# School Heads' Instructional Leadership on Teachers' Work Performance

Mary Joy A. Capillanes, MaEd AS
STI West Negros University, Bacolod City
maryjoy.capillanes.ampalayohan@deped.gov.ph

## Abstract

Instructional leadership critically shapes teaching and learning within the various schools. These school heads, who play the basic role of instructional leadership, are expected to create a conducive environment that promotes teacher efficacy as well as students' success. In many education systems, particularly in the Philippines, teachers' performance is often subject to the leadership style and practices of their administrators. In this context, this study explored the relationship between school heads' instructional leadership practices and teachers' work performance in a district of Central Philippines during the 2024–2025 academic year. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, the study focused on three leadership dimensions: curriculum development and assessment, classroom management and inclusive learning environments, and professional development, coaching, and collaboration. Data were collected from 96 teachers using a validated and reliable survey instrument. Findings showed school heads demonstrated a very high level of instructional leadership, particularly in curriculum-related aspects. However, lower ratings were observed in coaching and use of data-driven strategies. Teachers exhibited high performance across demographic variables, and no significant relationship was found between instructional leadership and teacher performance. The study recommends targeted professional development programs be instituted for school heads, especially to improve their coaching and use of data-driven strategies. This will better place school leaders in supporting the continuous improvement of teachers in their instruction toward a more effective and responsive environment for learning.

*Keywords*: Instructional leadership, teacher performance, curriculum development, professional development, inclusive education

## Bio-Profile

Mary Joy A. Capillanes, 30, is a licensed professional teacher from Polo, Alcantara, Cebu. She currently teaches Grade 5 at Polo Elementary School, a public school in her hometown. With nine years of combined experience in both private and public schools, she has grown into an efficient and passionate educator. Mary Joy is presently completing her Master's Degree major in Administration and Supervision at STI West Negros University. She is committed to shaping the future of her learners and believes in strong collaboration between adminitrators teachers, and parents to achieve shared educational goals. Her dedication to excellence in teaching has earned her the title of Outstanding Teacher for three consecutive years based on her IPCRF ratings since 2022-2025.

# Introduction

## Rationale

The role of instructional leadership for school heads in supporting teacher performance and quality of education has significantly increased. In the Philippines, RA No. 9155, or the "Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001," indicates that school leaders are responsible for creating environments that are conducive to effective teaching and learning. The Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) act as a complementary guide to this and identifies major domains of leadership, such as instructional supervision, human human resource management, and school operation (DepEd, 2015).

The research of the last decade has overwhelmingly shown how instructional leadership positively affects teacher performance in various areas, including curriculum management, monitoring and coaching, and professional support. Darling-Hammond et al. (2015) and Kraft and Blazar (2017) have shown that through curriculum oversight and feedback-oriented coaching, leaders can actually improve teacher effectiveness along with instructional quality. Furthermore, supportive leadership can exert an even greater influence on teacher motivation or job satisfaction (Leithwood et al., 2020).

Nevertheless, there are challenges posed to this. Many teachers state that due to time and administrative duties, school heads are often unable to engage in effective instructional supervision (Sebastian et al., 2018; Grissom et al., 2021). Such lack of direct engagement may indirectly contribute to isolation, lowered morale, and performance of the teacher.

The study finds its grounding in the Instructional Leadership Theory by Hallinger and Murphy (1985), which provides a holistic view through which the leadership works by the heads of schools can be analyzed. These scholars portrayed three principal dimensions: defining the school mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive school learning environment. Thus, it offers a veritable backdrop against which to assess the strategic actions of school leaders as applicable to teacher performance and student outcomes.

This study, therefore, is aimed at investigating the relationship between school heads' instructional leadership practices and teachers' work performance in the region of Central Philippines in order to provide practical ideas to improve leadership.

## Literature Review

The review of related literature reveals how instructional leadership and teacher performance are closely intertwined, shaping educational outcomes worldwide and within the Philippine context. Internationally, results are consistent with findings that effective school leaders, who make an explicit vision of their schools, manage the curriculum well, and emphasize the course of professional development, have a positive impact upon the performance of teachers and achievement of students. Hallinger and Wang (2015) reveal that instructional leaders create collaborative environments supportive of teachers. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017)

mention the value of continuing teacher education enabled through leadership. The research of Kraft and Blazar (2017) discloses that individualized coaching provided by school heads enhances the quality of teaching and leads to gains in students' performance. Leithwood et al. (2020), as well as Sebastian et al. (2018), confirm how building trust, monitoring, and giving timely feedback translate for enhancement in instructional effectiveness for teachers.

All these findings line-up with local studies from the Philippines-revealing that Filipino school heads employ leadership style to meet the complexities of the environment. Contextualized leadership strategies maintain instructional quality, especially when resources are lacking, according to Corpuz (2016). Rural leaders creatively engage the community in innovative approaches to make up for the isolation and deficiency of resources, says Naval (2017). Following Reyes' (2018) observation, urban school heads concentrate on teacher development to nurture positive learning environments. Continuous leadership training to innovate teaching is advocated by Mendoza (2019), while Santiago (2020) recommends institutionalizing leadership development to continue to benefit from the gains in teacher performance and student learning achieved.

Directly documented in foreign and local literature is how instructional leadership bears a positive influence on the performance of teachers. Teacher effectiveness is, according to Hattie, the most powerful school-related factor influencing student achievement, amplified by leadership that supports professional growth and providing constructive feedback (Hattie, 2015). According to Robinson et al. (2016), supportive leadership has been shown to enhance resources such as motivation and productivity among the majority of teachers, while Day and Gu (2017) state that positive school climates and professional support sustain teacher resilience. Targeted professional advancement indeed improves the quality of teaching, as stated by Guskey (2018), and Murphy (2019) adds that effective leadership nurtures teachers' self-efficacy, thus paving the way for innovative instruction.

Like-wise, leadership, in the Philippine context, has shown association with actual teacher performance. According to Dela Cruz (2016), professional growth, administration support, and community involvement are factors affecting classroom teaching effectiveness. Garcia's (2017) findings show that classroom supervision and appraisals by leaders improve the instructional standards of rural schools. Continuous training and collaborative school culture are points highlighted by Santos (2018) as well as Luna (2019) as sustaining factors for teacher performance. In fact, Gernalin, Bautista, and Maguate (2023) discovered strong relationships' between compliance to the code of conduct and performance of teachers in public elementary schools in the province of Negros Occidental, citing the need for broad-based teacher development programs.

These studies demonstrate the importance of instructional leadership in establishing a context that fosters the flourishing of teachers. Such effective leadership promotes collaboration, professional growth, and accountability; consequently, teaching practices and student benefits improve in different educational contexts. The examined body of literature gives a sound basis for analyzing the nexus between the instructional leadership of school heads and teachers' performance, which is to be carried out in this study.

## Objectives

This study aimed to assess the instructional leadership practices of school heads and how these relate to teachers' work performance. Specifically, it sought to determine 1) the extent of instructional leadership demonstrated by school heads across key domains such as curriculum development and assessment, classroom management and inclusive learning environments, and professional development, coaching, and collaboration, 2) the performance level of teachers, 3) whether there were significant differences in instructional leadership practices and teacher performance based on demographic variables such as age, civil status, and length of service, 4) if there is a significant relationship between the school heads' instructional leadership practices and the performance outcomes of teachers.

## Methodology

This research employed a descriptive-correlational design to explore the relationship between school heads' instructional leadership practices and teachers' work performance. This section includes the research design, subject-respondents, research instrument, data collection procedures, ethical considerations, data analysis, and statistical treatment.

## Research Design

This research employed a descriptive-correlational design to explore the relationship between school heads' instructional leadership practices and teachers' work performance. The descriptive aspect of the study aimed to provide a clear picture of the leadership behaviors exhibited by school heads and the performance level of teachers. The correlational aspect, on the other hand, sought to examine whether there were statistically significant relationships between the leadership practices and teacher performance outcomes.

## Respondents

The respondents of the study was 96 public elementary and high school teachers in a district within a large division in Central Philippines during the 2024–2025 academic year. The specific respondents were chosen using stratified random sampling from a total population of 126. This sampling method ensured that different schools and teacher demographics were proportionately represented, enhancing the generalizability of the findings within the district.

## Research Instrument

Data were collected using a validated 30-items self-made survey instrument that consisted of three major parts: demographic profile, instructional leadership practices of school heads, and teachers' performance ratings based on the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF). The instrument underwent validation by three educational experts,

achieved a validity index of 4.81, and was pilot-tested for reliability, resulting in a Cronbach's alpha of 0.967, indicating excellent internal consistency.

## Data Gathering Procedure

Permission to conduct the study was obtained from appropriate education authorities, and data collection followed ethical research protocols, including informed consent, confidentiality, and adherence to health guidelines. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, and mean to summarize the respondents' profile and leadership and performance levels. Inferential statistics, including the Mann-Whitney U test and Spearman's rho, were used to test for differences and correlations, respectively, with a significance level set at 0.05.

## Ethical Consideration

Ethical protocols included informed consent, anonymity, voluntary participation, and data confidentiality. Health protocols were followed during data collection.

## Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

Objective No. 1 used the descriptive analytical scheme and weighted mean to assess the determine the extent of instructional leadership demonstrated by school heads across key domains such as curriculum development and assessment, classroom management and inclusive learning environments, and professional development, coaching, and collaboration. Objective no. 2 likewise used the descriptive analytical scheme and mean as statistical tools to examine the performance level of teachers. Meanwhile, objective no. 3 used the comparative analytical scheme and Mann-Whitney U test to determine if there is a significant difference in instructional leadership practices and teacher performance based on demographic variables such as age, civil status, and length of service. Finally, objective no. 4 used the relational analytical scheme and Spearman Rho as statistical tools to determine if there is a significant relationship between the school heads' instructional leadership practices and the performance outcomes of teachers.

## Results and Discussion

This section presents the analyzed results of the data gathered from the respondents. It provides a detailed discussion on the demographic profile of the teachers, the level of instructional leadership practices of school heads, and the corresponding work performance of teachers. Additionally, it explores whether differences and correlations exist among variables using statistical analysis. The findings are presented in tabular form with accompanying interpretations.

**Table 1**
*Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices in Curriculum Development, Instructional Planning, and Assessments*

| Item | Mean | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|
| Ensuring curriculum aligns with standards | 4.88 | Very High |
| Developing curriculum map | 4.71 | Very High |
| Designing plans for diverse learners | 4.65 | Very High |
| Incorporating technology | 4.65 | Very High |
| Training in assessments | 4.56 | Very High |
| Using assessment data | 4.71 | Very High |
| Focusing on student interest | 4.63 | Very High |
| Encouraging interdisciplinary links | 4.61 | Very High |
| Using feedback to improve plans | 4.58 | Very High |
| Leading common assessments | 4.61 | Very High |
| **Overall Mean** | **4.66** | **Very High** |

Table 1 indicates a considerably very high level of instructional leadership demonstrated by school heads in curriculum development, instructional planning, and assessment techniques, as endorsed by the overall mean rating of 4.66. The strongest of these areas appears to be ensuring curriculum and assessments align to state or national standards, which has the highest mean rating of 4.88. This suggests a strong commitment by these school leaders in ensuring curriculum coherence and adherence to mandated benchmarks.

These observations affirm findings by Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) that emphasize the importance of continuous and high-quality professional development in assessment literacy for improving instructional effectiveness and student achievement. Their research supports the argument that giving teachers an understanding of both formative and summative assessments allows them to make sounder decisions for the betterment of learning outcomes. Hence, while in general, the school heads rank high, this research reiterates the need for strengthening assessment trainings so that instructional leadership can remain comprehensive and responsive to the ever-changing needs of the teachers.

**Table 2**

*Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership in Classroom Management, Engagement, and Inclusive Learning Environments*

| Item | Mean | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|
| Guidelines for student behavior | 4.73 | Very High |
| Promoting inclusivity | 4.77 | Very High |
| Adapting strategies for diversity | 4.65 | Very High |
| Supporting cultural inclusion | 4.66 | Very High |
| Promoting student voice | 4.61 | Very High |
| Using restorative discipline | 4.51 | Very High |
| Engaging families | 4.75 | Very High |
| Integrating SEL | 4.54 | Very High |
| Reviewing environments | 4.63 | Very High |
| Promoting interactive methods | 4.72 | Very High |
| **Overall Mean** | **4.66** | **Very High** |

Table 2 evaluated the instructional leadership practices of school heads in relation to classroom management, student participation, and the nurturing of inclusive learning environments. The overall mean rating of 4.66 shows a very high level of performance in the three domains. The item that received the highest rating, with a mean of 4.77, is "Promoting a school-wide environment that values respect, inclusivity, and engagement," thus showing that school leaders place a great deal of emphasis on the establishment of a positive and welcoming school climate. This suggests that school heads are very effective in creating a tone of mutual respect and inclusivity, which is vital to encouraging student participation and feeling of belonging.

Li et al. (2022) substantiate these findings: in their study, school leaders employing proactive and culturally responsive approaches, such as restorative discipline, were more likely to motivate students, foster peer relationships, and lessen behavioral issues. Their analysis upholds the perspective that the inclusive-restorative knowledge and leadership practices are thus fundamental for student behavior management and positive learning environment creation.

School heads in this study perform at a very high level, but the restoring of practices embedded within holistic instructional leadership needs to be advanced.

**Table 3**
*Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership in Professional Development, Coaching, and Collaboration for Data-Driven Instruction*

| Item | Mean | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|
| Peer coaching encouragement | 4.69 | Very High |
| Teacher observation opportunities | 4.46 | High |
| Leading PLCs | 4.49 | High |
| PD on interpreting data | 4.60 | Very High |
| Goal-setting based on data | 4.56 | Very High |
| Establishing mentorships | 4.63 | Very High |
| Personalized PD | 4.39 | High |
| Supporting research-based teaching | 4.36 | High |
| Dashboard use training | 4.19 | High |
| Coaching cycles | 4.50 | Very High |
| **Overall Mean** | **4.49** | **High** |

Table 3 explores school heads' efforts in fostering professional development, coaching, and collaboration to support data-driven instruction. Having a mean score of 4.49, interpreted as high level, this study shows commitment, albeit ethetruism, toward empowering teachers through growth-oriented practices. Most notably, "Encouraging teachers to work with peers in coaching relationships for mutual growth" was the highest-rated item, scoring an average of 4.69. This signifies an appreciation for collaborative learning and peer mentorship and how those informal professional communities are actively promoted by school leaders.

In consonance with that observation, Audisio et al. (2024) highlighted the importance of data in the improvement of education, emphasizing that capacity-building programs tagged toward data tools impact on teaching processes with resultant improvement in student outcomes. The research concluded that the teachers trained to interpret and to act on the data on the students

could deliver centered instructions while at the same time increase students' engagement and address learning gaps highly efficient. In brief, while school heads provide strong leadership for collaborative professional development, there is equally an urgency to see this capacity-building work extended to ensure effective use of data tools to guide instructional practice.

**Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices According to the Curriculum Development, Instructional Planning, and Assessments; Classroom Management, Engagement, and Inclusive Learning Environments; and Professional Development, Coaching, and Collaboration for Data-Driven Instruction when grouped according to Age, Civil Status, and Length of Service**

Table 4

*Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices According to the Curriculum Development, Instructional Planning, and Assessments when grouped according to Age*

| Items | Younger | | Older | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Interpretation | Mean | Interpretation |
| My school head is… | | | | |
| 1. developing a detailed curriculum map that aligns with school goals and student needs. | 4.85 | Very High Level | 4.90 | Very High Level |
| 2. designing plans that cater to diverse learning styles and abilities. | 4.67 | Very High Level | 4.74 | Very High Level |
| 3. incorporating technology into curriculum design and assessment practices. | 4.52 | Very High Level | 4.76 | Very High Level |
| 4. training teachers in formative and summative assessments to monitor student progress. | 4.50 | Very High Level | 4.78 | Very High Level |
| 5. using assessment data to refine curriculum plans and instructional strategies. | 4.48 | High Level | 4.64 | Very High Level |
| 6. developing curriculum and instruction that focus on students' interests and experiences. | 4.67 | Very High Level | 4.74 | Very High Level |
| 7. encouraging links between different subject areas to foster holistic learning. | 4.54 | Very High Level | 4.70 | Very High Level |
| 8. gathering and using feedback from teachers and students to improve instructional plans. | 4.59 | Very High Level | 4.64 | Very High Level |
| 9. leading the creation of common assessments to ensure consistency across classrooms. | 4.52 | Very High Level | 4.64 | Very High Level |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10. developing a detailed curriculum map that aligns with school goals and student needs. | 4.59 | Very High Level | 4.64 | Very High Level |
| **Overall Mean** | **4.59** | **Very High Level** | **4.72** | **Very High Level** |

Table 4 compares perceptions of younger and older teachers school heads' instructional leadership in the area of curriculum, instructional planning, and assessments. School heads in both age categories rated at what is referred to as a "very high level," with an overall mean of 4.59 from younger teachers and a slightly higher score of 4.72 from older teachers. Therefore, this apparent agreement lends credence to the finding that school heads are unreservedly seen as competent instructional leaders, whatever the age of the teacher. The consistently high ratings from the two groups underline the fact that their leadership is unanimously effective and their endeavors duly acknowledged.

The conclusion is drawn, therefore, that while perceptions may differ slightly depending on age--possibly based on differences in experience, familiarity with pedagogy, or expectation-the general confidence in the instructional leadership of school heads remains quite strong. Salvan and Hambre (2020) reiterated such confidence as leadership effectiveness is generally perceived consistently across diverse teacher demographics, yet subtle differences arise based on experience and exposure to instructional strategies. In the final analysis, the results affirm that instructional leadership practices do engage a considerable weight of value and respect, with the differences on age being minor, thus having little or no effect on the perception.

**Table 5**
*Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices According to the Classroom Management, Engagement, and Inclusive Learning Environments when grouped according to Age*

| Items | Younger | | Older | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Mean** | **Interpretation** | **Mean** | **Interpretation** |
| My school head is… | | | | |
| 1. establishing clear guidelines for student behavior and supporting teachers in implementation. | 4.63 | Very High Level | 4.82 | Very High Level |
| 2. promoting a school-wide environment that values respect, inclusivity, and engagement. | 4.70 | Very High Level | 4.84 | Very High Level |
| 3. tailoring the classroom management strategies to meet the needs of diverse students. | 4.52 | Very High Level | 4.76 | Very High Level |
| 4. supporting teachers in creating culturally inclusive learning environments. | 4.70 | Very High Level | 4.62 | Very High Level |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. encouraging practices that give students a say in their learning process. | 4.54 | Very High Level | 4.68 | Very High Level |
| 6. implementing restorative approaches to discipline rather than punitive measures. | 4.48 | High Level | 4.54 | Very High Level |
| 7. engaging families in the classroom and school activities to support student learning. | 4.87 | Very High Level | 4.64 | Very High Level |
| 8. integrating SEL programs into classroom management practices. | 4.50 | Very High Level | 4.58 | Very High Level |
| 9. conducting regular reviews of physical and social environments to ensure inclusivity. | 4.63 | Very High Level | 4.62 | Very High Level |
| 10. promoting interactive teaching methods that keep students engaged in learning. | 4.70 | Very High Level | 4.74 | Very High Level |
| **Overall Mean** | **4.63** | **Very High Level** | **4.68** | **Very High Level** |

Based on Table 5, the instructional leadership practices on classroom management, student engagement, and inclusive learning environments by heads of schools are rated differently when grouped according to teachers' ages. Both younger and older teacher groups rated their school heads at a "very high level" and gave overall mean scores of 4.63 and 4.68, respectively, thus showing a very strong and uniform recognition of leadership effectiveness across age demographics and suggesting that school heads are on average seen as competent in maintaining an inclusive, respectful, and well-managed classroom environment.

Taken together, the data suggest that while there are few minor differences based on age, they do not compromise the general consensus on the quality of leadership by heads of schools. Both age groups do understand and appreciate efforts in cultivating a positive and inclusive learning environment. The findings are consistent with those of Pitpit (2020), wherein it was found that teacher age has little apparent effect on leadership perception, although older educators probably have attuned observations on structured approaches toward discipline and engagement.

**Table 6**
*Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices According to the Professional Development, Coaching, and Collaboration for Data-Driven Instruction when grouped according to Age*

| Items | Younger Mean | Interpretation | Older Mean | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| My school head is… | | | | |
| 1. encouraging teachers to work with peers in coaching relationships for mutual growth. | 4.67 | Very High Level | 4.70 | Very High Level |
| 2. organizing classroom visits where teachers observe and learn from each other. | 4.35 | High Level | 4.56 | Very High Level |
| 3. leading PLCs focused on data analysis and instructional improvement. | 4.54 | Very High Level | 4.44 | High Level |
| 4. providing professional development on interpreting student data for instructional purposes planning. | 4.52 | Very High Level | 4.68 | Very High Level |
| 5. working with teachers to set measurable goals based on student performance data. | 4.50 | Very High Level | 4.62 | Very High Level |
| 6. establishing mentor-mentee relationships for new teachers or those needing support. | 4.57 | Very High Level | 4.68 | Very High Level |
| 7. offering personalized PD sessions based on individual teacher needs. | 4.28 | High Level | 4.48 | High Level |
| 8. supporting teachers in conducting classroom-based research to improve practice. | 4.39 | High Level | 4.34 | High Level |
| 9. training teachers to use data dashboards for real-time student progress monitoring. | 4.15 | High Level | 4.22 | High Level |
| 10. implementing coaching cycles that include planning, observation, and feedback. | 4.52 | Very High Level | 4.48 | High Level |
| **Overall Mean** | **4.45** | **High Level** | **4.52** | **Very High Level** |

Table 6 examined school heads' instructional leadership pertaining to professional development, coaching, and collaboration for data-driven instruction, with the ratings grouped by teachers' age. The data present the perception by the practitioners as uniformly strong across both age groups, as it finds mean scores of 4.45 with the annotation "high level" by the younger teachers and a scarcely higher 4.52, annotated with "very high level" by older teachers.

Therefore, the interpretation of generally effective school heads in moderating professional growth and collaborative environments holds true for both age groups, although older teachers appear to be more appreciative, albeit slightly.

The subtle differences suggest that although instructional leadership may be regarded with some degree of uniformity across teacher age groups, older teachers seem to have placed more value on mentorship models and structured data-use strategies as pertaining to a longer time in the profession and more proposed pathways to analysis. In summation, the data reflect positive views regarding school heads' supportiveness of professional learning and collaboration efforts. The findings are in line with Santiago (2020), who noted a general positive perception of instructional leadership across teacher demographics but observed supported mentorship and instructed teaching systems rates higher among more experienced teachers.

**Table 7**

*Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices According to the Curriculum Development, Instructional Planning, and Assessments when grouped according to Civil Status*

| Items | Single | | Married | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Mean** | **Interpretation** | **Mean** | **Interpretation** |
| My school head is… | | | | |
| 1. developing a detailed curriculum map that aligns with school goals and student needs. | 4.96 | Very High Level | 4.85 | Very High Level |
| 2. designing plans that cater to diverse learning styles and abilities. | 4.58 | Very High Level | 4.75 | Very High Level |
| 3. incorporating technology into curriculum design and assessment practices. | 4.54 | Very High Level | 4.68 | Very High Level |
| 4. training teachers in formative and summative assessments to monitor student progress. | 4.63 | Very High Level | 4.65 | Very High Level |
| 5. using assessment data to refine curriculum plans and instructional strategies. | 4.67 | Very High Level | 4.53 | Very High Level |
| 6. developing curriculum and instruction that focus on students' interests and experiences. | 4.75 | Very High Level | 4.69 | Very High Level |
| 7. encouraging links between different subject areas to foster holistic learning. | 4.58 | Very High Level | 4.64 | Very High Level |
| 8. gathering and using feedback from teachers and students to improve instructional plans. | 4.71 | Very High Level | 4.58 | Very High Level |
| 9. leading the creation of common assessments to ensure consistency across classrooms. | 4.58 | Very High Level | 4.58 | Very High Level |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10. developing a detailed curriculum map that aligns with school goals and student needs. | 4.67 | Very High Level | 4.60 | Very High Level |
| **Overall Mean** | **4.67** | **Very High Level** | **4.66** | **Very High Level** |

Table 7 presents Perceived instructional leadership practices of school heads in curriculum development, instructional planning, and assessments in relation to civil status. Results yielded a consistent very high level of perceived leadership effectiveness, with single teachers giving an overall mean rating of 4.67 and married teachers slightly lower at 4.66. These minor differences suggest that civil status does not provide any significant variance in how teachers perceive the heads' instructional leadership in respect to the area.

On the whole, these high ratings in unison reaffirm that teachers, whether married or single, recognize and appreciate the strong instructional leadership of their school heads in curriculum and assessment. These findings concur with Salvan and Hambre (2020), who found that demographic variables like civil status have little to no impact on perceptions of instructional leadership, stating that professional preparation, leadership training, and organizational culture are some of the more influential variables in shaping effective leadership practices.

**Table 8**

*Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices According to the Classroom Management, Engagement, and Inclusive Learning Environments when grouped according to Civil Status*

| Items | Single | | Married | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Mean** | **Interpretation** | **Mean** | **Interpretation** |
| My school head is… | | | | |
| 1. establishing clear guidelines for student behavior and supporting teachers in implementation. | 4.58 | Very High Level | 4.78 | Very High Level |
| 2. promoting a school-wide environment that values respect, inclusivity, and engagement. | 4.83 | Very High Level | 4.75 | Very High Level |
| 3. tailoring classroom management strategies to meet the needs of diverse students. | 4.58 | Very High Level | 4.67 | Very High Level |
| 4. supporting teachers in creating culturally inclusive learning environments. | 4.79 | Very High Level | 4.61 | Very High Level |
| 5. encouraging practices that give students a say in their learning process. | 4.58 | Very High Level | 4.63 | Very High Level |
| 6. implementing restorative approaches to discipline rather than punitive measures. | 4.50 | Very High Level | 4.51 | Very High Level |

| | Single | | Married | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | | Mean | |
| 7. engaging families in the classroom and school activities to support student learning. | 4.79 | Very High Level | 4.74 | Very High Level |
| 8. integrating SEL programs into classroom management practices. | 4.67 | Very High Level | 4.50 | Very High Level |
| 9. conducting regular reviews of physical and social environments to ensure inclusivity. | 4.71 | Very High Level | 4.60 | Very High Level |
| 10. promoting interactive teaching methods that keep students engaged in learning. | 4.75 | Very High Level | 4.71 | Very High Level |
| **Overall Mean** | **4.68** | **Very High Level** | **4.65** | **Very High Level** |

Table 8 shows the level of the school heads' instructional leadership practices on classroom management, student engagement, and inclusive learning environments according to their civil status. The results illustrate that both groups maintain a very high rating, with a figure of 4.68 for single teachers and a figure lower than that for married teachers at 4.65. Thus, civil status does not seem to make a significant difference in teachers' perceptions about the effectiveness of their school heads in this respect.

From the above, teachers acknowledged their school heads' powerful instructional leadership concerning developing inclusive, engaging, and well-disciplined learning environments despite civil status. This is, therefore, in line with Pitpit (2020) that people's demographics about civil status were not largely developing their perceptions of leadership—professional development and training were even more determining factors for the effectiveness of leadership.

**Table 9**

*Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices According to the Professional Development, Coaching, and Collaboration for Data-Driven Instruction when grouped according to Civil Status*

| Items | Single | | Married | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Interpretation | Mean | Interpretation |
| My school head is… | | | | |
| 1. encouraging teachers to work with peers in coaching relationships for mutual growth. | 4.88 | Very High Level | 4.63 | Very High Level |
| 2. organizing classroom visits where teachers observe and learn from each other. | 4.25 | High Level | 4.53 | Very High Level |
| 3. leading PLCs focused on data analysis and instructional improvement. | 4.50 | Very High Level | 4.49 | High Level |
| 4. providing professional development on interpreting student data for instructional planning. | 4.71 | Very High Level | 4.57 | Very High Level |
| 5. working with teachers to set measurable goals based on student performance data. | 4.67 | Very High Level | 4.53 | Very High Level |
| 6. establishing mentor-mentee relationships | 4.63 | Very High Level | 4.63 | Very High Level |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| for new teachers or those in need of support. | | | | |
| 7. offering personalized pd sessions based on individual teacher needs. | 4.42 | High Level | 4.38 | High Level |
| 8. supporting teachers in conducting classroom-based research to improve practice. | 4.46 | High Level | 4.33 | High Level |
| 9. training teachers to use data dashboards for real-time student progress monitoring. | 4.04 | High Level | 4.24 | High Level |
| 10. implementing coaching cycles that include planning, observation, and feedback. | 4.63 | Very High Level | 4.46 | High Level |
| **Overall Mean** | **4.52** | **Very High Level** | **4.48** | **High Level** |

Table 9 indicates the level of the practice of instructional leadership given by school heads in developing their profession, coaching, and collaboration for data-driven instruction according to their civil status. Overall, these results show that both groups consistently point out that higher levels indicate a great extent for using perceptions of leadership effectiveness. The rating of single teachers had an overall mean of 4.52 ("very high level"), while married teachers scored slightly lower at 4.48 ("high level"). This little difference may not really mean a big thing because both ratings imply that civil status does not play a significant role in how teachers perceive the effectiveness of school heads in promoting professional learning and collaboration.

Overall finding thus indicates that school heads qualify as effective school instructional leaders to teachers, irrespective of civil status, on professional growth, coaching, and collaboration. Variances could result from exposure to diversified professional experiences or expectations and not from civil status. They correlate with Dwiri and Okatan (2021), who asserted that leadership effectiveness is more molded by professional training and institutional practices than by personal demographics such as marital status.

**Table 10**
*Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices According to the Curriculum Development, Instructional Planning, and Assessments when grouped according to Length of Service*

| Items | Shorter | | Longer | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Interpretation | Mean | Interpretation |
| My school head is… | | | | |
| 1. developing a detailed curriculum map that aligns with school goals and student needs. | 4.83 | Very High Level | 4.90 | Very High Level |
| 2. designing plans that cater to diverse learning styles and abilities. | 4.67 | Very High Level | 4.73 | Very High Level |
| 3. incorporating technology into curriculum design and assessment practices. | 4.56 | Very High Level | 4.70 | Very High Level |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. training teachers in formative and summative assessments to monitor student progress. | 4.58 | Very High Level | 4.68 | Very High Level |
| 5. using assessment data to refine curriculum plans and instructional strategies. | 4.39 | High Level | 4.67 | Very High Level |
| 6. developing curriculum and instruction that focus on students' interests and experiences. | 4.67 | Very High Level | 4.73 | Very High Level |
| 7. encouraging links between different subject areas to foster holistic learning. | 4.56 | Very High Level | 4.67 | Very High Level |
| 8. gathering and using feedback from teachers and students to improve instructional plans. | 4.61 | Very High Level | 4.62 | Very High Level |
| 9. leading the creation of common assessments to ensure consistency across classrooms. | 4.56 | Very High Level | 4.60 | Very High Level |
| 10. developing a detailed curriculum map that aligns with school goals and student needs. | 4.61 | Very High Level | 4.62 | Very High Level |
| **Overall Mean** | **4.60** | **Very High Level** | **4.69** | **Very High Level** |

Table 10 presents the level of instructional leadership practices of the school heads in curriculum development, instructional planning, and assessments as categorized based on years of service. In effect, one observes consistent high ratings from both shorter-serving teachers and longer-serving teachers. Further analysis revealed that the mean scores for both categories were quite high, namely, 4.60 and 4.69-itself rated as "very high level." This shows that teachers think highly of their school heads' competence in this regard regardless of years of experience.

The general outcome was that school heads showed admirable instructional leadership in terms of curriculum and assessment, according to the perception of teachers regardless of the duration of their service. The slight edge in ratings from longer-serving teachers can be attributed to deeper insight gained through experience. These results agree with Santos and Villanueva (2020), where very minimal differences were found in instructional leadership competencies as years of experience vary because such similarities are manifested through standard professional development programs and leadership training that support school heads across different educational contexts consistently.

**Table 11**

*Level Of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices According to the Classroom Management, Engagement, and Inclusive Learning Environments when grouped according to Length of Service*

| Items | Shorter Mean | Interpretation | Longer Mean | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| My school head is… | | | | |
| 1. establishing clear guidelines for student behavior and supporting teachers in implementation. | 4.67 | Very High Level | 4.77 | Very High Level |
| 2. promoting a school-wide environment that values respect, inclusivity, and engagement. | 4.67 | Very High Level | 4.83 | Very High Level |
| 3. tailoring the classroom management strategies to meet the needs of diverse students. | 4.61 | Very High Level | 4.67 | Very High Level |
| 4. supporting teachers in creating culturally inclusive learning environments. | 4.67 | Very High Level | 4.65 | Very High Level |
| 5. encouraging practices that give students a say in their learning process. | 4.67 | Very High Level | 4.58 | Very High Level |
| 6. implementing restorative approaches to discipline rather than punitive measures. | 4.61 | Very High Level | 4.45 | High Level |
| 7. engaging families in the classroom and school activities to support student learning. | 4.89 | Very High Level | 4.67 | Very High Level |
| 8. integrating SEL programs into classroom management practices. | 4.61 | Very High Level | 4.50 | Very High Level |
| 9. conducting regular reviews of physical and social environments to ensure inclusivity. | 4.78 | Very High Level | 4.53 | Very High Level |
| 10. promoting interactive teaching methods that keep students engaged in learning. | 4.89 | Very High Level | 4.62 | Very High Level |
| **Overall Mean** | **4.71** | **Very High Level** | **4.63** | **Very High Level** |

Table 11 shows the extent to which school heads were rated in terms of instructional leadership practices for classroom management, student engagement, and inclusive learning environments across groups of teachers of differing service length. Teachers in both groups gave high ratings to their school heads in these dimensions, with mean scores of 4.71 and 4.63, both interpreted as "very high level." These results indicate that school heads are perceived by teachers, irrespective of years in the profession, to be very effective at establishing positive and inclusive, and well-managed learning environments.

Thus, in this patterned framework, both groups were in agreement in perceiving strong leadership by school heads while the shorter-serving teachers tended to view them more favorably, particularly in respect of innovative and contemporary practices. These findings coincide with Santiago's (2020) finding that there was no significant difference among alleged leader effectiveness with regard to service length but newer educators seemed to be more aligned with recent strategies since they were exposed to updated leadership frameworks and training lately.

**Table 12**

*Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices According to the Professional Development, Coaching, and Collaboration for Data-Driven Instruction when grouped according to Length of Service*

| Items | Shorter Mean | Interpretation | Longer Mean | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| My school head is… | | | | |
| 1. encouraging teachers to work with peers in coaching relationships for mutual growth. | 4.67 | Very High Level | 4.70 | Very High Level |
| 2. organizing classroom visits where teachers observe and learn from each other. | 4.28 | High Level | 4.57 | Very High Level |
| 3. leading PLCs focused on data analysis and instructional improvement. | 4.61 | Very High Level | 4.42 | High Level |
| 4. providing professional development on interpreting student data for instructional purposes planning. | 4.58 | Very High Level | 4.62 | Very High Level |
| 5. working with teachers to set measurable goals based on student performance data. | 4.61 | Very High Level | 4.53 | Very High Level |
| 6. establishing mentor-mentee relationships for new teachers or those needing support. | 4.69 | Very High Level | 4.58 | Very High Level |
| 7. offering personalized PD sessions based on individual teacher needs. | 4.42 | High Level | 4.37 | High Level |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8. supporting teachers in conducting classroom-based research to improve practice. | 4.58 | Very High Level | 4.23 | High Level |
| 9. training teachers to use data dashboards for real-time student progress monitoring. | 4.25 | High Level | 4.15 | High Level |
| 10. implementing coaching cycles that include planning, observation, and feedback. | 4.58 | Very High Level | 4.45 | High Level |
| **Overall Mean** | **4.53** | **Very High Level** | **4.46** | **High Level** |

Table 14 presents the level of instructional leadership practiced by the school heads in terms of professional development, coaching, and collaboration for data-driven instruction as perceived by teachers grouped according to their length of service. The results show that the shorter-serving teachers gave an overall mean rating of 4.53, interpreted as a "very high level," while longer-serving teachers rated a little lower, at 4.46, interpreted as a "high level." Such consistently positive ratings imply that teachers from all backgrounds recognize their heads' capabilities as instructional leaders with very few perceptual differences based on tenure.

Overall, the results seem to indicate that teachers-perhaps with few exceptions, depending on their years of service-perceive their school heads as effective instructional leaders for nurturing professional development and coaching in support of data-based practices. Ratings loosely indicating higher positive perceptions by shorter-serving teachers may indicate that they have more exposure and, thereby, are more conversant with current leadership models and coaching practices promoted in recent teacher education and training. This finding is in consonance with the findings of Audisio et al. (2024), stating instructional leadership effectiveness tends to stay rather constant across length of service, whereas newer educators often value collaborative and data-driven instruction more since that is the kind of modern leadership that they have been exposed to.

**Table 13**
*Level of Teachers' Work Performance when grouped and compared according to Age, Civil Status, and Length of Service*

| Variable | Categories | Mean | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Age | Younger | 4.40 | Very Satisfactory |
| | Older | 4.44 | Very Satisfactory |
| Civil Status | Single | 4.40 | Very Satisfactory |
| | Married | 4.43 | Very Satisfactory |
| Length of Service | Shorter | 4.32 | Very Satisfactory |
| | Longer | 4.48 | Very Satisfactory |
| **Overall Mean** | | **4.42** | **Very Satisfactory** |

Table 13 presents a comparison of teachers' work performance on three demographic variables-age, civil status, and length of service. The younger teachers were given an overall mean rating of 4.40, while their older counterparts scored a 4.44, both ratings in the "very satisfactory" range. Similarly, single teachers obtained a score with a mean of 4.40, while married teachers scored a little higher at 4.43, also under the "very satisfactory" rating. In terms of length of service, teachers with less service years were rated 4.32, while those rated longer were given a significantly high score of 4.48, meaning teachers with lengthier service had a stronger work performance.

There is evidence for the work done by Pitpit (2020) in supporting this study, which analyzed teacher performance in public schools in the Philippines and concluded that although high performance existed regardless of age, marital status, and length of service, the more experienced teachers were better performers in instructional planning, classroom management, and student engagement. Pitpit observed that mentorships and continuous professional development should be instituted so that all teachers would dispense high-quality instruction and nurture their professional growth irrespective of their demographic backgrounds.

**Comparative Analysis in the Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices according to the different areas when grouped according to Profile**
**Table 14**
*Difference in the Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices to the Curriculum Development, Instructional Planning, and Assessments when grouped according to Profile*

| Variable | Category | N | Mean Rank | Mann Whitney U | p-value | Sig. level | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age | Younger | 46 | 44.96 | 987.00 | .206 | | Not Significant |
| | Older | 50 | 51.76 | | | | |
| Civil Status | Single | 24 | 49.27 | 845.50 | .869 | 0.05 | Not Significant |
| | Married | 72 | 48.24 | | | | |
| Length of Service | Shorter | 36 | 46.10 | 993.50 | .489 | | Not Significant |
| | Longer | 60 | 49.94 | | | | |

Table 14 presents a comparative analysis of school heads' instructional leadership practices in curriculum development, instructional planning, and assessments based on teachers' age, civil status, and length of service, using the Mann-Whitney U test. The results show that differences were not statistically significant in all categories, the p-value for age being 0.206,

civil status 0.869, and the length of service 0.489, all over the 0.05 alpha level. This means that teachers' views on their school heads' instructional leadership practices do not vary based on demographic considerations. It implies that universally adopted procedures of training and institutional practices give rise to uniform effectiveness. This conforms with Salvan and Hambre (2020), who concluded that what constitutes an effective leader is more determined by training and institutional policies than by individual demographic characteristics.

**Table 15**

*Difference in the Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices to the Classroom Management, engagement, and Inclusive Learning Environments when grouped according to Profile*

| Variable | Category | N | Mean Rank | Mann Whitney U | p-value | Sig. level | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age | Younger | 46 | 46.70 | 1067.00 | .513 | | Not Significant |
| | Older | 50 | 50.16 | | | | |
| Civil Status | Single | 24 | 47.85 | 848.50 | .888 | 0.05 | Not Significant |
| | Married | 72 | 48.72 | | | | |
| Length of Service | Shorter | 36 | 49.72 | 1036.00 | .720 | | Not Significant |
| | Longer | 60 | 47.77 | | | | |

Table 15 demonstrates differences in instructional leadership practices under the three aspects of classroom engagement, management, and inclusive learning environments as perceived by school heads, classified by age, civil status, and length of service, and determined through the Mann-Whitney U test with a 0.05 alpha level. No statistically significant difference has been proven; all p-values were below 0.513 (age), 0.888 (civil status), and 0.720 (length of service). This means that the perceptions are uniform among teacher groups. This reveals that teachers of different demographic backgrounds will perceive their school heads as equally efficient in classroom management, engagement, and inclusiveness. Such consistency supports that leadership practices must be more in relation to institutional standards and professional development rather than personal attributes, validating Dimopoulos' (2020) assertion that leadership training is more influential than demographic factors in determining effective instructional leadership.

**Table 16**

*Difference in the Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices to the Professional Development, Coaching, and Collaboration for Data-Driven Instruction when grouped according to Profile*

| Variable | Category | N | Mean Rank | Mann Whitney U | p-value | Sig. level | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age | Younger | 46 | 45.66 | 1019.50 | .329 | | Not Significant |
| | Older | 50 | 51.11 | | | | |
| Civil Status | Single | 24 | 49.15 | 848.50 | .894 | 0.05 | Not Significant |
| | Married | 72 | 49.28 | | | | |
| Length of Service | Shorter | 36 | 49.25 | 1053.00 | .835 | | Not Significant |
| | Longer | 60 | 48.05 | | | | |

Table 16 compares the heads of schools as they practice instructional leadership in professional development, coaching, and collaboration for data-driven instruction, according to the age of them, civil status, and length of service, using the Mann-Whitney U test at the 0.05 alpha level. The result shows no significant difference in the findings across all groups, with p-values of 0.329 (age), 0.894 (civil status), and 0.835 (time of service). These findings suggest that teachers, by virtue of any demographic background, perceive the school heads' competencies in professional development, coaching, and data-driven collaboration similarly. This uniformity reflects the impact of standardized training, institutional policies, and leadership capacity because it contradicts individual demographic factors; hence, it supports the conclusion drawn by Dwiri and Okatan (2021) that leadership effectiveness relates more to structured professional development than age, civil status, or length of service.

**Comparative analysis in Level of Teachers' Work Performance when grouped and compared according to Profile**

**Table 17**

*Comparative analysis in Level of Teachers' Work Performance When Grouped according to Profile*

| Variable | Category | N | Mean | T-test | p-value | Sig. level | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age | Younger | 46 | 4.40 | -0.880 | .381 | | Not Significant |
| | Older | 50 | 4.43 | | | | |
| Civil Status | Single | 24 | 4.40 | - 0.416 | .678 | 0.05 | Not Significant |
| | Married | 72 | 4.43 | | | | |
| Length of | Shorter | 36 | 4.32 | - 3.116 | .002 | | Significant |

| Service | Longer | 60 | 4.48 |
|---|---|---|---|

Table 17 shows comparative performance work of teachers based on the independent t-test at a 0.05 alpha level by age, civil status, and length of service. Results obtained did not show differences in performance between younger and older teachers ($p = 0.381$) or by single or married teachers ($p = 0.678$), which both have p-values above 0.05. A significant difference was observed, however, with regard to years of service: teachers with less service (mean = 4.32) scored lower than those with longer mean periods of service (mean = 4.48; $p = 0.002$), thus indicating how favorable teaching experience is for performance. Findings strongly indicate that age and civil status do not significantly affect work performance as length of service does. This could be attributed to the benefits that accrue from accumulated experience and professional growth. This finding supports Pitpit's (2020) findings that teaching experience, more than demographic variables, leads to higher performance and shows the need for targeted professional development that supports emerging teachers.

**Correlational Analysis between the Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices and the Level of Teachers' Work Performance**

**Table 20**
*Relationship between the Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices and the Level of Teachers' Work Performance*

| Variables | N | Pearson-correlation | p-value | Level of Significance | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices | 96 | | | | |
| | | -0.88 | 0.398 | 0.05 | Not Significant |
| Level of Teachers' Work Performance | 96 | | | | |

Using Pearson's correlation coefficient, Table 20 shows the relationship between instructional leadership practices of school heads and teachers' work performance. Analysis utilizing an alpha at 0.05 yielded a correlation coefficient of -0.88 and a p-value of 0.398. While the coefficient indicates a negative relationship, the fact that thep-value exceeds the alpha threshold indicates there is no statistically significant correlation between the two variables. Therefore, instructional leadership practices of school heads in this study did not significantly impact teachers' work performance. Similar findings were observed by Soroñoa and Quirap (2023), who also found the relationship to be insignificant and believed that teacher performance

was more influenced by personal experience, professional development, and access to resources than by mere leadership practices.

## Conclusion

The study found that all attributed instructional leadership practices of school heads-such as curriculum design, instructional planning skills, classroom management, engagement, inclusive learning, professional development, and data-driven instruction-were considered equivalently across teacher demographics. The statistical treatments rendered through the Mann-Whitney U test and independent t-test showed that there exist no significant differences in the perception depending on age, civil status, and length of service, implying that school heads practice a uniform style of leadership, irrespective of the personal attributes of their teachers-a phenomenon that likely reflects strong adherence to institutional policies, leadership training, and professional expectations.

As for teachers' work performance, findings showed that age and civil status had no significant influence on performance levels. A significant difference, however, emerged with length of service concerning the performance rating, where more experienced teachers had higher score rating. This suggests that the teaching experience is vital in developing effective classroom practices and professional maturity. It also indicates that early-career teachers need targeted support and development opportunities to close the experience-related performance gaps.

Lastly, the relational analysis between school heads' instructional leadership and teachers' work performance found no statistically significant correlation. Though leadership plays an important role in shaping the school culture and giving it direction, the data may suggest that it does not have a direct effect on the performance of an individual teacher. Instead, it seems performance is more impacted by personal experience, the hosting of professional development, and the availability of instructional resources. These findings bolster the arguments made in the literature about sustaining a teacher's development alongside strong leadership structures to enhance education. This study suggests to strengthen continuous professional development programs for early-career teachers and ensure consistent implementation of instructional leadership practices to support overall teacher performance.

## Acknowledgment

## Conflict of Interest

The researcher declares no conflict of interest related to the conduct, authorship, or publication of this study. All procedures were carried out with academic integrity and without any financial, personal, or professional influence that could have affected the outcomes or interpretations of the research.

# References

Audisio, A., Taylor-Perryman, R., Tasker, T., & Steinberg, M. (2024). Does Teacher Professional Development Improve Student Learning? Evidence from Leading Educators' Fellowship Model. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness,* 1–40. https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2024.2361467.

Corpuz, B. (2016). Educational Leadership in the Philippines. *Manila: Rex Book Store.*

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., Gardner, M., & Espinoza, D. (2017). Effective Teacher Professional Development. *In Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.*

Darling-Hammond, L., Meyerson, D., Lapointe, M., & Orr, M. (2015). Preparing Principals for a Changing World: Lessons from Effective School Leadership Programs. *Preparing Principals for a Changing World: Lessons from Effective School Leadership Programs.* https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118269329.

Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2017). Resilient teachers, resilient schools: Building and sustaining quality in testing times. *Routledge.*

Dela Cruz, R. (2016). Factors Affecting Teachers' Work Performance in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Education,* 89(3), 45–56.

DepEd. (2015). *Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH).* https://www.deped.gov.ph

Dimopoulos, A. (2020). Educational Leadership Effectiveness. Is it a Matter of a Leader's Characteristics, Behaviors, or Leadership Style? *Journal of Economics and Management Sciences*, 3(1). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.30560/jems.v3n1p13

Dwiri, B., & Okatan, K. (2021). The Impact of Gender on Leadership Styles and Leadership Effectiveness. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR).* https://doi.org/10. 1419 - 1434.10.21275/SR21126183926.

Garcia, A. (2017). Instructional Leadership in Rural Schools: Impact on Teachers' Work Performance. *Journal of Rural Education*, 22(1), 34–50.

Gernalin, J. B., Bautista, M. A., & Maguate, G. (2023). Compliance with the code of conduct and teaching performance. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management,* 11(11), eL01. https://doi.org/10.18535/ijsrm/v11i11.el01

Grissom, J. A., Loeb, S., & Master, B. (2017). Effective Instructional Time Use for School Leaders: Longitudinal Evidence from Observations of Principals. *Educational Researcher*, 42(8), 433–444.

Grissom, J. A., Loeb, S., & Mitani, H. (2021). Principal Time Management Skills: Explaining Patterns in Principals' Time Use, Job Stress, and Perceived Effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 59(4), 451–469.

Guskey, T. R. (2018). Professional Development and Teacher Change. *Teachers College Press*.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal,* 86(2), 217–247.

Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. C. (2015). Assessing instructional leadership with the principal instructional management rating scale. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 47, 22–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2015.07.002

Hattie, J. (2015). Visible Learning for Teachers: Maximizing Impact on Learning. *Routledge.*

Kraft, M. A., & Blazar, D. (2017). Individualized Coaching to Improve Teacher Practice across Grades and Subjects: New Experimental Evidence. *Educational Policy*, 31(1), 103–147.

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

Li, X., Bergin, C., & Olsen, A. (2022). Positive teacher-student relationships may lead to better teaching. *Learning and Instruction*, 80(2022). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2022.101581.

Luna, R. (2019). School Climate and Teachers' Work Performance: An Analysis. *Educational Management and Leadership Review*, 12(2), 78–94.

Mendoza, A. (2019). Professional Development of School Heads: Implications for Instructional Leadership. *Journal of Philippine Educational Leadership,* 18(4), 123–138.

Murphy, J. (2019). Teacher Self-Efficacy and Work Performance: Exploring the Link. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 111(3), 432– 445.

Naval, C. (2017). Instructional Leadership in Philippine Rural Schools. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 10(2), 22–35.

Pitpit, G. M. (2020). Elementary School Principals' Instructional Leadership Practices to Retain Novice Teachers in the Philippines. *Walden University*.

Reyes, J. (2018). Impact of Instructional Leadership on Teacher Performance in Urban Schools. *Urban Education Journal*, 23(1), 56– 72.

Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2016). The Impact of Leadership on Student Outcomes: An Analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 52(3), 313–342.

Salvan, V. J., & Hambre, M. (2020). Teachers' Demographic Profile on the Learners' Performance Using the K-12 Earth and Space Module. *Journal of Education & Social Policy*, 7. https://doi.org/10.30845/jesp.v7n4p14.

Santiago, M. (2020). Instructional Leadership Practices in Public Schools: A Philippine Perspective. *International Journal of Educational Management,* 34(6), 1123–1139.

Santos, J., & Villanueva, J. C. (2020). *School Principals as Instructional Leaders: An Investigation of School Leadership Capacity And Effectiveness Of Instructional Supports.* https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.30276.86400.

Santos, P. (2018). Professional Development Needs of Filipino Teachers. *Philippine Teacher Education Journal*, 29(1), 91–104.

Sebastian, J., & Allensworth, E. (2019). The Influence of Principal Leadership on Classroom Instruction and Student Learning: A Study of Urban Schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 56(4), 783–814.

Sebastian, J., Allensworth, E., & Huang, H. (2018). The Role of Teacher Leadership in How Principals Influence Classroom Instruction and Student Learning. *American Journal of Education*, 123(1), 69–108.

Soroñoa, C. G., & Quirap, E. A. (2023). School Heads' Instructional Leadership And Teachers' Performance. *International Journal of Research Publications (IJRP),* 125(1), 356–366. https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP1001251520234916