

SCHOOL HEADS' INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND PERFORMANCE

Jade S. Eleccion, Educational Management
STI West Negros University
Bacolod City, Negros Occidental
jade.eleccion@deped.gov.ph

Abstract

This study examined the instructional leadership and performance of school heads in one City Schools Division in Negros Occidental during the School Year 2025–2026. Anchored on Full Range Leadership Theory and Cognitive-Achievement Theory, it determined the extent of instructional leadership practices, differences when grouped according to age, average family monthly income, and highest educational attainment, and the relationship between instructional leadership and performance. Using a descriptive-comparative and descriptive-correlational design, public elementary and secondary school teachers evaluated school heads through a validated questionnaire, while performance data were obtained from the Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF). Results showed that school heads demonstrated a very high level of instructional leadership in instructional supervision, learning resource management, and learning assessment and monitoring. No significant differences were found when grouped according to the selected profile variables. Instructional leadership was significantly related to school heads' performance. The findings highlight the importance of strengthening instructional leadership to enhance school performance and ensure quality education delivery.

Keywords: School heads, performance evaluation, instructional leadership, education full range leadership theory, cognitive-achievement theory

Bio-Profile:

Jade S. Eleccion holds a PhD in Educational Management and serves as Teacher III at Victorias National High School. His research interests are in management strategies, leadership styles, teaching and learning strategies, and curriculum analysis.

Introduction

Rationale

School leaders are really important for a school to do well. They make sure the teachers are teaching well. The students are learning. Around the world, people who work in schools say the person in charge is key to ensuring everyone knows what they are doing. They help the





teachers. Make sure everyone is always trying to get better. Some people, like Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins in 2020 that when school leaders are good at their jobs, students do much better. Instructional leadership is what makes this happen. It is really important for school success and learner achievement. School leaders and instructional leadership play a role in this.

In the Philippines, the Department of Education believes that school heads should be effective leaders of teachers. They have something called the Results-Based Performance Management System. This system checks how well school heads are doing their job. It looks at how they help teachers use test results to decide what to teach, manage resources like books and computers, and check whether students are learning. The Department of Education uses a form called the Office Performance Commitment and Review Form to see how well school heads are doing these things. Instructional leadership is a part of this. It means that school heads should mentor and coach teachers, use test results to inform what they teach, manage learning resources such as books and computers, and monitor how teachers teach and students learn. School heads should be strong leaders.

The City Schools Division of Negros Occidental understands the importance of instructional leadership. Not many people have looked into how instructional leadership affects the work of school heads at the division level. Some school heads in the City Schools Division of Negros Occidental are really good at leadership. They have done things that have helped teachers do their jobs better. Students learn more. People have even recognized them for this. There are many other good things that school heads are doing with instructional leadership that people do not know about. Instructional leadership is not written down. Talked about enough. The City Schools Division of Negros Occidental has school heads who are performing instructional leadership roles. They need to share what they are doing so others can learn from them. Instructional leadership is very important for school heads at the division level.

This gap underscores the need to systematically examine instructional leadership practices and their relationship to school heads' performance. Addressing this concern may provide an empirical basis for leadership development programs and strengthen instructional leadership, thereby enhancing school effectiveness and the delivery of quality education.

Literature Review\

School leaders have a job to do. They need to make sure the teachers are teaching well. The students are learning. People who study schools say that school leaders have to make sure everyone knows what they are working towards. They have to make sure what the teachers are teaching and how they are testing the students matches up with what the students need to learn. School leaders also have to make sure the school is a place to learn.

Garibay (2025) noted that school leaders need to do three things. They need to tell everyone what the school is trying to achieve. They need to make sure the teachers have programs to teach with. They need to make sure the school is a happy and supportive place for students to learn. Instructional leadership is very important for school leaders. Instructional leadership helps school leaders ensure students are learning and teachers are teaching well. The school heads have a role in ensuring the school operates consistently and improves. These roles



make school heads the people who drive the school to do things consistently and to improve it. School heads are very important for coherence and school improvement.

Leadership in schools is about more than one person. Nowadays, people think that leadership is about working and making big changes. According to Ng (2023), leadership for Learning is a model because it helps connect what the school wants to achieve to what actually happens in the classroom. This model is about shared leadership, where everyone works together to make sure the school is a good place to learn. It is also important to ensure that what is taught in the classroom aligns with the school's goals. Hallinger and Wang (2020) emphasized that leaders should be involved in classroom activities and ensure that the curriculum aligns with what is being taught. Leadership, for Learning and instructional leadership, is important because it helps schools become places to learn. These models show that the person in charge of teaching is not the one making decisions. The school as a whole is responsible for learning and teaching. This is a team effort, and instructional leadership is a part of it. The school works together to make sure everyone is learning. Instructional leadership is a part of this process.

School leaders have an impact on how teachers do their job. They do this by supervising teachers and helping them improve. Some people, like DiPaola and Wagner, did a study in 2018. They found out that good school leaders use a system to help teachers. This system includes giving feedback, showing teachers how to do things, and thinking about what they did.

There is a concept called supervision that helps teachers reflect on what they are doing and how they can do it better (Schön et al., 2023). Sebastian (2021) further confirmed that frequent classroom observations combined with constructive feedback enhance teachers' instructional methods, resulting in improved teaching effectiveness and learner performance.

Research shows that school leaders play a role in making sure students are learning. They have to watch how things are going and make decisions based on the information they get. Hallinger and Murphy said that school leaders are responsible for developing systems to assess how well the school is doing and to help teachers improve. Freeman (2021) found that when school leaders work with teachers to review the information together, it helps teachers improve their classes. Other scholars, such as Robinson and Leithwood (2022), emphasize that school leaders must ensure everyone works together to help the school improve.

They have to review the information and make decisions that will help students learn more. School leaders are very important in ensuring the school is a place where students can learn. In the year 2019, people said that when teachers get clear feedback, it helps them feel more confident in themselves and teach better. This is true no matter what the students are like. The school leaders play a role in making this happen. They ensure that the way teachers are assessed remains the same and fair. This helps teachers trust the system and do their job well. Instructional leaders are important because they guide teachers and help them improve. When teachers receive guidance, they teach better, which is good for students. The teachers feel more confident when they know what they are doing is right. This is what happened in 2019.

Instructional leadership is crucial for school leaders to do their jobs. Studies have found that effective school leaders make a big difference in how well teachers do their jobs, how much they learn, and how well students perform. For example, teachers perform better. Students get better results when school heads are strong instructional leaders. Instructional leadership is



connected to ways of leading, such as transformational and distributed leadership, that help people work together, learn, and navigate tough times. This is something that researchers like Boyce, Bowers, Harris, and Jones have talked about. Instructional leadership is key to improving schools. It is linked to how well schools can adapt to changes and keep going even when things get tough. Collectively, these studies affirm that instructional leadership is a critical determinant of school heads' performance and a foundational element in achieving sustained improvements in teaching and learning.

Theoretical Underpinnings

The theoretical framework is anchored on Full Range Leadership Theory and Cognitive Achievement Theory to explain instructional leadership and school heads' performance. Full Range Leadership Theory (Bass & Avolio, 1994) describes leadership along a continuum that includes transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire styles, emphasizing that transformational leadership is most effective in shaping instructional direction, motivating teachers, and fostering a positive learning environment. Cognitive Achievement Theory, on the other hand, posits that educational achievement is influenced by leadership decisions and the learning conditions they create, asserting that improved instruction and supportive leadership practices lead to better learner and institutional outcomes. Together, these theories provide a strong foundation for understanding how instructional leadership behaviors translate into enhanced school performance.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of this study is anchored on the relationship between instructional leadership and school heads' performance. It begins by considering selected profile variables of school heads—age, average monthly family income, and highest educational attainment—that may influence leadership perspectives and instructional decision-making. Instructional leadership is examined across three key dimensions: instructional supervision, learning resource management, and learning assessment and monitoring. These dimensions represent core leadership functions that directly affect teacher performance, curriculum implementation, and the quality of teaching and learning processes within schools.

School heads' performance serves as the outcome variable and is measured using the Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF), which reflects effectiveness in achieving institutional goals and instructional outcomes. The framework further establishes the relationship between instructional leadership and performance, as well as differences in instructional leadership practices across school heads grouped by profile variables. Overall, the framework emphasizes that strong instructional leadership practices are essential in fostering improved school performance and sustaining quality education delivery.

Objectives





This study aimed to determine the levels of instructional leadership and performance of school heads in one City Schools Division in Negros Occidental during the School Year 2025–2026. Specifically, it sought to describe the respondents' profiles in terms of age, average monthly family income, and highest educational attainment. It further examined the level of instructional leadership of school heads in instructional supervision, learning resource management, and learning assessment and monitoring, as well as the overall performance of school heads. The study also determined the level of instructional leadership among school heads, grouped according to the identified profile variables, and examined whether significant differences existed among the groups. Finally, it investigated the significant relationship between school heads' instructional leadership and their performance.

Methodology

This chapter describes the research design, the study's locale, the respondents, the validity and reliability of the research instrument, the data analysis procedure in relation to the specific objectives, and the statistical tools used.

Research Design

This study utilized a descriptive research design, specifically combining descriptive-comparative and descriptive-correlational approaches. These designs were selected to help the researcher explore and better understand school heads' instructional leadership practices and their overall performance in one of the City Schools Divisions in Negros Occidental during the 2025–2026 school year.

Study Respondents

The respondents in this study were 271 public elementary and secondary school teachers from one City Schools Division in Negros Occidental during the School Year 2025–2026. They were selected through stratified random sampling across 27 schools to ensure fair representation and reliable insights, as their daily interaction with school heads allows them to directly observe instructional leadership practices. In this study, school heads include principals, teachers-in-charge, or senior teachers designated to manage daily school operations, supervise instruction, and ensure effective teaching and learning. Gathering teachers' evaluations of their school heads provides a basis for assessing how instructional leadership influences overall school performance, as measured through the Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF).

Data Gathering Instrument

The study collected data using a researcher-made questionnaire designed to assess teachers' perceptions of school heads' instructional leadership and its relationship to school





performance. The instrument included demographic items—age, average family monthly income, and highest educational attainment—and items measuring instructional leadership across three dimensions: instructional supervision, learning resource management, and learning assessment and monitoring, rated on a 5-point Likert scale. Official performance data of school heads were obtained from the Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) for the 2024–2025 school year to ensure objective and standardized measures. The questionnaire underwent face and construct validation by five experts, achieving an Excellent validity index of 4.62, and its reliability was confirmed through a pilot test with 30 teachers, yielding a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.964 for instructional leadership. These procedures ensured that the instrument was both valid and highly reliable, providing a strong basis for examining how instructional leadership practices influence school heads' performance.

Data Gathering Procedure

Data were collected using a structured survey questionnaire designed to measure teachers' perceptions of school heads' instructional leadership in terms of instructional supervision, learning resource management, and learning assessment and monitoring. Respondent demographics, including age, average monthly family income, and highest educational attainment, were also collected to examine possible differences in leadership practices. School heads' performance was obtained from the Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) for the 2024–2025 school year to ensure objective and standardized evaluation. These procedures ensured that the instrument was accurate, reliable, and appropriate for analyzing the relationship between instructional leadership and school performance.

Data Analysis

After collecting the questionnaires, the data were tallied, encoded, and analyzed using SPSS, with statistical analyses aligned with the study's objectives. The respondents' profiles, including age, average monthly family income, and highest educational attainment, were summarized using frequencies and percentages to provide a clear picture of the demographic distribution (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The level of instructional leadership, encompassing instructional supervision, learning resource management, and learning assessment and monitoring, was assessed using mean scores on a five-point Likert scale, interpreted from "Low level" (1.00–1.49) to "Very High Level" (4.50–5.00) (Bluman, 2015). School heads' overall performance was measured using the Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF), with mean scores interpreted from "Poor" (1.00–1.49) to "Outstanding" (4.50–5.00). Differences in instructional leadership across demographic groups were examined using the mean, while significant differences in teachers' perceptions were tested with the Mann-Whitney U Test for non-parametric data (Pallant, 2020). Finally, the relationship between instructional leadership and school performance was analyzed using Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient to determine the strength and direction of the association (Cohen, 1988).



Ethical Considerations

This study adhered to a thorough and respectful ethics protocol to ensure the rights, dignity, and well-being of all individuals involved. Guided by principles of voluntary participation, informed consent, confidentiality, and responsible data handling, it fully complied with the Department of Education's guidelines, the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (RA 10173), and other relevant policies. Participation was entirely voluntary. Before answering the survey, each respondent was informed about the study's purpose, process, and their right to withdraw at any time without any consequences. No pressure or incentives were used. All responses remained anonymous and confidential, with no names or identifying information in the analysis or reporting. The data was used only for academic purposes, specifically to support the development of a relevant intervention plan, and was never shared with unauthorized individuals. Printed forms were locked away to protect the information, and digital files will be stored on password-protected devices accessible only to the researcher and their advisers. One year after the study ended, all data will be secured and permanently deleted, paper forms will be shredded, and digital files will be erased using reliable software. Before the study commenced, it underwent ethical review and approval by the Schools Division Office and the relevant academic body. Throughout every step, the researcher was committed to maintaining transparency, respect, and trust, ensuring that participants felt safe, valued, and protected throughout the study.

Results and Discussion

The data were further analyzed, presented, and interpreted to focus on the study's specific problem. It presents the study's findings using statistical tools and the analysis of descriptive and inferential data.

Instructional Leadership of the School Heads

Table 1

Level of School Head's Instructional Leadership in terms of Instructional Supervision, Learning Resource Management, and Learning Assessment and Monitoring

Areas	Mean	Interpretation
Instructional Supervision	4.57	Very High Level
Learning Resource Management	4.38	Very High Level
Instructional Assessment and Monitoring	4.53	Very High Level
As a Whole	4.49	Very High Level

In the area of instructional supervision, school heads had an overall mean of 4.57, indicating a very high level of performance. This suggests that they were highly effective in observing classroom practices, providing feedback, mentoring teachers, and ensuring instructional alignment with curriculum standards. These findings are consistent with Hallinger and Murphy (2019), who emphasized that regular classroom supervision and meaningful



feedback from school leaders enhance teacher effectiveness and instructional quality. Similarly, Sebastian, Allensworth, and Huang (2021) reported that school leaders' active guidance and support positively influence teacher performance and student outcomes.

For learning resource management, the overall mean was 4.38, reflecting a high level of instructional leadership. This indicates that school heads effectively provided and allocated instructional materials, supported access to digital resources, and mobilized external support for learning needs. However, there remains potential to further improve the maintenance and updating of learning resource centers to maximize teaching and learning benefits. These results align with Balyer (2019), who highlighted that strategic management of learning resources is essential for enhancing teacher performance, and Pont, Nusche, and Moorman (2020), who emphasized that equitable access to instructional materials and technology contributes to better student outcomes.

In the area of learning assessment and monitoring, school heads achieved an overall mean of 4.53, indicating a very high level of leadership. This reflects a strong commitment to promoting diverse assessment practices, analyzing student performance data, and utilizing results to guide instructional improvements. These findings support Hallinger and Murphy (2019), who stated that the effective use of assessment data by school leaders improves teaching decisions and overall school performance. Similarly, Ng and Nguyen (2020) noted that encouraging multiple forms of assessment fosters deeper student engagement and learning.

Overall, the school heads' instructional leadership across instructional supervision, learning resource management, and learning assessment and monitoring yielded a composite mean score of 4.49, which falls under the Very High Level category. This overall result underscores that school heads demonstrate exceptional leadership skills in these key aspects of instructional management, reinforcing their critical role in enhancing teacher effectiveness and improving student achievement.

School Heads' Instructional Leadership when grouped according to Age

Table 2

Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership in terms of Instructional Supervision, Learning Resource Management, and Learning Assessment and Monitoring when grouped by Age

Areas	Younger		Older		As a Whole	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
Instructional Supervision	4.55	Very High Level	4.58	Very High Level	4.57	Very High Level
Learning Resource Management	4.33	High Level	4.43	High Level	4.38	High Level
Instructional Assessment and Monitoring	4.47	High Level	4.58	Very High Level	4.53	Very High Level



	Very High	Very High	
as a whole	4.45 Level	4.53 Level	4.49 High Level

When grouped according to age, school heads' instructional leadership in instructional supervision was rated very high by both younger and older teachers, with overall means of 4.55 and 4.58, respectively. This indicates that school heads are highly effective in conducting classroom observations, providing constructive feedback, mentoring teachers, and ensuring alignment of instruction with the Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCs). The minimal difference in ratings may be attributed to varying expectations, as younger teachers may seek more detailed guidance and coaching, while older teachers tend to be more accustomed to established leadership practices. These findings support Hallinger (2019), who emphasized that active instructional supervision, feedback, and professional development enhance teacher performance, and Day and Gu (2020), who noted that supportive school leadership fosters sustained teacher growth and motivation.

In the area of learning resource management, overall mean scores reflected a high level of instructional leadership, with younger teachers rating school heads at 4.33 and older teachers at 4.43. This suggests that school heads effectively manage instructional materials, digital resources, and stakeholder support while ensuring alignment with instructional goals. However, slightly lower ratings in the maintenance and upgrading of learning resource centers indicate opportunities for improvement, particularly in modernizing and sustaining these facilities to better support teaching and learning. These results align with international and local studies, including Leithwood and Sun (2020), who highlighted that strategic resource management enhances teacher effectiveness and student outcomes, and Castillo (2019), Ramos (2021), and Delos Santos (2020), who found that effective allocation and maintenance of learning resources in Philippine schools strengthen curriculum implementation and learner performance.

For learning assessment and monitoring, younger teachers rated school heads at 4.47, interpreted as a high level, while older teachers provided a higher overall mean of 4.58, indicating a very high level of leadership. This reflects strong leadership in promoting varied assessment strategies, analyzing student performance data, and implementing follow-up actions to improve instruction. The slightly lower ratings related to facilitating the development and contextualization of assessment tools suggest a need for additional support and mentoring, particularly for younger teachers. These findings are supported by Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe (2019), who emphasized that school leaders' effective use of assessment data improves teaching and learning, and Hallinger and Wang (2020), who highlighted that integrating multiple forms of assessment ensures responsive and effective instructional practices.

Overall, the younger group had a mean of 4.45, while the older group had a slightly higher mean of 4.53. Both results fall into the Very High Level category, indicating that school heads are perceived as demonstrating strong instructional leadership regardless of age. The combined overall mean of 4.49, interpreted as a High Level of performance, further reinforces this finding. In summary, school heads, regardless of age, exhibit very high levels of leadership in instructional supervision and learning assessment. However, younger school heads tend to perform at a slightly lower level in learning resource management and instructional assessment



compared to their older counterparts, highlighting areas where targeted professional development and mentoring may further enhance instructional leadership and overall school performance.

School Heads' Instructional Leadership when grouped according to Average Family Income

Table 3

Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership in terms of Instructional Supervision, Learning Resource Management, and Learning Assessment and Monitoring when grouped according to Average Family Income

Areas	Higher		Lower		As a Whole	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
Instructional Supervision	4.58	Very High Level	4.55	Very High Level	4.57	Very High Level
Learning Resource Management	4.43	High Level	4.34	High Level	4.39	High Level
Instructional Assessment and Monitoring	4.56	High Level Very High	4.50	Very High Level	4.53	Very High Level
as a whole	4.52	Level	4.46	Level	4.49	High Level

As shown in Table 3, when grouped according to average family monthly income, school heads' instructional leadership in instructional supervision was rated very high by both lower-income and higher-income teacher groups. Lower-income teachers gave an overall mean of 4.58, while higher-income teachers rated school heads at 4.55. This indicates that school heads are highly effective in monitoring classroom practices, providing constructive feedback, mentoring teachers, and aligning instruction with the Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCs). The slightly lower ratings in classroom observation for higher-income teachers and in addressing instructional gaps for lower-income teachers point to specific areas where targeted improvement may be beneficial. These findings align with Hallinger (2019), who emphasized that effective instructional supervision and professional development directly enhance teaching quality, and Arlestig and Törnsén (2020), who highlighted the role of fairness and open feedback in supporting teacher growth.

In the area of learning resource management, both income groups rated school heads at a high level, with lower-income teachers giving an overall mean of 4.43 and higher-income teachers giving 4.34. This reflects strong leadership in providing updated instructional materials, ensuring equitable resource distribution, and supporting access to both digital and traditional learning tools. However, the lowest-rated indicator—updating and maintaining the Learning Resource Center—suggests room for improvement in modernizing and sustaining library and



learning spaces. These results are consistent with Hallinger and Wang (2020), who noted that strategic resource management enhances teacher effectiveness, as well as local studies by Castillo (2019), Ramos (2021), and Delos Santos (2020), which emphasized that well-managed learning resources contribute to improved instructional delivery and student outcomes.

For learning assessment and monitoring, school heads received very high ratings from both lower-income and higher-income teachers, with overall means of 4.56 and 4.50, respectively. This indicates strong leadership in promoting multiple assessment methods, analyzing student performance data, and ensuring appropriate follow-up actions to guide instructional improvement. The lowest-rated indicator, facilitating the creation and contextualization of assessment tools, highlights the need for additional professional development and technical support in this area. These findings corroborate Hallinger and Hosseingholizadeh (2019), who argued that effective school leaders utilize assessment data to inform teaching and school improvement. Local studies by Bernardo (2020), Torres (2021), and Dizon (2022) likewise demonstrated that data-driven instructional leadership enhances teacher performance and fosters a culture of continuous learning.

When the data are viewed holistically, the higher family income group obtained an overall mean score of 4.52, while the lower family income group registered a mean of 4.46. Both results fall under the Very High Level category, indicating consistently strong instructional leadership across income groups. The combined overall mean of 4.49, interpreted as a High Level of performance, further supports this finding. In summary, school heads in both higher- and lower-income groups demonstrate very high levels of instructional leadership in most areas, with only minor variations, particularly in learning resource management. Overall, the findings suggest that average family income does not significantly influence the instructional leadership levels of school heads, underscoring the consistency of leadership practices across diverse socioeconomic contexts.

School Heads' Instructional Leadership when grouped according to Highest Educational Attainment

Table 4

Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership in terms of Instructional Supervision, Learning Resource Management, and Learning Assessment and Monitoring when grouped according to Highest Educational Attainment

Areas	Lower		Higher		As a Whole	
	Mea n	Interpretation	Mea n	Interpretatio n	Mea n	Interpretation
Instructional Supervision	4.54	Very High Level	4.61	Very High Level	4.58	Very High Level
Learning Resource Management	4.38	High Level	4.39	High Level	4.39	High Level
Instructional Assessment and Monitoring	4.51	High Level	4.51	Very High Level	4.51	Very High Level



as a whole	4.48	Very High Level	4.50	Very High Level	4.49	High Level
------------	------	-----------------	------	-----------------	------	------------

As shown in Table 4, when grouped by highest educational attainment, school heads' instructional leadership in instructional supervision was rated very high by both teachers with undergraduate qualifications and those with graduate qualifications, with the former reporting an overall mean of 4.54 and the latter 4.61. This indicates that school heads are highly effective in conducting classroom observations, providing constructive feedback, mentoring teachers, promoting professional growth through Learning Action Cell (LAC) discussions, and ensuring instructional alignment with the Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCs). The slightly lower ratings in classroom observations across both groups suggest that the observation process may benefit from further standardization and clearer communication to enhance teachers' understanding and engagement. These findings align with Hallinger and Wang (2022), who emphasized that consistent instructional supervision and coaching improve teaching quality and overall school performance.

In the area of learning resource management, both teachers with undergraduate qualifications and those with graduate qualifications rated school heads at a high level, with overall means of 4.38 and 4.39, respectively. This reflects strong leadership in prioritizing updated and appropriate instructional materials, ensuring equitable resource distribution, mobilizing stakeholder support, and integrating digital learning tools. However, the lowest-rated indicator—updating and maintaining the Learning Resource Center or library—suggests room for improvement in sustaining and modernizing school facilities to better support instructional delivery. These results are consistent with Hallinger and Bryant (2021), who noted that strategic management of learning resources enhances instructional effectiveness, as well as local studies by Castillo (2019), Ramos (2021), and Delos Santos (2020), which emphasized that well-managed learning resources contribute to improved teaching practices and student outcomes.

For instructional assessment and monitoring, school heads received very high ratings from both groups, with teachers holding undergraduate qualifications giving an overall mean of 4.51 and those with graduate qualifications reporting 4.56. This indicates strong leadership in promoting multiple forms of assessment, analyzing student performance data, facilitating teacher collaboration, and ensuring appropriate follow-up actions based on assessment results. The lowest-rated indicator, facilitating the creation or contextualization of assessment tools, points to a need for additional support and professional development in developing localized, meaningful, and curriculum-aligned assessments. These findings corroborate Sun and Leithwood (2022), who argued that leaders who integrate multiple assessment approaches foster a culture of continuous learning, and Brillantes (2021), who highlighted that data-driven instructional leadership enhances accountability and responsiveness in schools.

When considered as a whole, the lower educational attainment group obtained an overall mean score of 4.48, while the higher educational attainment group registered a slightly higher mean of 4.50. Both results fall into the Very High Level category, indicating consistently strong instructional leadership across educational attainment levels. The combined overall mean of 4.49, interpreted as a High Level of performance, further reinforces this finding. In summary,



school heads demonstrate very high levels of instructional leadership across most areas, regardless of their highest level of educational attainment. However, a slight difference is evident in instructional supervision and assessment, with those possessing higher educational attainment scoring marginally higher in these domains, suggesting the added value of advanced academic preparation in strengthening instructional leadership practices.

School Heads' Performance

Table 5

Level of School Heads' Performance

Performance	Mean	Interpretation
School Heads	4.482	Very Satisfactory

Table 5 shows the overall performance level of school heads in the division, with a mean score of 4.482, interpreted as Very Satisfactory (VS) under the DepEd Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS). This rating indicates performance that exceeds targets by 15% to 29%, approaching the threshold for Outstanding, which exceeds targets by 30% or more (Department of Education). The results suggest that school heads are effectively fulfilling their roles in instructional leadership, financial management, and school governance, balancing administrative responsibilities with high-quality instructional practices, supporting teachers, managing resources, and maintaining learning environments conducive to student success.

The Very Satisfactory rating demonstrates that school heads consistently meet and often surpass expected standards, reflecting strong leadership across supervision, resource management, and assessment practices. While performance is commendable, there remains potential for further improvement. Advancing to Outstanding could be achieved by deepening stakeholder engagement, strengthening data-driven decision-making, and promoting collaborative, innovative school cultures, thereby further enhancing instructional quality and student outcomes.

These findings align with both international and local research emphasizing the critical role of effective school leadership. Hallinger and Wang (2020) and Day and Sammons (2018) highlighted that robust instructional and transformational leadership motivates teachers and improves school performance. Similarly, in the Philippine context, Brillantes (2019), Andaya (2020), and Llego (2017) reported that effective school heads foster teacher motivation, enhance curriculum implementation, support pedagogical practices, and cultivate collaborative and accountable school cultures. Collectively, these studies confirm that the high performance of school heads in this study reflects established evidence that strong leadership is a key driver of quality education.

Comparative Analysis of the Level of Instructional Leadership



Table 6

Differences in the Level of Instructional Leadership in the Area of Instructional Supervision when grouped and compared according to variables

	Instructional Supervision			Learning Resource Management			Instructional Assessment and Monitoring		
	<i>p-value</i>	<i>sig. level</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>sig. level</i>	<i>interpretation</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>sig. level</i>	<i>interpretation</i>
Age	0.626		NS	0.504		NS	0.223		NS
Average Family Income	0.283		NS	0.183		NS	0.220		NS
Highest Educational Attainment	0.546	0.0	NS	0.971	0.05	NS	0.602	0.05	NS

The analysis of school heads' instructional leadership across the areas of Instructional Supervision, Learning Resource Management, and Instructional Assessment and Monitoring revealed no statistically significant differences across age, average family income, or highest educational attainment. Specifically, the p-values for age were 0.626, 0.504, and 0.223 for instructional supervision, learning resource management, and assessment and monitoring, respectively; for average family income, the p-values were 0.283, 0.183, and 0.220; and for highest educational attainment, the p-values were 0.546, 0.971, and 0.602. All values exceeded the standard significance threshold ($p > 0.05$), indicating NS (not significant) differences.

These findings suggest that school heads maintain a consistent and equitable level of instructional leadership regardless of teacher characteristics. In instructional supervision, resource management, and assessment and monitoring, teachers' perceptions were largely uniform, highlighting the school heads' ability to apply consistent supervisory strategies, provide equitable access to learning resources, and promote effective assessment practices across the teaching staff. This consistency supports a culture of fairness, trust, and shared responsibility within the school community.

The results align with both international and local studies emphasizing the importance of leadership quality over teacher demographics. Harris and Jones (2018) and Day et al. (2019) highlighted that effective instructional supervision fosters shared understanding among teachers regardless of their backgrounds, while Hallinger and Murphy (2018) and Leithwood and Sun (2020) emphasized that equitable resource management and transparent assessment practices strengthen instructional leadership across diverse teacher groups. Similarly, Robinson et al. (2018) underscored that consistent assessment and monitoring practices enhance teacher



confidence and instructional quality, confirming that demographic differences do not hinder the effectiveness of strong school leadership.

Relationship between School Heads' Instructional Leadership and Performance

Table 7

Relationship Between the Levels of School Heads' Instructional Leadership and Performance

Correlation	Rho	Sig. level	p-value	Interpretation
Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership	0.114	0.05	0.572	Not Significant
Level of School Heads' Performance				

The results presented in Table 7 reveal that the relationship between the level of school heads' instructional leadership and their overall performance was not statistically significant, with a p-value of 0.572, exceeding the 0.05 significance threshold. This indicates that, within the context of the study, the instructional leadership practices of school heads did not show a statistically significant association with their performance ratings. While school heads engaged in various instructional leadership activities—such as supervising instruction, guiding teachers, and supporting curriculum implementation—these efforts did not translate into measurable differences in their overall performance.

This finding suggests that other domains of leadership—such as administrative management, community engagement, human resource management, and strategic planning—may have played a more significant role in shaping how school heads were evaluated or in determining their effectiveness in fulfilling their responsibilities.

The implications of these results highlighted the need for a more holistic approach to leadership development among school heads. Since instructional leadership alone did not significantly predict performance, capacity-building programs should integrate other leadership competencies, including organizational management, communication, planning, and stakeholder relations. Moreover, performance evaluation systems may require refinement to ensure that instructional leadership is adequately captured and aligned with expected outcomes. Additionally, the findings underscore the importance of contextual factors, as variables such as school resources, teacher cooperation, and community support could have influenced performance independently of instructional leadership efforts. Overall, these results reinforced the understanding that school leadership is multifaceted, and strengthening school heads' performance requires a balanced and integrated approach across multiple leadership domains.

These findings align with both local and global studies. Dela Cruz and Padilla (2021) highlighted that Filipino school heads are often rated more on managerial and administrative functions than on instructional leadership, which weakens the connection between instructional



practices and performance. Similarly, Torres (2022) noted that school leaders in the Philippines often prioritize administrative tasks due to excessive workload and systemic demands, thereby limiting the potential impact of their instructional leadership on performance outcomes. Globally, Hallinger and Wang (2020) noted that the impact of instructional leadership is highly context-dependent and does not always correlate strongly with performance indicators. Liebowitz and Porter (2020, p. 26) emphasized that effective leadership is multidimensional, with instructional leadership being just one of several domains that contribute to a leader's success. Supovitz (2020) also argued that instructional leadership becomes less predictive of performance when school heads face structural constraints that limit their ability to implement instructional reforms.

Conclusion

The study concludes that school heads in the division exhibit strong instructional leadership, with teachers perceiving high or very high levels of supervision, learning assessment, and curriculum support, contributing to their Very Satisfactory performance ratings. However, correlation analysis revealed no statistically significant relationship between instructional leadership and overall performance, indicating that while school heads effectively guide teaching practices, these efforts alone do not account for variations in performance outcomes. This suggests that other factors, such as administrative management, stakeholder engagement, or contextual challenges, may influence performance. Strengthening instructional leadership through consistent supervision, data-driven assessment, teacher mentoring, and professional development is recommended to enhance teaching quality and better align leadership practices with performance outcomes.

Acknowledgment

This endeavor will not become successful without the concerned effort and support of the following personalities. Dr. Democrito D. Juyamao Jr., Dean, STI-West Negros University-Graduate Studies, for the genuine and honest encouragement and for reminding the importance of professional development; Dr. Wilfredo Hermosura, the researcher's adviser, always shared her knowledge and provided constant support. Her helpful critiques and insightful suggestions significantly contributed to the development of this thesis. The researcher is thankful to Dr. Grace M. Abao, Dr. Jose Donnie S. Sajonia, Dr. Renith S. Guanzon, and Dr. Randolph L. Asistido, panel members of the oral defense, for their time and insightful feedback. Their expertise in the field has enriched the quality of this study. To the researcher's respondents for giving their precious time and for answering the test instrument to the best of their abilities; to Dr. Vince Paul Y. Lobaton, thank you for the guidance, reinforcement, and encouragement, especially in times of doubt. The researcher extends heartfelt gratitude to his mother, Dr. Fatima S. Eleccion, and grandmother for their unwavering love, understanding, and support. The researcher acknowledges his brothers' boundless love and support, which have been his constant



motivation, especially for his brother Jefs, who is in heaven. Manong, you will always be loved and be inspired by your selfless love for others. Above all, our almighty GOD for being my rock in the entire study process, and without His grace and blessings, this study would not have been possible. Thank you, God, for listening to his prayers and clearing the way for him to overcome every obstacle

Conflict of Interest

In relation to this study entitled “School Heads’ Instructional Leadership and Performance,” the researchers declare that there are no conflicts of interest. The researchers have no financial, personal, or professional relationships that could be construed as influencing the conduct, findings, or conclusions of the study. All phases of the research, including data collection, analysis, and interpretation, were carried out objectively and solely for the advancement of knowledge in this field.

References

- Andaya, E. (2020). Instructional leadership and school performance in Philippine public schools. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership*, 15(1), 45–60.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage Publications.
- Boyce, J., & Bowers, A. J. (2018). Toward an evolving conceptualization of instructional leadership as leadership for learning. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 56(2), 161–182. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-06-2017-0064>
- Brillantes, A. B. (2019). Leadership practices and school effectiveness in the Philippines. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 39(2), 216–230.
- Castillo, R., & Hernandez, J. (2019). Financial reporting and school head performance in Bicol. *Bicol University Journal of Education*, 3(2), 101–116.
- Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2019). *Successful school leadership*. Education Development Trust.
- DiPaola, M. F., & Wagner, C. A. (2018). *Improving instruction through supervision, evaluation, and professional development*. Information Age Publishing.
- Freeman, J. G. (2020). Data-informed leadership and instructional improvement. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(4), 620–636. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219833016>
- Hallinger, P. (2020). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(2), 263–273. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218817568>
- Hallinger, P., & Hosseingholizadeh, R. (2021). Exploring instructional leadership across cultures: A meta-synthesis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 59(3), 273–290. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-04-2020-0071>
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Instructional leadership: A conceptual perspective. *Educational Leadership*, 42(7), 1–8.





- Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. C. (2015). *Assessing instructional leadership with the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale*. Springer.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2019). Strategic planning and budgeting in English schools. *School Leadership & Management*, 39(4), 365–381.
- Leithwood, K., Sun, J., & Pollock, K. (2021). *How school leaders contribute to student success: The four paths framework*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-60777-5>
- Liebowitz, D. D., & Porter, L. (2020). The effect of principal behaviors on student, teacher, and school outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(2), 173–214. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X19881635>
- Llego, M. A. (2017). School leadership and instructional supervision practices. *DepEd Learning Resource Portal*.
- Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the mediating effects of teacher practices. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635–674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321509>
- Sebastian, J., Allensworth, E., & Huang, H. (2021). Principal leadership and teacher learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 57(4), 615–648. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X20961066>
- Supovitz, J. A. (2020). Building instructional leadership capacity. *Teachers College Record*, 122(1), 1–40.

