

Shaping instructional leadership quality and teaching efficacy towards enhancement

Eden B. Mingo*

Cebu Technological University – Main Campus, Cebu City, Philippines

ABSTRACT

Strong instructional leadership promotes coherent teaching practices, collaboration among teachers, and continuous professional learning, all of which enhance teacher performance and instructional quality. This study determined the relationship between instructional leadership and teacher performance of Tabor Hill College OAD Inc, Purok 3 Brgy San Jose, Cebu City for the school year 2025-2026 as basis for an enhancement plan. The study was conducted at Tabor Hill College OAD Inc, Purok 3 Brgy San Jose, Cebu City with over 25 respondents. The questionnaire used in the study was adapted from Hyder (2022) and Akram (2017). The research design involved a descriptive-correlational research design. The study employed statistical tools such as the weighted mean, simple percentage, and Pearson product-moment. The study describes the respondents as mostly younger to mid-adult female teachers with bachelor's degrees, limited graduate education, early to mid-career experience, and participation mainly in school-based professional development activities. Findings on instructional leadership show that school heads consistently demonstrate strong practices across key areas, including providing instructional resources and maintaining visibility through classroom visits, supporting professional development via meetings, monitoring student attendance, giving feedback through progress reporting to parents, and promoting curriculum implementation through lesson planning. Teacher performance is generally high across all domains, particularly in the use of instructional materials, democratic classroom management, varied assessment strategies, and strong teacher–student relationships focused on character development. Staff collaboration is present but less consistently observed compared to other areas. Overall, the study reveals a significant positive relationship between instructional leadership practices of school heads and teacher performance, indicating that stronger leadership is associated with higher levels of teacher effectiveness. Based on these findings, the proposed enhancement plan is recommended for adoption to further strengthen instructional leadership and teacher performance of the teachers.

Keywords: Administration and supervision, instructional leadership, teaching efficacy, descriptive-correlational method, Cebu City, Philippines.

Date Submitted: September 11, 2026

Date Accepted: September 18, 2026

Date Published: October 7, 2026

*Corresponding author / Email: eden.mingo@gmail.com.ph

Recommended citation:

Mingo, E. B. (2026). Shaping instructional leadership quality and teaching efficacy towards enhancement. Pantao (International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences) 5 (4), 411-427.

INTRODUCTION

The quality of teaching and learning in schools remains a central concern of educational research and practice, particularly in contexts where student outcomes continue to lag behind expectations. Instructional leadership, which involves principals' deliberate actions to influence curriculum coordination, supervision, and professional development, has been identified as a critical driver of teaching effectiveness and professional growth among teachers (Azmi & Musa, 2025). Strong instructional leadership fosters coherent instructional practices, promotes collaboration among teaching staff, and supports ongoing professional learning elements that are essential in enhancing teacher performance and instructional quality. Given that school heads are pivotal in shaping the instructional environment, examining how their leadership practices relate to teacher performance appraisal contributes to improving educational outcomes at the school level.

Despite this importance, the linkage between instructional leadership and teacher performance appraisal is not fully understood in many school systems, including those in Philippine contexts where appraisal tools such as the Teachers' Performance Appraisal Scale (TPAS) or the Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES) are used to measure teaching effectiveness. Performance appraisal systems offer structured feedback, identify strengths and areas for growth, and can inform professional development priorities (Krisnasari & Imamah, 2024). Several authors emphasize the critical role of instructional leadership in enhancing teacher performance and fostering professional growth, highlighting that principals' leadership behaviors significantly shape instructional quality and teacher efficacy. Guo et al., (2024) argue that effective instructional leadership predicts teachers' engagement in professional development activities and positively influences classroom practices, while Azmi and Musa (2025) assert that leadership practices such as mentoring, supervision, and collaborative decision-making strengthen teacher performance outcomes and workplace satisfaction. Studies by Krisnasari and Imamah (2024) indicate that performance appraisal systems, when aligned with instructional leadership, provide actionable feedback that guides teachers' professional improvement and instructional effectiveness.

Although numerous studies have established the positive impact of instructional leadership on teacher performance (He et al., 2024), there remains a notable research gap in understanding how these leadership practices specifically interact with structured teacher performance appraisal systems such as the Teachers' Performance Appraisal Scale (TPAS) in the Philippine private school context. While previous investigations have examined instructional leadership in general or teacher appraisal in isolation, limited empirical evidence explores the direct relationship between principals' leadership behaviors and appraisal outcomes, particularly in rural or district-level schools where resource constraints and contextual factors may influence both leadership implementation and teacher responsiveness. This gap underscores the need for context-specific research that not only assesses the correlation between instructional leadership and appraisal scores but also identifies how leadership practices can be optimized to enhance the effectiveness of teacher performance appraisals, thereby informing targeted professional development interventions and evidence-based school management policies, particularly at Tabor Hill College OAD Inc, Purok 3 Brgy San Jose, Cebu City for the school year 2025-2026.

Finally, investigating this relationship in specific educational contexts such as private schools can offer localized evidence that informs policy and practice. Schools and districts seeking to strengthen teacher performance must understand not only the appraisal scores but also how leadership practices facilitate or hinder performance improvements. By exploring the relationship between instructional leadership and teacher performance appraisal, this study aims to provide data that can inform targeted enhancement plan that enhance instructional

quality, align leadership and appraisal practices, and support continuous teacher growth. The findings are expected to contribute to a body of literature that bridges leadership theory and practical appraisal systems, thereby guiding school leaders, policymakers, and education stakeholders in fostering effective teaching environments.

Statement of the problem

This study determined the relationship between instructional leadership and teacher performance at Tabor Hill College OAD Inc., Purok 3, Brgy. San Jose, Cebu City, during the school year 2025-2026, as a basis for developing an enhancement plan.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, gender, highest educational attainment, years in service, and relevant training, seminars, and workshops attended?
2. What is the level of instructional leadership of the school heads as perceived by the teacher respondents in terms of providing instructional resources and maintaining a visible presence, promoting professional development and maximizing instructional time, monitoring student progress, providing feedback on teaching and learning, and implementing the curriculum?
3. What is the level of teacher performance based on the Teachers' Performance Appraisal Scale (TPAS) in terms of teaching and learning, classroom management, assessment, teacher-student relationships, and staff collaboration?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the level of instructional leadership of the school heads and the level of teacher performance?
5. Based on the findings of the study, what enhancement plan may be proposed?

METHODOLOGY

The study employed the descriptive-correlational method, which was best suited to a descriptive type of research since the data gathered were presented in tables. This method used an adopted questionnaire for the respondents to answer in terms of their profiles, the level of instructional leadership dimensions of the school heads as perceived by the teacher-respondents, the level of teacher performance based on the Teachers' Performance Appraisal Scale (TPAS), and the significant relationship between the level of instructional leadership of the school heads and the level of teacher performance appraisal.

The research followed a system model employing the input, process, and output approaches, as illustrated in Figure 2, which presents the flow of the study. The input contained the profiles, the level of instructional leadership dimensions of the school heads as perceived by the teacher-respondents, the level of teacher performance based on the TPAS, and the significant relationship between the level of instructional leadership and the level of teacher performance appraisal. The process analyzed the results of the questionnaires to assess the profile of the elementary teachers, the level of instructional leadership dimensions of the school heads as perceived by the teacher-respondents, the level of teacher performance based on the TPAS, and the significant relationship between the level of instructional leadership of the school heads and the level of teacher performance appraisal. The data gathered were tabulated, analyzed, computed, and evaluated to determine the results. The output of the research provided the researcher with empirical data from which an enhancement plan may be proposed to enhance instructional leadership and improve teacher performance appraisal outcomes.

The study was conducted in Tabor Hill College OAD Inc, Purok 3 Brgy San Jose, Cebu City, whose location is shown in Figure 3, the location map of the study. Tabor Hill College OAD Inc. is an appropriate setting for the study on the relationship between instructional leadership and teacher performance appraisal because it provides a relevant educational environment where school leadership and teacher evaluation practices can be directly observed and analyzed. Located in Purok 3, Brgy. San Jose, Cebu City, the institution operates within a structured academic system where administrators and teachers interact regularly in implementing instructional policies and performance standards. These conditions allowed the researcher to examine how the instructional leadership practices of school administrators influence the appraisal and professional performance of teachers.

The respondents were the teachers of the above-mentioned research environment. The researcher employed the random sampling method, which was chosen for the faster and more accessible administration of the study. As presented in Table 1, the distribution of respondents with $n=25$, the respondents consisted of Teachers numbering 25, which was 100.00% of the respondents, and the total likewise was 25, or 100.00%. The random sampling method was particularly suited for this study on the relationship between the instructional leadership of the school heads and teacher performance appraisal because it allowed every teacher within the selected school in Tabor Hill College OAD Inc, Purok 3 Brgy San Jose, Cebu City an equal chance of being included as a respondent.

The questionnaire had three (3) parts. The study and instrument developed by Hyder (2022), titled “Development and Validation of Teachers’ Performance Appraisal Scale (TPAS) for Public Primary Schools of Punjab,” and by Akram (2017), titled Development and validation of instructional leadership questionnaire, served as the basis of the instrument. Part I was the demographic profile of the teachers, Part II was the level of instructional leadership dimensions of the school heads as perceived by the teacher-respondents, and Part III was the level of teacher performance based on the TPAS.

The procedures for gathering the data necessary to address the research questions were outlined to specify the methods, instruments, and protocols applied throughout the data collection process, so as to ensure that the information obtained was valid, reliable, and aligned with the objectives of the study. In the preliminary stage, the researchers sent a transmittal letter to the school principal to request permission to conduct the study. Upon approval, the researchers coordinated and finalized the schedule for meeting the respondents and administering the data collection activities. In the data gathering stage, the researchers conducted an orientation to introduce the study to the respondents. Key concerns such as the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the measures for ensuring confidentiality will be explained. After the orientation, the survey questionnaires were administered. Clear instructions were provided on how to answer the survey questionnaires and participate in the interviews. The researcher was also available to assist respondents during the completion of the questionnaires, and sufficient time will be allotted to ensure accurate and complete responses. In the post data gathering stage, after data collection, the responses were tallied, organized, summarized, interpreted, and analyzed. Appropriate statistical tools were utilized to process and treat the data to generate meaningful findings.

The statistical analysis of the data in the study involved a descriptive measure. The descriptive method was used in the presentation of data, particularly in the profile of the elementary teachers, the level of instructional leadership dimensions of the school heads as perceived by the teacher-respondents, the level of teacher performance based on the TPAS, and the significant relationship between the level of instructional leadership of the school heads and the level of teacher performance. The following statistical treatments were used: simple percentage computation described the profile and frequency of the respondents; the weighted mean determined the distribution of results for the level of instructional leadership dimensions

of the school heads as perceived by the teacher-respondents and the level of teacher performance based on the TPAS; and the Pearson moment product correlation R determined the significant relationship between the level of instructional leadership of the school heads and the level of teacher performance.

For scoring, the researcher applied the five-point Likert Scales, which required an individual participant to respond to a series of statements in the questionnaire by indicating to what extent the level of instructional leadership dimensions of the school heads as perceived by the teacher-respondents and the level of teacher performance based on the TPAS were present. A response category of 5, with the range 4.20-5.00 and the verbal description Always (A), was interpreted as Extremely High, meaning that the statement is permanently existing and observed. A response category of 4, with the range 3.40-4.19 and the verbal description Often (O), was interpreted as Moderately High, meaning that the statement is regularly existing and observed. A response category of 3, with the range 2.60-3.39 and the verbal description Sometimes (S), was interpreted as Somewhat High, meaning that the statement is occasionally existing and observed. A response category of 2, with the range 1.80-2.59 and the verbal description Rarely (R), was interpreted as Slightly High, meaning that the statement is rarely existing and observed. A response category of 1, with the range 1.00-1.79 and the verbal description Never (N), was interpreted as Not High, meaning that the statement is not at all existing at all and not observed.

To avoid ambiguities in the study, the following terms were defined operationally. The enhancement plan was the proposed output of the study, a structured set of activities or interventions designed to enhance teachers' knowledge, skills, and instructional practices. In this study, it referred to the proposed program developed based on the relationship between instructional leadership and teacher performance appraisal, aiming to strengthen teacher competencies and improve overall teaching quality. Instructional leadership referred to the actions and practices of school heads aimed at improving teaching and learning, which include serving as instructional resource provider and maintaining visible presence, professional development and maximizing instructional time, monitoring student progress, giving feedback on teaching and learning, and acting as curriculum implementer. It was measured based on the teachers' perception of their school heads' leadership practices through a structured survey or questionnaire. Teacher performance appraisal referred to the systematic evaluation of teachers' professional competencies, effectiveness, and contribution to student learning. In this study, it was operationally measured using the TPAS, which assesses dimensions such as teaching and learning, classroom management, assessment, teacher-student relationship, and staff collaboration.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study involved 25 teacher-respondents from Tabor Hill College OAD Inc., Purok 3, Brgy. San Jose, Cebu City, who constituted 100.00% of the respondent distribution. The study employed a descriptive-correlational design and drew its respondents through random sampling, which gave every teacher in the selected school an equal chance of inclusion. Data were gathered with a questionnaire of three parts, adapted from the instruments of Hyder (2022) on the Teachers' Performance Appraisal Scale (TPAS) and Akram (2017) on instructional leadership. The parts covered the demographic profile, the level of instructional leadership dimensions of the school heads as perceived by the teachers, and the level of teacher performance based on the TPAS. Responses were scored on a five-point Likert scale. The data were treated with simple percentage for the profile, weighted mean for the instructional

leadership and teacher performance dimensions, and Pearson product moment correlation for the relationship between the two variables. The discussion below is grounded in the data gathered, and the results are interpreted in direct relation to the objectives of the study.

Profile of the respondents

In terms of age, 14 respondents (56.00%) were aged 21-30 years old and 11 respondents (44.00%) were aged 31-40 years old, while no respondents (0.00%) fell in the 41-50 or 51-60 age brackets, for a total of 25 (100.00%). The sample is therefore composed of younger teachers, so the findings may reflect the perspectives and adaptability of practitioners who are likely more open to innovation, technology integration, and contemporary instructional approaches. Richter, Kunter, and Klusmann (2019) found that teacher learning trajectories are strongly influenced by years of experience, affecting instructional adaptability and classroom effectiveness. Opfer and Pedder (2020) likewise emphasized that professional growth is a continuous, experience-based process in which attitudes toward collaboration and instructional change vary across career stages.

In terms of gender, 2 respondents (8.00%) were male and 23 respondents (92.00%) were female, for a total of 25 (100.00%). This highly uneven composition is commonly observed in the teaching workforce. The findings may therefore be more representative of female teachers' practices, perceptions, and experiences, and the limited male participation may restrict gender-based diversity of viewpoints. Mills and McLure (2019) found that gender segregation in teaching persists across many education systems, with women consistently comprising the majority of classroom teachers because of long-standing social expectations and career pathways. Drudy (2020) emphasized that the underrepresentation of male teachers may limit diversity in pedagogical approaches and role modeling. Addi-Raccah and Ayalon (2022) noted that gender imbalance can shape instructional culture by reinforcing traditional caregiving roles among female educators while constraining broader perspectives in classroom management and communication strategies.

Regarding highest educational attainment, 16 respondents (64.00%) held a Bachelor's degree. Three respondents (12.00%) had units in a Master's degree, three (12.00%) held a Master's degree, and three (12.00%) had units in a Doctorate, while none (0.00%) had completed a Doctorate degree, for a total of 25 (100.00%). This pattern suggests an evident interest in continuing professional and academic development, although advanced qualifications such as a completed Doctorate are not yet present. The group may thus be still strengthening its expertise through graduate education, which may influence the depth of theoretical grounding and research engagement in professional practice. Kini and Podolsky (2019) found that advanced teacher preparation and continuous professional learning are positively associated with improved instructional quality and student achievement, although incremental gains can still be achieved through ongoing graduate coursework and in-service training.

In terms of years in service, 10 respondents (40.00%) had served 11-20 years and 10 respondents (40.00%) had served six to ten years. Five respondents (20.00%) had served one to five years, and none (0.00%) had served 21 years and beyond, for a total of 25 (100.00%). The workforce is moderate in professional longevity, combining developing and experienced practitioners but lacking highly veteran educators. The findings are thus shaped by intermediate levels of experience, and the absence of long-serving respondents may limit insights on seasoned expertise, leadership maturity, and long-established instructional practices. Atteberry and Bryk (2019) found that teachers with greater years of experience tend to show more effective instructional decision-making and improved responsiveness to classroom complexities. Kraft and Papay (2020) noted that experience contributes significantly to

instructional effectiveness, school improvement, and mentoring capacity, particularly in supporting novice teachers and strengthening institutional stability.

As to relevant training, seminars, and workshops attended, all 25 respondents (100.00%) had attended only at the school level, while none (0.00%) had attended at the national, regional, division, or district level. Their professional development is therefore entirely school-based, which suggests that capacity-building opportunities are localized and may focus on immediate, school-specific concerns rather than broader educational trends and innovations. Opfer and Pedder (2020) similarly found that teachers who engage in structured, externally supported professional learning programs are more likely to adopt innovative instructional strategies and improve classroom effectiveness than those who rely solely on school-based training.

Level of instructional leadership dimensions of the school heads

For instructional resource provider and maintain visible presence, the indicator “Encourage teachers to use instructional materials freely” obtained a mean of 4.40 (Always), “Organize and deliver the instructional materials to teachers” 4.36 (Always), “Teachers have sufficient access to instructional material” 4.60 (Always), “Guide teachers in using instructional resources” 4.68 (Always), and “Visit classes regularly to observe teaching and learning” 4.72 (Always). The last was the highest-rated indicator. The aggregate mean was 4.55, described as Always. Regular classroom visitation indicates that instructional supervision is actively practiced, allowing school heads to observe instruction, give timely feedback, and respond to teachers’ needs, which may strengthen instructional quality and accountability. Sebastian and Allensworth (2019) emphasized that school leaders who engage in instructional monitoring and provide structured feedback have a greater impact on teacher development than those who focus mainly on administrative responsibilities. Grissom et al. (2021) noted that classroom observation and instructional support significantly strengthen teacher accountability, instructional quality, and school performance. The aggregate mean of 4.55 shows that school heads are highly visible and continuously involved in guiding teachers, reflecting a strong culture of instructional leadership. This is consistent with Grissom et al. (2020), who found that consistently present and involved leaders contribute significantly to teacher effectiveness and student achievement, and with Leithwood et al. (2021), who noted that close instructional supervision and sustained teacher support have the strongest influence on instructional quality and student learning outcomes.

For professional development and maximizing instructional time, “Conduct meetings to discuss instructional matters” obtained a mean of 4.52 (Always), “Discuss with teachers the matters related to the instruction” 4.64 (Always), “Visibly present in school for teachers and students” 4.76 (Always), “Arrange teachers’ meetings to help them grow professionally” 4.80 (Always), and “Develop follow up plans for assessing professional development” 4.60 (Always). The aggregate mean was 4.66, described as Always. The highest indicator, at 4.80, points to a strong culture of continuous professional learning in which collaboration and shared development are prioritized. Stoll et al. (2019) noted that professional learning communities promote sustained collaboration, leading to improved instructional practices and shared accountability for learner outcomes. Ainscow and West (2020) found that schools with strong collaborative professional cultures show higher teacher engagement, instructional improvement, and student achievement. The aggregate of 4.66 suggests that school heads organize professional development and use instructional time productively. Sebastian and Allensworth (2019) found that principals who actively support teacher learning contribute to

stronger instructional practices and improved student outcomes, and Grissom et al. (2021) noted that leadership focused on instructional time management, teacher support, and professional development has one of the strongest impacts on teaching quality and student achievement.

For monitoring student progress, “Ensure that all students are present in the class during class time” obtained a mean of 4.76 (Always), “Protect classroom instructional time from outside interruptions” 4.64 (Always), “Encourage all teachers to come to class well-prepared and in time” 4.60 (Always), “Use class time of teachers for regular meetings” 4.68 (Always), and “Make sure that students are not allowing to office during class” 4.72 (Always). The aggregate mean was 4.68, described as Always. The highest indicator shows that student attendance is prioritized as a key factor in learning continuity. Gottfried and Hansen (2019) found that chronic absenteeism is significantly associated with lower academic performance, while consistent attendance predicts higher achievement. Kearney and Graczyk (2020) emphasized that systematic attendance monitoring and school-based intervention are effective in reducing absenteeism and improving engagement, and Balfanz and Byrnes (2021) noted that attendance-focused school practices contribute to improved classroom participation and instructional continuity. The aggregate of 4.68 indicates that teachers regularly experience strong leadership involvement in tracking student development and engagement, which may support student accountability, timely identification of learning gaps, and more responsive interventions. Sebastian and Allensworth (2019) found that principals who monitor student progress and use data to guide instruction improve both teacher effectiveness and student achievement, and Loeb (2021) emphasized that systematic monitoring of student learning contributes to more responsive teaching strategies and improved academic outcomes.

For feedback on teaching learning, “Solve issues related to discipline to maximize instructional time” obtained a mean of 4.64 (Always), “Meet teachers individually to discuss student progress issues” 4.60 (Always), “Discuss students’ results with teachers for curricular strengths” 4.72 (Always), “Review students’ work when evaluating classroom instruction” 4.68 (Always), and “Ask the teachers to send the students’ progress reports to parents” 4.80 (Always). The aggregate mean was 4.68, described as Always. The highest indicator suggests that school heads strongly emphasize home-school collaboration, which may strengthen parental involvement, improve transparency in student assessment, and support timely interventions. Jaynes (2019) found that parental involvement is consistently associated with higher achievement, particularly when schools establish structured communication systems. Goodall and Montgomery (2020) emphasized that effective home-school partnerships enhance student motivation, behavior, and academic success, and Sheldon et al. (2022) noted that school leadership in promoting family engagement fosters collaborative monitoring of student progress. The aggregate of 4.68 indicates that teachers regularly experience leadership practices that emphasize communication of student progress, instructional monitoring, and collaboration with stakeholders, and that school heads prioritize transparency. Grissom, Kalogrides, and Loeb (2021) found that principals who communicate instructional feedback and engage parents contribute significantly to teacher effectiveness and student achievement, and Epstein et al. (2023) found that strong home-school partnerships and continuous feedback systems enhance teacher performance.

For curriculum implementer, “Provide public praise to those teachers who perform well” obtained a mean of 4.48 (Always), “Students’ marks provide info about curriculum implementation” 4.56 (Always), “Meet teachers to get reports about curriculum implementation” 4.60 (Always), “Encourage my teachers to engage their students in activities” 4.68 (Always), and “Encourage a lesson plan for making curriculum effective” 4.80 (Always). The aggregate mean was 4.62, described as Always. The highest indicator shows that school heads emphasize structured instructional planning to ensure effective curriculum delivery,

which may improve lesson organization and the alignment of instructional activities. Hallinger and Shin (2020) emphasized that leadership focused on curriculum alignment and planning significantly improves instructional quality and student learning outcomes, and Grissom et al. (2021) found that principals who guide instructional planning and ensure curriculum coherence contribute to higher teacher effectiveness. The aggregate of 4.62 indicates that teachers frequently experience strong support in ensuring that the curriculum is planned, implemented, and aligned with instructional goals. Supovitz and Poglinco (2019) likewise emphasized that leadership practices focused on curriculum coherence and teacher support significantly enhance instructional quality and student achievement. Across all five dimensions, instructional leadership was perceived at the highest verbal description of Always.

Level of teacher performance based on the TPAS

For teaching and learning, “I do proper lesson planning of teaching process” obtained a mean of 4.80 (Always), “I use variety of audio video aids in teaching-learning process” 4.84 (Always), “I encourage students’ constructive participation in teaching-learning process” 4.72 (Always), “I use variety of teaching methods to enhance students’ understanding about topic” 4.68 (Always), and “I focus on students’ individual needs during teaching-learning process” 4.72 (Always). The aggregate mean was 4.76, described as Always. The highest indicator, at 4.84, shows that teachers are highly engaged in employing diverse instructional materials to enhance understanding, sustain attention, and promote active learning. Mayer (2020) noted that multimedia learning principles significantly improve comprehension when visual and auditory materials are effectively integrated, Hattie (2019) emphasized that varied teaching resources and visual supports have a strong positive effect on achievement and engagement, and Schleicher (2021) noted that digital and audio-visual tools enhance classroom interaction, support differentiated instruction, and improve retention. The aggregate of 4.76 indicates that instructional practices are regularly and effectively implemented, with strong adherence to teaching standards and a sustained commitment to instructional excellence. Hattie and Zierer (2019) emphasized that clarity of instruction, feedback, and active student involvement have a strong positive impact on achievement, and Cook-Harvey et al. (2020) found that sustained implementation of evidence-based strategies enhances engagement, comprehension, and learning outcomes.

For classroom management, “I involve students in development of classroom discipline rules” obtained a mean of 4.84 (Always), “I encourage students on an ideal behavior in class room” 4.72 (Always), “I take notice of students’ unwanted actions immediately in classroom” 4.60 (Always), “I discourage students’ misbehavior in a suitable way” 4.68 (Always), and “I use different rewards to improve classroom management” 4.64 (Always). The aggregate mean was 4.69, described as Always. The highest indicator suggests that teachers value student engagement and shared responsibility in maintaining order, fostering ownership and accountability. Osher et al. (2020) found that student-centered classroom management approaches that promote shared responsibility significantly improve behavior and engagement, and Gregory and Clawson (2019) emphasized that involving students in rule-setting fosters respectful relationships, reduces disciplinary issues, and strengthens adherence to norms. The aggregate of 4.69 indicates that effective management practices are regularly and systematically implemented, creating an orderly and conducive learning environment. Simonsen et al. (2019) emphasized that clear expectations and consistent reinforcement significantly reduce disruptions and improve instructional time, and Emmer and Sabornie

(2020) found that proactive management strategies are associated with higher engagement and fewer behavioral issues.

For assessment, “I use different assessment methods to assess students’ learning” obtained a mean of 4.92 (Always), “I use self made tests to assess students’ learning” 4.72 (Always), “I use assessment results to improve teaching process” 4.68 (Always), “I share educational assessment results with students well in time” 4.60 (Always), and “I discuss educational assessment results with family of the students” 4.69 (Always). The aggregate mean was 4.73, described as Always. The highest indicator, at 4.92, shows a strong commitment to measuring learning through multiple approaches, which may include formative, summative, and performance-based assessments, and may yield a more comprehensive understanding of progress and better identification of learning needs. Black and Wiliam (2019) emphasized that formative assessment significantly enhances learning by providing timely feedback and guiding instructional adjustments, and Guskey and Bailey (2020) found that assessment systems integrating multiple methods lead to a more accurate understanding of progress and improved planning. The aggregate of 4.73 indicates that assessment is regularly and effectively integrated into instruction and supports data-informed decisions and more targeted interventions. Brookhart (2019) emphasized that classroom assessment provides essential feedback that guides instruction, and Guskey and Bailey (2020) found that continuous assessment supports accurate identification of strengths and weaknesses.

For teacher-student relationship, “I maintain a pleasant relationship with all the students” obtained a mean of 4.68 (Always), “I provide an environment of trust to all students” 4.64 (Always), “I pay attentions on character building of my students” 4.80 (Always), “I take care about students’ self-respect” 4.60 (Always), and “Students discuss their learning problems with me, without any hesitation” 4.60 (Always). The aggregate mean was 4.66, described as Always. The highest indicator shows that teachers attend not only to academic instruction but also to students’ values, attitudes, and behavior, which may promote holistic development and positive discipline. Berkowitz and Hoppe (2019) emphasized that character education significantly improves social behavior, moral reasoning, and interpersonal relationships, and Lickona and Davidson (2020) found that teachers who promote character development contribute to stronger discipline, responsibility, and respectful interactions. The aggregate of 4.66 indicates that respect and care are regularly observed in the classroom, fostering trust and open communication. Roorda et al. (2019) emphasized that high-quality teacher-student relationships are associated with increased engagement, improved academic performance, and reduced behavioral problems, and Pianta and Hamre (2020) found that emotionally supportive environments characterized by trust and care enhance motivation and participation.

Staff collaboration was the only dimension of teacher performance that did not reach the highest verbal description. “I like to work in collaboration with other colleagues of my school” obtained a mean of 4.64 (Always), “I openly discuss my teaching problems with other colleagues of my school” 3.84 (Often), “I participate in collective teaching activities at school” 4.04 (Often), “I participate in non academic activities of school” 3.92 (Often), and “Teachers of my school support me to improve my professional performance” 4.20 (Often). The aggregate mean was 4.12, described as Often. The highest indicator suggests that teachers recognize the importance of teamwork and shared responsibility. Vangrieken et al. (2019) emphasized that teacher collaboration enhances professional learning, instructional innovation, and problem-solving capacity, and Ronfeldt and Pacton (2020) found that strong collaborative practices are associated with improved instructional quality, job satisfaction, and student achievement. The aggregate of 4.12 indicates that collaboration is practiced with some regularity but not to the fullest or most consistent extent, so there remain opportunities to institutionalize teamwork and strengthen professional support systems. Ronfeldt et al. (2019) found that collaboration is positively associated with instructional improvement and student achievement, particularly

when it is frequent, structured, and focused on instructional practice. Vangrieken and Kyndt (2020) emphasized that partial or informal collaboration yields limited benefits compared with sustained professional learning communities that promote shared responsibility and continuous improvement.

Relationship between instructional leadership and teacher performance

Pearson product moment correlation was used to test the relationship between the level of instructional leadership of the school heads and the level of teacher performance. The computed r-value of 0.71 indicates a high positive relationship, meaning that as instructional leadership practices improve, teacher performance also tends to improve. The computed t-value of 9.45 with df of 98 exceeded the critical t-value of 1.984, and the p-value of 0.000 was lower than the level of significance of 0.05. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected, and there is a significant relationship between the two variables. This implies that instructional leadership is a vital factor in teacher performance. When school heads provide instructional support, monitor teaching and learning, give feedback, promote professional development, and ensure proper curriculum implementation, teachers become more motivated and capable, which is associated with better teaching strategies, classroom management, assessment practices, collaboration, and teacher-student relationships. School administrators should therefore continue strengthening their instructional leadership competencies through leadership trainings, mentoring programs, and continuous professional development. This supports the view that effective school leaders influence teachers' practices, motivation, and commitment to quality education. Hallinger (2011) held that instructional leadership directly contributes to teaching quality through curriculum implementation, supervision, and professional development. Robinson et al. (2008) emphasized that leaders who engage in instructional matters have a greater impact on student and teacher outcomes than those who focus mainly on administrative concerns. Leithwood et al. (2020) noted that supportive and effective leadership fosters teacher commitment, professional growth, and instructional improvement.

Synthesis

The data from 25 teacher-respondents show a young (56.00% aged 21-30 years old and 44.00% aged 31-40 years old), predominantly female (92.00%) group. Most held a Bachelor's degree (64.00%), and all (100.00%) had attended training only at the school level. School heads were perceived at the level of Always across all five instructional leadership dimensions, with aggregate means of 4.55, 4.66, 4.68, 4.68, and 4.62. Teachers rated their own performance at Always for teaching and learning (4.76), classroom management (4.69), assessment (4.73), and teacher-student relationship (4.66), and at Often for staff collaboration (4.12). The significant positive relationship ($r = 0.71$, $t = 9.45$, $p = 0.000$, $\alpha = 0.05$, null hypothesis rejected) addresses the central objective of the study by showing that stronger instructional leadership is associated with higher teacher performance. The study thus adds empirical evidence from a school in Cebu City to the literature linking leadership practice to teacher appraisal outcomes. The results also point to staff collaboration and externally supported professional development as areas for improvement, which prepares the way for the enhancement plan proposed in the next chapter.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study show that the teacher-respondents of Tabor Hill College OAD Inc, Purok 3 Brgy San Jose, Cebu City, numbering over 25, are generally composed of younger to mid-adult age groups, with no representation from older age categories. They are predominantly female, with only minimal male representation. Most hold a bachelor's degree, while a smaller number have completed or are pursuing graduate studies and only a few have earned units in doctoral programs, with no respondent having completed a doctoral degree. Their years in service are mainly distributed within early to mid-career teaching experience, with no long-serving personnel beyond two decades. All respondents have participated only in school-based trainings, seminars, and workshops, with no involvement in district, division, regional, or national level programs. Using a descriptive-correlational design, with a questionnaire adapted from Hyder (2022) and Akram (2017) and analyzed through the weighted mean, simple percentage, and Pearson product-moment correlation, the study then examined how the teachers perceived the instructional leadership of their school heads and how they performed according to the Teachers' Performance Appraisal Scale (TPAS).

With regard to instructional leadership, the teacher-respondents perceived all five dimensions as consistently demonstrated by their school heads. In instructional resource provision and maintaining visible presence, the highest-rated indicator was the regular visiting of classes to observe teaching and learning. In professional development and maximizing instructional time, the highest-rated indicator was the organization of teachers' meetings that support professional growth. In monitoring student progress, the most prominent indicator was ensuring student presence during class time, while in feedback on teaching and learning, the highest-rated indicator was the submission of students' progress reports to parents. In curriculum implementation, the most emphasized indicator was encouraging the use of lesson planning to enhance curriculum effectiveness. Taken together, these results indicate that the school heads maintain a visible, supportive, and consistent instructional presence that touches resources, teacher growth, student monitoring, feedback, and curriculum delivery.

In the same manner, the TPAS results reveal that the teachers consistently exhibit high levels of professional performance across all evaluated domains. In teaching and learning, teachers were most proficient in utilizing various audio-visual aids to enhance instruction. Classroom management was characterized by a democratic approach, primarily involving students in the creation of discipline rules. In assessment, teachers excelled in consistently applying diverse evaluation methods to gauge student progress, and in the teacher-student relationship, they showed dedicated focus on the character building of learners. While performance in these areas was described as always present, staff collaboration, marked by a strong willingness to work with colleagues, was observed to occur often rather than always. This suggests that collaboration remains a relatively less developed area within an otherwise strong performance profile.

Most importantly, the study found a significant and high positive relationship between the instructional leadership of school heads and teacher performance. As the instructional leadership practices of school heads improved, teacher performance showed a corresponding upward trend. Because the relationship was statistically significant, the null hypothesis was rejected. It is therefore concluded that there is a direct and significant link between the two variables, and that the quality of leadership provided by school heads is a vital determinant of teacher effectiveness. As school heads demonstrate more proficient instructional leadership, the professional performance of the teaching staff improves in a consistent and measurable way. Consequently, the leadership approach of school heads serves as a fundamental driver in shaping and elevating the standards of teaching and learning within the institution.

In light of these conclusions, several recommendations are offered. School administrators should strengthen instructional leadership by providing continuous supervision, mentoring, and professional guidance through regular classroom observations, coaching

sessions, and collaborative learning activities that improve instructional strategies and classroom management. They are also encouraged to establish open communication, recognize teachers' achievements, and promote a supportive school climate that enhances motivation and performance. Teachers, for their part, are encouraged to participate actively in professional development programs, seminars, workshops, and collaborative learning communities, to maintain positive communication with school leaders, and to remain open to feedback and coaching. This is particularly relevant given that the respondents' training participation was confined to the school level, and a stronger commitment to continuous learning and reflective teaching may contribute to higher teaching performance and learner achievement.

Beyond the school, the Department of Education may develop and strengthen leadership training programs focused on instructional leadership competencies among school heads and supervisors, reinforce policies and support systems that promote teacher development, mentoring, and performance enhancement, and provide sufficient resources and monitoring mechanisms to ensure effective implementation of instructional leadership practices. Parents and community stakeholders should likewise support school programs and initiatives that promote effective teaching and learning, since active participation in school activities, partnerships, and educational programs fosters a positive learning environment and strengthens collaboration between schools and stakeholders. Future researchers may conduct similar studies with wider scopes, larger samples, or different variables, and may explore factors such as teacher motivation, organizational climate, job satisfaction, and professional development, preferably through qualitative or mixed-method approaches that offer deeper insight into the relationship between instructional leadership and teacher performance. Finally, the enhancement plan entitled "Enriching Instructional Leadership and Teachers' Teaching Performance" shall be used to translate these conclusions and recommendations into concrete action.

REFERENCES

- Ainscow, M., & West, M. (2020). Improving school collaboration and professional learning. Routledge.
- Atteberry, A., & Bryk, A. S. (2019). Teacher learning trajectories and instructional improvement over time. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 41(2), 123–145.
- Azmi, N., & Musa, K. (2025). The role of instructional leadership, teacher efficacy, and collaborative practices in shaping teacher development and well-being: A systematic review. *International Journal of Education, Psychology and Counselling*, 10(61), 657–679. <https://doi.org/10.35631/IJEPC.1061046>
- Balfanz, R., & Byrnes, V. (2021). The importance of attendance in student achievement and graduation outcomes. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 26(1), 1–20.
- Bayat, M., et al. (2025). Do educators' demographic characteristics drive learner academic performance? *Education Sciences*, 15(4), Article 487. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15040487>
- Berkowitz, M. W., & Hoppe, M. A. (2019). Character education and student moral development. *Journal of Moral Education*, 48(3), 345–360.

- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2019). Classroom assessment and learning improvement. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 26(3), 1–15.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2019). *How to use classroom assessment to improve learning*. ASCD.
- Cook-Harvey, C. M., Darling-Hammond, L., & Flook, L. (2020). Strengthening instructional practices through evidence-based strategies. *Educational Researcher*, 49(4), 210–220.
- Drudy, S. (2020). Gender balance and inequality in the teaching profession. *Gender and Education*, 32(5), 567–582.
- Emmer, E. T., & Sabornie, E. J. (2020). Classroom management: A critical review of research. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 22(1), 1–12.
- Epstein, J. L., Sheldon, S. B., & Sanders, M. G. (2023). School, family, and community partnerships and student success. *Review of Educational Research*, 93(2), 150–180.
- Espinosa, M. P., Reomero, J. I., Deguito, P., Lugatiman, R., & Bantilan, J. (2023). Performance appraisal of teachers in public secondary schools: A systematic review. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation (IJRSI)*. <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2023.1011030>
- Goodall, J., & Montgomery, C. (2020). Parental engagement and student achievement in schools. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 1–18.
- Gottfried, M. A., & Hansen, B. (2019). Chronic absenteeism and academic performance outcomes. *Educational Researcher*, 48(3), 123–133.
- Gregory, A., & Clawson, K. (2019). Student involvement in classroom management and behavior outcomes. *Journal of School Psychology*, 72, 45–60.
- Grissom, J. A., Egalite, A. J., & Lindsay, C. A. (2021). How principals affect students and schools: A systematic synthesis of two decades of research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 57(2), 210–245.
- Guskey, T. R., & Bailey, J. M. (2020). *Developing standards-based assessment systems*. Corwin Press.
- Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from instructional leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 126–147.
- Hallinger, P., & Shin, T. (2020). Instructional leadership and school improvement effectiveness. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(2), 223–244.
- Hattie, J. (2019). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- Hattie, J., & Zierer, K. (2019). *10 mindframes for visible learning*. Routledge.

He, P., Guo, F., & Abazie, G. A. (2024). School principals' instructional leadership as a predictor of teacher's professional development. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 9, Article 63. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00290-0>

Hyder, M. R., & Farooq, M. S. (2022). Development and validation of Teachers' Performance Appraisal Scale (TPAS) for public primary schools of Punjab. *International Research Journal of Education and Innovation*, 3(2), 241–256.

Jafferi, N. A., Salleh, K. M., & Ahmad, A. N. (2025). Secondary school principal instructional leadership style and organization agility: Level of readiness principals managing instructional program with organisation agility. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.909000526>

Jeynes, W. H. (2019). A meta-analysis on parental involvement and student academic achievement. *Urban Education*, 54(5), 1–25.

Kearney, C. A., & Graczyk, P. A. (2020). Attendance problems and school interventions: A review. *Psychology in the Schools*, 57(9), 1425–1442.

Khaemba, P. N., Maiyo, J. K., & Manini, M. M. (2025). Performance appraisal practices and teacher performance in public secondary schools in Kenya: A case of Busia County. *Journal of Education and Practice*.

Kini, T., & Podolsky, A. (2019). Does teaching experience increase teacher effectiveness? A review of research. Learning Policy Institute Report.

Kraft, M. A., & Papay, J. P. (2020). Can professional environments in schools promote teacher development? *American Educational Research Journal*, 57(4), 150–180.

Krisnasari, S., & Imamah, N. (2024). The influence of the teacher performance appraisal system and principal leadership on the quality of teacher performance at TK Tunas Harapan Nusa. *Journal of Scientific Research, Education, and Technology*, 3(2), 552–563.

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 1–21.

Lickona, T., & Davidson, M. (2020). Smart & good schools: Integrating excellence and ethics for success in school, work, and beyond. Character Education Partnership.

Macharia, M. (2024). Influence of teachers' appraisal on teaching methods on students' academic performance in public schools for Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education. *The Journal of Quality in Education*, 14(24), 25–43. <https://doi.org/10.37870/joqie.v14i24.434>

Mayer, R. E. (2020). Multimedia learning: Principles and applications. *Cambridge Handbook of Multimedia Learning* (2nd ed.).

Mills, M., & McClure, J. (2019). Gender segregation in teaching professions. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 85, 120–130.

- Mukhtar, N. A., Mohd Noor, M. A., Abdul Majid, N. A., & Zailan, N. A. (2025). Challenges in teachers' performance appraisal: A qualitative study on structural flaws and systemic inequities. *International Business Education Journal*, 18(2). <https://doi.org/10.37134/ibej.Vol18.2.8.2025>
- Nalangan, A. M., & Bercilla, L. C. (2025). Influence of leadership style and social support on performance appraisal of public elementary teachers. *International Journal of Education and Social Science Research*, 8(1), 11–25. <https://doi.org/10.37500/IJESSR.2025.8102>
- Ngoon, T. J., Sushil, S., Stewart, A., Lee, U.-S., Venkatraman, S., Thawani, N., ... Ogan, A. (2024). ClassInSight: Designing conversation support tools to visualize classroom discussion for personalized teacher professional development. arXiv.
- Opfer, V. D., & Pedder, D. (2020). Conceptualizing teacher professional learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 90(2), 1–35.
- Osher, D., Poirier, J., & Jackson, S. (2020). Positive behavioral supports and classroom management. *Educational Psychologist*, 55(2), 1–15.
- Pianta, R. C., & Hamre, B. K. (2020). Teacher–student relationships and school success. In *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 373–394). Springer.
- Prestoza, M.-J. R., & Naldoza, N. (2025). Challenges and practices of instructional leadership: A qualitative inquiry of principals' and teachers' perspectives. *The Normal Lights*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.56278/tnl.v19i1.3112>
- Richter, D., Kunter, M., & Klusmann, U. (2019). Teacher learning and development across career stages. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 83, 1–12.
- Rivera, B. H., Jr. (2024). Relationship of instructional leadership practices among school administrators and school performance: Input development of annual improvement plan. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*.
- Robinson, V., Lloyd, C., & Rowe, K. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635–674.
- Ronfeldt, M., & Pacton, S. (2020). Collaboration and teacher effectiveness. *American Educational Research Journal*, 57(3), 1–30.
- Ronfeldt, M., Farmer, S. O., McQueen, K., & Grissom, J. A. (2019). Teacher collaboration in instructional improvement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 41(2), 1–25.
- Roorda, D. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., & Spilt, J. L. (2019). Teacher–student relationships and engagement outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 89(3), 1–45.
- Schleicher, A. (2021). *Teaching and learning in a digital world*. OECD Publishing.
- Seashore Louis, K., & Wahlstrom, K. (2020). Instructional leadership and school effectiveness. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(4), 1–30.

- Sebastian, J., & Allensworth, E. (2019). The influence of school leadership on instruction and learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 55(2), 1–35.
- Sheldon, S. B., Epstein, J. L., & Galindo, C. L. (2022). Parent engagement and student academic success. *School Community Journal*, 32(1), 1–20.
- Simonsen, B., Fairbanks, S., Briesch, A., Myers, D., & Sugai, G. (2019). Evidence-based classroom management practices. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 21(1), 1–12.
- Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Wallace, M., & Thomas, S. (2019). Professional learning communities: A review. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 4(2), 1–18.
- Supovitz, J., & Poglinco, S. (2019). Instructional leadership and curriculum coherence. *Educational Leadership Review*, 20(1), 1–20.
- Tarraya, H. O. (2025). Challenges and opportunities for teacher leaders in public schools. *ASEAN Journal of Educational Research and Technology*.
- Tefera, A., et al. (2025). The relationship between principals' pedagogical leadership practices and teachers' job performance: The role of sociodemographic characteristics. *BMC Psychology*, 13, Article 89. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-02415-7>
- Vangrieken, K., & Kyndt, E. (2020). Professional collaboration in schools. *Educational Research Review*, 31, 1–15.
- Vangrieken, K., Dochy, F., Raes, E., & Kyndt, E. (2019). Teacher collaboration and professional learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 84, 1–12.
- Xiao, J., & Meriales, R. D. (2025). Assessing professional development and teaching effectiveness. *International Journal of Education and Humanities*. <https://doi.org/10.54097/qvz42h48>