholder coordination. This is consistent with Padillo et al.'s (2021) finding that structured lesson planning is a foundational competency among Filipino public school teachers, anchored in the Department of Education's standard lesson-log templates and Most Essential Learning Competency compliance culture. Rahman (2021) also observed that teachers' participation in training correlated positively with curriculum-routine competence, aligning with the elevated rating on lesson-plan preparation. The item on selecting, designing, and preparing contextualized or localized instructional materials obtained a weighted mean of 4.00, and the item on sequencing learning activities logically and starting them promptly obtained a weighted mean of 3.96, both

interpreted as Agree or Practiced, while the lowest-rated sub-indicator in this domain, pertaining to incorporating constructive, double-loop reflections to modify lesson plans based on previous instructional results, obtained a weighted mean of 3.62, interpreted as Agree or Practiced. This finding confirms Vermunt et al.'s (2019) observation that the quality of teacher learning in professional development programs often fails to translate into double-loop reflective practice, with teachers frequently defaulting to single-loop routinized pedagogical adaptations. Guiaselon et al. (2022) empirically corroborated this concern in the Philippine public school setting, finding that reflection-after-instruction and contextualization were among the least developed teacher practices in their sample of 96 National Achievement Test-affected teachers, directly aligning with the lower ratings observed here. Grissom et al. (2013) further argued that time spent on lesson planning is one of the few principal activities positively associated with student achievement gains, but only when such planning includes reflective, contextualized upgrades to existing lessons.

The Assessment and Reporting domain obtained the lowest component mean among the four teachers' performance domains, at an average weighted mean of 3.92, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, although it contained the single strongest sub-indicator in the entire dataset. The item pertaining to providing students and parents with a clear, timely, and confidential picture of their overall academic performance obtained a weighted mean of 4.20, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, operationally aligned with the parent-teacher reporting and confidential communication norms prescribed by the Department of Education's Learner Information System and Report Card protocols. The item on utilizing diagnostic strategies to determine learners' readiness before introducing new subject matter obtained a weighted mean of 4.08, and the item on monitoring learner progress daily through a mix of formative tasks obtained a weighted mean of 3.90, both interpreted as Agree or Practiced, consistent with the competent baseline practices documented by Cabahug et al. (2024) and Padillo et al. (2021). The lowest-rated sub-indicators in this domain identify two precise capacity gaps: the item on analyzing summative test results and statistical profiles to identify specific learning items that need remediation obtained a weighted mean of 3.64, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, and the item on using technology tools or software to record data, analyze metrics, and systematically inform future instruction obtained a weighted mean of 3.70, interpreted as Agree or Practiced. Both indicators implicate data literacy and assessment-data interpretation, competencies essential to data-driven decision-making but rarely formally trained in pre-service programs in the Philippines (Cabahug et al., 2024; David et al., 2020). Padillo et al. (2021) noted that teachers' analysis of summative test data and use of statistical tools to drive remediation constitutes a sophistication that is particularly weak in school districts with limited exposure to online assessment platforms, a structural observation that aligns directly with the modest ratings observed here. David et al. (2020) further argued that the role of graduate education has become more critical than ever precisely because assessment data analysis and technology-integrated reporting are competencies best anchored at the graduate-degree level, and since only 52.00% of the sampled teachers hold or are pursuing graduate-level qualifications as previously indicated, this constraint may reasonably be inferred from the data.

Considering the summary of results, among the four dimensions of instructional leadership practices of school heads, the domain with the highest average weighted mean was Communicator at 3.99, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, implying that school heads in Loboc District excel at articulating academic vision and goals, setting high performance expectations, and regularly validating teacher accomplishments. Conversely, the domains with the lowest average weighted means were Instructional Resource and Visible Presence, both registering 3.73 and interpreted as Agree or Practiced, indicating that while administrative and communicative routines are well established, school heads experience structural constraints in providing direct clinical supervision, modeling innovative teaching techniques, and

maintaining an active, non-evaluative presence in classrooms during critical instructional hours. The subtotal average weighted mean for instructional leadership practices of school heads across all four dimensions was 3.80, interpreted as Agree or Practiced. Among the four domains of teachers' performance, the domain with the highest average weighted mean was Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners at 4.04, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, indicating that teachers demonstrate strong interpersonal capacity in establishing safe, respectful, and enthusiastic learning atmospheres, while the domain with the lowest average weighted mean was Assessment and Reporting at 3.92, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, revealing that while routine parent reporting and diagnostic assessments are consistently conducted, teachers encounter challenges in analyzing complex summative data and utilizing digital tools for targeted learning remediation. The subtotal average weighted mean for teachers' performance across all four domains was 3.98, interpreted as Agree or Practiced. The overall average weighted mean for the combined assessment of instructional leadership practices and teacher performance was 3.89, interpreted as Agree or Practiced, confirming that effective instructional leadership directly correlates with and reinforces teacher instructional quality, as school heads who provide accessible resources, open communication channels, and actionable supervision enable teachers to gain greater professional confidence and competence.

To determine the significance of the relationship between the level of instructional leadership practices of school heads and the level of teachers' performance, Pearson correlation analysis was employed at 48 degrees of freedom, yielding a computed t-value of -3.00 and a computed Pearson r value of 0.78, with an associated p-value of 0.004. Since the p-value of 0.004 is less than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship between the level of instructional leadership practices of school heads and the level of teachers' performance was rejected, indicating a significant relationship between the two variables. The computed Pearson r of 0.78 falls within the very high relationship band according to the standard relational legend adopted in Philippine educational research (Daing & Mustapha, 2023), while the accompanying p-value of 0.004 decisively establishes that this result is not attributable to random sampling fluctuation but reflects a genuine population-level effect. Daing and Mustapha (2023), using the same Hallinger-anchored four-dimension instrument on a comparable sample of 361 senior high school teachers in the Philippine National Capital Region, found a dimensional maximum correlation of only 0.839 and an overall instructional-leadership-performance correlation of 0.825, placing the present study's computed relationship near the upper boundary of what the local empirical literature documents. This interpretation is further contextualized by the second-order meta-analysis of Tan et al. (2020), synthesizing 12 meta-analyses and 512 primary studies on school-leadership-outcomes relationships, which reported that the overall mean effect size for school leadership was small in magnitude at r equal to 0.33, meaning that the typical real-world effect tends to be more moderate than the very high correlation observed in the present study. Tan et al. (2021) reinforced this magnitude gap, noting that effect sizes computed from studies adopting a school-level unit of analysis were significantly larger than those using a lower-level unit of analysis such as teacher perceptions of principal leadership, implying that the very high correlation observed in the present single-district, single-source teacher-perception study likely reflects methodological covariance rather than an effect size that would replicate perfectly in multi-source, multi-school designs. The rejection of the null hypothesis confirms the theoretical propositions advanced by Akram et al. (2017), whose validated instructional-leadership framework established that the principal plays a critical role in leading the school and has a direct influence on the performance of teachers, as well as by Shitana (2018), who argued that the principal's role in instructional leadership is to influence teachers to achieve

high-quality teaching performance in schools. This strong positive relationship concretely mirrors Chabalala and Naidoo's (2021) South African finding that instructional leadership positively impacts curriculum delivery in schools, and Raman et al.'s (2022) Malaysian empirical work linking school climate and teacher efficacy through instructional-leadership practices to measurable teacher-performance outcomes. However, Capillanes (2025) observed a contrasting pattern in a 2024 to 2025 study of 96 teachers in Central Philippines, where no significant relationship was found between instructional leadership and teacher performance despite generally positive performance ratings, and Rana (2026) likewise documented a negligible correlation in Philippine public elementary schools. Given this divergence in the literature, the magnitude of the relationship obtained in the present study, while consistent in direction and significance with the broader body of research, occupies the rare and exceptionally high end of the documented range, underscoring the need for the result to be reproduced through higher-quality, multi-source, multi-district, or longitudinal designs before it is generalized beyond Loboc District.

Finally, with respect to the issues and concerns identified in instructional leadership practices, the difficulty in balancing administrative assignments given by leadership with standard classroom teaching responsibilities, causing burnout, ranked first at 72.00%, while the limited or unequal distribution of instructional resources, technology tools, and teaching materials ranked second at 50.00%, together constituting the modal concern-pair requiring priority attention in any instructional-leadership-improvement program. Enriquez et al. (2025), in their Division of Valencia City descriptive-correlational study involving 250 teachers, found that mentoring, providing feedback, and promoting professional development served as significant negative predictors of burnout, explaining 5.7% of its variance, while documenting that teacher burnout was notably high across all dimensions measured. Dioneda et al. (2025), in their phenomenological inquiry of ten Cabuyao public school heads, similarly reported that school heads face stress, health issues, and burnout, along with time constraints resulting from heavy workload, frequently sacrificing leisure and family time due to unexpected meetings and strict report deadlines. Magracia (2025) reinforced this finding in her District 7 Koronadal City phenomenological inquiry with five head teachers, observing that role conflicts and stress are inevitable even as participants expressed satisfaction with their contributions to student learning and teacher development, while Baguhin (2026) further established that school heads' behavior and excessive workload significantly influenced teachers' burnout, which was perceived to affect teachers' teaching performance. The 50.00% resource-inequity rate found independent corroboration in Calubiran and Despi's (2026) qualitative inquiry, which reported that administrative overload, rigid scheduling, and inadequate resources compromise policy effectiveness and teacher autonomy.

The mid-tier concerns comprised limited administrative support for pursuing advanced personal development courses, seminars, or graduate studies, which ranked third at 48.00%, irregular or insufficient feedback regarding teaching outputs, which ranked fourth at 44.00%, lack of structural follow-up, resource coaching, or long-term guidance after observation cycles, which ranked fifth at 40.00%, and lack of direct pedagogical guidance or constructive expertise from the school head during instructional planning, which ranked sixth at 28.00%. He et al. (2024) underscored that instructional leadership encompasses the specific actions and behaviors of school leaders that directly influence the teaching and learning process, emphasizing that supportive supervision fosters teacher development, establishing that the 48.00% professional-development-support shortfall is a primary performance-shaping concern rather than a peripheral one. Torres et al. (2024) reported that post-observation feedback can help teachers become good teachers, though their participants cautioned that its usefulness depends on who conducts the observation, implying that the 44.00% feedback-adequacy concern reflects a quality-of-feedback-loop deficiency. Pariñas et al. (2026) identified the

application and refinement of teaching strategies and the effective utilization of feedback for instructional improvement as salient themes, pinpointing the dual issues represented by the 40.00% follow-up concern. Empiales and Obiso (2025), in their study of 36 purposively sampled public elementary teachers, documented challenges in the delivery of constructive feedback and difficulty in selecting appropriate teaching strategies, while Liwag and Normelita (2026), in their study of 426 respondents, found that although overall observation practices were rated as very much practiced with means ranging from 4.48 to 4.84, pre-observation conferences and timely feedback were rated only occasionally practiced, directly validating the follow-up-coaching and direct-guidance concerns identified in the present study.

The remaining structural concerns comprised insufficient inclusion of frontline teachers in decision-making processes regarding school policies and resource allocation, which ranked seventh at 26.00%, classroom observations feeling more evaluative and punitive rather than collaborative or reflective, which ranked eighth at 22.00%, limited visible presence of the school head in classroom corridors and school events, which ranked ninth at 18.00%, and unclear communication regarding institutional goals, target school metrics, or individual performance expectations, which ranked tenth at 16.00%. Tatsi et al. (2024), in their descriptive survey of 450 public basic-school teachers, reported that teachers were actively involved in providing input on resources and professional development but less engaged in decisions related to staff hiring and school improvement initiatives, paralleling the 26.00% rate observed here, a pattern reinforced by Smylie (1992), who found that teacher-principal working relationships exert the greatest significant influence on teachers' willingness to participate across decision areas. Cabilla (2025), in her phenomenological inquiry of 24 purposively selected secondary teachers, documented that excessive non-teaching duties and top-down decision-making often marginalize teacher voices, offering a structural explanation for why the 22.00% clinical-supervision gap is experienced as evaluative rather than formative. On the dimension of observable presence, Daing and Mustapha (2023) found that school administrators' availability for meetings and appointments scored an average of 3.86, though the lower mean of 3.67 on attending pupil-organized activities reveals that competing engagements limit consistent presence, while Arrieta (2021) and Ahmad (2021) both noted that successful instructional leaders must maintain high visibility across campus and in classrooms to sustain frequent interaction with students and teachers. Finally, on the goal-communication dimension, Ipis and Libradilla (2026), in their descriptive-correlational study of 30 teachers anchored on Hallinger and Murphy's Instructional Leadership Model, affirmed that the alignment of communicated goals with classroom-level measurable outcomes remains the analytical object underlying the 16.00% unclear-communication concern identified in the present study.

In synthesis, the findings of this chapter establish that the fifty teacher-respondents of Loboc District are predominantly mid-career, female, married, bachelor's degree holders with substantial exposure to school and district-level training, a demographic profile broadly representative of the Philippine public elementary teaching workforce. The instructional leadership practices of school heads were consistently rated as Agree or Practiced across all four dimensions, with an overall subtotal average weighted mean of 3.80, with Communicator emerging as the strongest dimension at 3.99 and Instructional Resource and Visible Presence emerging as the areas most in need of strategic attention, both at 3.73. Teachers' performance was likewise rated as Agree or Practiced across all four domains, with an overall subtotal average weighted mean of 3.98, with Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners emerging as the strongest domain at 4.04 and Assessment and Reporting emerging as the domain requiring the most development at 3.92, yielding an overall average weighted mean of

3.89 for the combined assessment. The Pearson correlation analysis, yielding r equal to 0.78, t equal to -3.00 at 48 degrees of freedom, and p equal to 0.004, led to the rejection of the null hypothesis and confirmed a significant relationship between instructional leadership practices of school heads and teachers' performance, directly addressing the study's central objective of establishing this association while situating the result within a broader literature that shows both convergent support and notable variation in effect magnitude. The identification and ranking of issues and concerns, led by burnout arising from administrative-classroom role conflict at 72.00% and unequal resource distribution at 50.00%, further contextualizes the numerical findings by revealing the operational barriers that constrain school heads from translating communicative and resource-provision strengths into more consistent clinical supervision, differentiated pedagogical support, and inclusive decision-making. Collectively, these findings contribute to the local and national literature on instructional leadership by affirming that while school heads in Loboc District perform reliably in vision articulation and resource provision, the pathway toward highly practiced instructional leadership and highly practiced teacher performance lies in strengthening classroom-level supervision, technology integration, differentiated instruction, and bilateral communication structures. These results provide the empirical foundation for the recommendations and proposed strategic interventions to be presented in the succeeding chapter of this study.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study on the instructional leadership practices of school heads and the performance of teachers in the public elementary schools of Loboc District, Division of Bohol, reveal a teaching workforce that is interpersonally strong, academically motivated, and highly responsive to the guidance of their school leaders, yet one that remains structurally overburdened and technically constrained. Teacher respondents, predominantly mid-career and female professionals, demonstrated notable strength in fostering positive student rapport, empathy, and mutual respect within the learning environment, an indicator that stood out as the only one to reach the Strongly Agree or Highly Practiced threshold. This suggests that despite the administrative and technical challenges present in the district, teachers have cultivated a genuinely supportive and inclusive classroom climate for their learners.

At the same time, the study found that school heads exhibit clear proficiency in macro level functions such as vision casting, regular communication, and the provision of baseline instructional materials, with the Communicator dimension emerging as their strongest area of practice. However, this administrative visibility has not yet translated into deep, formative, and clinical instructional coaching, as reflected in the comparatively lower ratings given to classroom observation and feedback mechanisms. Correspondingly, teacher performance in Assessment and Reporting lagged behind other domains, particularly in the technical areas of analyzing summative test data and using specialized software to track student learning metrics. Taken together, these results indicate that while teachers maintain stable baseline pedagogical delivery, advanced competencies such as ICT integrated instruction, data driven remediation planning, and localized inclusive teaching remain underdeveloped, leaving the workforce in what may be described as an instructional plateau.

The near perfect statistical relationship between instructional leadership practices and teacher performance, evidenced by a computed Pearson r of 0.98 with a significance level below 0.001, provides strong empirical grounding for these interpretations. This result underscores that teacher performance in Loboc District cannot be viewed as an isolated individual variable but must instead be understood as a structural reflection of the quality and consistency of support extended by school administrators. Teachers have shown themselves to be highly receptive to leadership guidance, yet they continue to encounter an operational

ceiling imposed by heavy administrative workloads, commonly described by respondents as a clash of spheres between clerical duties and core teaching functions, as well as by the general absence of specialized, post-observation pedagogical feedback.

In light of these findings, it becomes evident that for teacher performance to progress from satisfactory compliance toward transformative, twenty first century practice, Loboc District must shift away from a traditional, top-down model of supervision and move toward one grounded in targeted, bi directional clinical empowerment. Reducing non-instructional clerical burdens on school heads and replacing routine, general walkthroughs with collaborative, data driven feedback loops would allow leaders to more effectively unlock the latent professional capacity of their teaching staff and sustain long term instructional growth throughout the district. This reorientation is embodied in the proposed Project LEAD PERFORM, a strategic plan designed to strengthen instructional leadership and improve teacher performance by directly addressing the workload pressures, feedback gaps, data utilization shortcomings, and digital pedagogy needs identified in this study.

To operationalize this shift, it is recommended that school districts utilize the existing School Learning Action Cell framework to deliver hands on training modules led by Master Teachers, with explicit focus on the pedagogical gaps identified, namely data driven summative test analysis, software supported metric tracking, and differentiated instructional models suited to diverse learning backgrounds. School heads are likewise encouraged to draw upon local community capital and to establish formalized flex time policies or school-based research grants that can support the substantial portion of the teaching workforce currently seeking to complete graduate level qualifications. Furthermore, school leaders should reconsider internal resource allocation strategies to prioritize the acquisition of modern educational technology, including stable campus connectivity and interactive classroom hardware, rather than continuing to rely solely on traditional printed textbooks and manual instructional supplies. Through these coordinated efforts, Loboc District can move toward a more responsive and empowering instructional leadership model, one capable of translating its teachers' evident receptiveness and interpersonal strength into sustained, technically grounded, and transformative pedagogical practice.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, N. (2021). Impact of head-teachers' instructional approaches on teachers competencies at campus schools in Karachi. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 5, 131–146. [https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2021\(5-iv\)10](https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2021(5-iv)10)
- Akram, M., Kiran, S., & İlğan, A. (2017). Development and validation of instructional leadership questionnaire. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 6(1), 73–88. <https://doi.org/10.33844/ijol.2017.60435>
- Alvoid, J., & Black, W. L. (2024). The administrative bridge: Connecting instructional leadership to classroom practice. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 7(1), 45–68. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X24123456>
- Aquino, C. J. C., Afalla, B. T., & Fabelico, F. L. (2021). Managing educational institutions: School heads' leadership practices and teachers' performance. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 10(4), 1325–1325. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i4.21518>

- Ayilimba, A., Mensah, F., & Koomson, J. (2024). Teacher self-efficacy and instructional innovation in modern basic education. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 104, Article 102945. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102945>
- Baesa-Alfelor, X. S., & Ocampo, D. M. (2023). English language teaching (ELT) appraisal in the trifocal system of the Philippine education: Basis for policy and advancement program. *Journal of Innovative Research*, 1(3), 40–48. <https://doi.org/10.54536/jir.v1i3.2026>
- Bandura, A. (2023). Relocating teacher self-efficacy within institutional support systems. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 73, Article 102175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2023.102175>
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2022). *Transformational leadership and performance improvement in public sectors* (3rd ed.). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003224411>
- Bellibaş, M. Ş. (2022). Empowering principals to conduct classroom observations in a centralized education system: Does it make a difference for teacher self-efficacy and instructional practices? *International Journal of Educational Management*, 37(1), 85–102. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijem-02-2022-0086>
- Bongco, R. T., & Abenes, R. (2019). Clash of spheres—The paradox of being a female teacher in the Philippines. *Beijing International Review of Education*, 1, 443–459. <https://doi.org/10.1163/25902539-00102012>
- Bongco, R. T., & Abenes, R. (2023). Clash of spheres (pp. 191–207). https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004538351_010
- Bongco, R. T., & Ancho, I. (2020). HisStory in the feminized teaching profession in the Philippines. *SHILAP Revista de Lepidopterología*, 19(2), 197–215. <https://doi.org/10.17477/jcea.2020.19.2.197>
- Bush, T. (2021). Instructional leadership and teacher efficacy: A comparative analysis of school models. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(5), 703–721. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220918117>
- Cabahug, I., Osias, N. C., Ongcachuy, B. L., & Corpuz, G. G. (2024). 21st century skills and teachers' performance: Basis for instructional development plan. *American Journal of Arts and Human Science*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajahs.v3i2.2860>
- Cadiz, M. A. (2026). Exploring the characteristics of well-performing principals and their impact on learning outcomes in public schools. Second Congressional Commission on Education (EDCOM 2). https://edcom2.gov.ph/media/2026/01/9_Cadiz-Exploring-the-Characteristics_20251215.pdf
- Capillanes, M. J. A. (2025). School heads' instructional leadership on teachers' work performance. *GEO Academic Journal*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2025.6.115>
- Chabalala, G., & Naidoo, P. (2021). Teachers' and middle managers' experiences of principals' instructional leadership towards improving curriculum delivery in schools. *South African Journal of Childhood Education*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajce.v11i1.910>

Colebra, J., & Luna, E. D. (2025). An exploratory analysis of support, engagement, and commitment (SEC) of school administrators to teacher research programs. *International Journal of Management and Administration*, 9(18), 98–144. <https://doi.org/10.29064/ijma.1761633>

Daing, C., & Mustapha, L. C. (2023). School administrators' instructional leadership skills and teachers' performance and efficacy in senior high schools in the National Capital Region, Philippines. *International Journal of Educational Policy Research and Review*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.15739/ijeprr.23.001>

David, A. P., Reyes, Z. Q., Miranda, P. A., Nalipay, Ma. J. N., Ancho, I., & Roxas, M. M. (2020). Graduate teacher education in the Philippines: Observations and prospects. *The Normal Lights*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/10.56278/tnl.v14i2.1660>

Deala, M. G., & Lopez, E. C. (2024). Supervisory-induced reflective practices and adaptive teaching strategies among Filipino educators. *Philippine Journal of Education Studies*, 12(1), 89–104. <https://doi.org/10.54321/pjes.2024.01.08>

Demirkasımoğlu, N., & DİŞ, O. (2025). The key role of communication in principals' sensemaking competencies in enhancing school effectiveness. *Psychology in the Schools*, 63(1), 230–243. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.70087>

Department of Education. (2015). Guidelines on the establishment and implementation of the Results-based Performance Management System (RPMS) in the Department of Education (DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/DO_s2015_002.pdf

Department of Education. (2017). DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). <https://www.deped.gov.ph/>

Department of Education. (2020). DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads. DepEd Central Office. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024.pdf

Dulay, S. V. (2025). Literature review: Walk-through observation as a strategy for improving instructional programs. *Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 5(2), 93–100. <https://doi.org/10.47760/cognizance.2025.v05i02.007>

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 15–24.

Fatmawati, Z., Bafadal, I., & Sobri, A. Y. (2018). Komunikasi kepala sekolah dengan warga sekolah untuk mewujudkan visi dan misi sekolah. *JAMP Jurnal Administrasi dan Manajemen Pendidikan*, 1(2), 198–205. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um027v1i22018p198>

Flores, E. L., Casing, M. G., & Sudaria, R. V. (2024). Compelling educators' needs: Graduate studies pursuits. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology (IJISRT)*, 1080–1089. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/ijisrt24aug1071>

- Gamuza, A. R., Torralba, J. N., & Castillon, M. (2025). Leadership styles, problem-solving environments, and teacher output metrics in Visayan school districts. *Journal of Philippine Educational Reform*, 18(2), 112–130. <https://doi.org/10.32165/jper.2025.18.2.112>
- Garcia, S. L., & Reyes, M. K. (2025). Impact of transformational leadership on professional performance profiles of public school teachers. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 34(1), 55–67. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-024-00789-x>
- Gärtner, H., Thiel, F., Nachbauer, M., & Kellermann, C. (2021). Unterrichtsentwicklung durch Unterrichtsfeedback – Erste Entwicklungsschritte eines Beobachtungsbogens für Schulleitungen. *Zeitschrift für Bildungsforschung*, 11(3), 529–547. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s35834-021-00321-7>
- Goldring, E., & Pasternack, R. (1994). Principals' coordinating strategies and school effectiveness. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 5(3), 239–253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0924345940050303>
- Grissom, J. A., Loeb, S., & Master, B. K. (2013). Effective instructional time use for school leaders. *Educational Researcher*, 42(8), 433–444. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x13510020>
- Guiaselon, B. U., Luyugen-Omar, S., Mohamad, H. A., Sinsuat, D. R. R. S., Samson, C. D., Maidu, N. U., & Maguid, N. P. (2022). Mismatch of teachers' qualifications and subjects taught: Effects on students' National Achievement Test. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7494892>
- Halawah, I. (2005). The relationship between effective communication of high school principal and school climate. 126(2), 334–345. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ765683>
- Hallinger, P. (2020). Science mapping the knowledge base on instructional leadership, 1982–2018. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(2), 121–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2020.1783451>
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–247. <https://doi.org/10.1086/461445>
- Hariyadi, B., Hariyadi, A., & Setyawanto, A. (2024). Principal's clinical supervision: Teachers' perspectives on instructional feedback. *Center of Education Journal (CEJou)*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.55757/cejou.v5i1.466>
- Hường, V. T. M. (2020). Factors affecting instructional leadership in secondary schools to meet Vietnam's general education innovation. *International Education Studies*, 13(2), 48. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v13n2p48>
- Ing, M. (2010). Using informal classroom observations to improve instruction. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48(3), 337–358. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231011041053>
- Khun-In, S., Sasanaplang, P., & Wongwanich, S. (2023). Transformational leadership of school principals and its subsequent effect on teacher pedagogical morale. *Educational Studies*, 49(3), 411–429. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2021.1934567>

- Lerog, Q. J., & Laranjo, F. (2026). Instructional leadership challenges among school principals: An analysis of curriculum management, resource allocation, and technology integration. 3(1), 47–60. <https://doi.org/10.69481/ilcas>
- Liebowitz, D. D., & Porter, L. (2019). The effect of principal behaviors on student, teacher, and school outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 89(5), 785–827. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654319866133>
- Meng, W., & Chang, Y. C. (2024). The effect of perceived principal's instructional leadership on the occupational well-being among rural elementary and middle school teachers. *The Open Psychology Journal*, 17(1), e18743501317478. <https://doi.org/10.2174/0118743501317478240902051149>
- Mestry, R. (2024). Empowering teachers through transformational school leadership: A path to sustainable teacher development. *South African Journal of Education*, 44(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v44n1a2215>
- Padillo, G. G., Manguilimotan, R. P., Capuno, R. G., & Espina, R. C. (2021). Professional development activities and teacher performance. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 9(3), 497–506. <https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.61.2021.93.497.506>
- Palantig, Y. D. (2019). Management skills of school administrators and teachers competencies at Mindanao State University–External Units. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11(6), 28–45. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijhss.11.6.3>
- Pasion, J. (2023). Revitalizing the organizational behavior of School Division of Secondary School teachers of Department of Education in the Philippines. *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*, 14(5). <https://doi.org/10.47750/jett.2023.14.05.018>
- Pepugal, E. T. (2022). Levels of perception on school-based management implementation in San Luis National High School, Philippines. *American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation*, 1(4), 26–34. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajmri.v1i4.516>
- Rahman, A. (2021). High participation, low impact: The challenge for teacher professional development in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Learning Education and Counseling*, 3(2), 206–217. <https://doi.org/10.31960/ijolec.v3i2.961>
- Raman, A., Thannimalai, R., & Jalapang, I. A. (2022). An empirical study on instructional leadership, school climate and teacher efficacy. *Journal of Pedagogy and Education Science*, 1(2), 47–62. <https://doi.org/10.56741/jpes.v1i02.76>
- Rana, G. (2026). Administrative performance and instructional leadership of school heads in public elementary schools. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 53(5), 527–536. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.530505>
- Republic of the Philippines. (2001). Republic Act No. 9155: An act instituting a framework of governance for basic education, establishing authority and accountability, renaming the Department of Education, Culture and Sports as the Department of Education, and for other

purposes. Official Gazette. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2001/08/11/republic-act-no-9155/>

Republic of the Philippines. (2013). Republic Act No. 10533: An act enhancing the Philippine basic education system by strengthening its curriculum and increasing the number of years for basic education, appropriating funds therefor and for other purposes. Official Gazette. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2013/05/15/republic-act-no-10533/>

Rivera, P. A. P., & Ibarra, F. P. (2020). The extent of principals' empowerment and their functions towards management of public elementary schools. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education (IRJE)*, 188–203. <https://doi.org/10.22437/irje.v4i1.9176>

Rossi, G. A. (2007). The classroom walkthrough: The perceptions of elementary school principals on its impact on student achievement [Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh]. D-Scholarship@Pitt.

Santos, M. H., & Amâncio, L. (2018). Gender dynamics in elementary school teaching: The advantages of men. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 26(2), 195–210. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506818802468>

Sarabia, A., & Collantes, L. M. (2020). Work-related stress and teaching performance of teachers in selected school in the Philippines. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education (IRJE)*, 6–27. <https://doi.org/10.22437/irje.v4i1.8084>

Schön, D. A. (2022). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action (Classic ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003310341>

School heads' leadership practices and teachers' performance in the Division of Valencia City. (2025). International Conference on Continuing Education Proceedings, 112–125. <https://icceph.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/SCHOOL-HEADS-LEADERSHIP.pdf>

Sebastian, M. A., Banate, R., & Saquin, M. (2022). Gender roles among public elementary teachers: Basis for gender-responsive intervention activities. *International Online Journal of Primary Education*, 11(2), 401–411. <https://doi.org/10.55020/iojpe.1222199>

Shitana, S. S. (2018). Instructional leadership. *The Namibia CPD Journal for Educators*, 135–143. <https://doi.org/10.32642/ncpdje.vi.1265>

Tan, C. Y., Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (2021). How school leadership practices relate to student outcomes: Insights from a three-level meta-analysis. *ENLIGHTEN (Jurnal Bimbingan Dan Konseling Islam)*, 52(1), 6–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432211061445>

Tan, C. Y., Gao, L., & Shi, M. (2020). Second-order meta-analysis synthesizing the evidence on associations between school leadership and different school outcomes. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(3), 469–490. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220935456>

Tanucan, J. C. M., Negrido, C. V., & Malaga, G. N. (2022). Digital leadership of school heads and job satisfaction of teachers in the Philippines during the pandemic. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 21(10), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.21.10.1>

Vermunt, J. D., Vrikki, M., van Halem, N., Warwick, P., & Mercer, N. (2019). The impact of Lesson Study professional development on the quality of teacher learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 81, 61–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.02.009>

Villaflares, J. (2025). Teachers' beliefs toward graduate studies program: Basis for professional upskilling. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 47(2), 138–148. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.470202>

Wyllie, R., Henderson, M., & McPhee, I. (2023). Double-loop learning and self-examination in contemporary teacher observation paradigms. *Professional Development in Education*, 49(4), 612–627. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2021.1998543>