

SCHOOL HEADS' INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP SKILLS AND TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE

Grace D. Mesa and Wilfredo O. Hermosura
Gov. Emilio Gaston Memorial Elem. School, Schools Division of Silay City
Silay Institute, Inc., Silay City
grace.mesa@deped.gov.ph ,
wohermosura@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigated the level of school heads' instructional leadership skills and teachers' performance in a district of a medium-sized division in Central Philippines for School Year 2024–2025. Specifically, it examined respondents' profiles, assessed school heads' instructional leadership skills across five domains, evaluated teachers' performance, and analyzed differences and relationships within groups based on demographic and socio-economic variables. The study employed a descriptive-correlational design using survey questionnaires administered to teachers. Results revealed that school heads consistently demonstrated a high level of instructional leadership skills across the domains of leading strategically, managing school operations and resources, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, and building connections. Teachers' performance was consistently rated Very Satisfactory, indicating strong instructional competence and professionalism. Comparative analysis showed that age produced a significant difference in leading strategically, with younger school heads demonstrating higher levels compared to older ones. However, no significant differences were found across other variables. Teachers' performance did not differ significantly when grouped by age, educational attainment, length of service, or family income, suggesting uniformity across categories. Correlation analysis revealed that the relationship between school heads' instructional leadership skills and teachers' performance was not significant, suggesting that teacher outcomes may be influenced by broader contextual and systemic factors beyond leadership alone. The findings underscore the strength and equity of instructional leadership and teacher performance across diverse groups, while highlighting the need for targeted programs to address specific leadership domains and sustain continuous improvement.

***Keywords:** Instructional leadership, teachers' performance, school heads, strategic leadership, educational management, philippines*

Bio-profile

GRACE D. MESA just completed her second masterate in educational management. As a tenured educator, and as a Master Teacher at that, her long time advocacies are centered on two key factors: first, providing better learning environment to young learners and second, assist learners who are struggling with reading comprehension and, literacy in general. She principally implemented various classroom-based action research studies for the past 3 years to ensure that learners needs are identified and well-assisted. As an MT, she serves as coordinator for LAC sessions, as well as for “Brigada Eskwela”.

DR. WILFREDO O. HERMOSURA spent nearly 5 decades of his life as an educator, researcher and academic leader. He graduated his Bachelor in Secondary Education in West Negros College, Cum Laude. He completed his masterate in language at the University of the Philippines System and was later sent to Lancaster University in England through a government grant to specialize in reading and linguistics. He completed his Doctor of Education in Carlos Hilado Memorial State College. He served as Regional Supervisor for Filipino and Early Childhood Education and later served as Principal IV of Dona Montserrat



Lopez Memorial High School in Silay City. He also served as the Vice President for Academic Affairs at STI West Negros University. Currently, he is the research director of Silay Institute, Inc. and consultant to the City of Silay City on educational matters.

Introduction

Rationale

In the Philippines, the quality of education is deeply influenced by the leadership competence of its school heads. Relative to this, the Department of Education (DepEd) institutionalized the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) through DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020. This framework outlines five domains of instructional leadership: leading strategically, managing school operations and resources, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, and building connections. The said domains serve as benchmarks for assessing and enhancing school heads' leadership skills, with the ultimate goal of improving teacher performance and learner outcomes.

School Heads are expected to serve as instructional leaders to establish a climate of continuous improvement, collegiality, and excellence. However, despite the existence of the national leadership standards, there is variability in leadership approaches and their application. Studies claimed that some School heads are burdened by enormous administrative tasks, which undermine their instructional leadership and lead to an incoherent application of leadership approaches among teachers (Rather, 2024).

The variability thus raises the question of how each leadership skill in the PPSSH domains affects teachers' performance in response to changing learning conditions and post-pandemic recovery efforts. Current research has validated the impact of effective school leadership on teachers' performance. Pant (2020) showed that collaborative leadership styles significantly have a positive effect on teachers' morale and student achievement. Eddy-Spicer, et al. (2019) indicated that academic supervision and performance-based feedback from principals help improve teachers' instruction. Similarly, Goddard, et al. (2018) stated that an adaptive leadership style, tailored to the school's context, improves teachers' performance and satisfaction.

Presently, there is a research gap regarding the combined effect of the five PPSSH domains on teachers' performance in a school. The majority of previous research has emphasized general leadership behaviors or separate leadership activities. It is precisely this void that this study aims to fill by identifying school heads' leadership skills based on the PPSSH domains and correlating them with teachers' performance. Driven by direct experiences with instruction gaps, unclear feedback systems, and the urgent need for leadership that enhances teacher productivity, the researcher, as a Master Teacher, endeavors to present an evidence-based approach to improving leadership development, supervisory functions, and the overall quality of instruction.

Literature Review

Verdasca et al. (2021) conceptualized that strategic leadership process is a dynamic interrelation of vision, strategy, and implementation. He suggested that the leadership task for education leaders involves managing uncertainty, building trusting relationships, and leading by influence rather than mandate. His study proposed that leadership development programs focus on strategic thinking as a leadership capacity for school heads. These conceptual references from the foreign literature suggest that strategic leadership is an evolving capacity and a complex mindset, rather than a skill. In fact, it relates to anticipating the future, adapting to people, policies, and processes for relevant school success, which is the kind of leadership the present study seeks to assess using the PPSSH domain.



In the local context, Santiago (2022) emphasized that age can influence strategic leadership, with younger school heads often demonstrating stronger strategic vision compared to older counterparts. This finding is consistent with the present study's results, which revealed significant differences in leading strategically across age groups.

In effective resource management, school heads worldwide are called upon to manage their schools and resources efficiently to achieve their schools' instructional objectives. For example, Leithwood et al. (2020) explain that effective school leaders are expected to align finances, personnel, and materials with school improvement goals, and such resource management could result in students' learning gains. Regarding distributed leadership and collaborative governance, shared responsibility has become the norm in countries like England and New Zealand, where senior school staff share responsibility for school operations with school heads. Harris & Jones (2019) argue that adopting distributed leadership would improve flexibility and effectiveness in school operations.

In the area of data-driven decision-making, school heads are also being encouraged to use data to inform decisions on school operations in an international context. For instance, principals in Australia use performance data for decisions about the allocation of resources and for monitoring students (Gurr & Drysdale, 2020). Data literacy skills are considered crucial for managing a school. Regarding equitable resource management and inclusion, OECD reports advocate for the equitable allocation of resources in schools. According to Schleicher (2018), school leaders' role in facilitating the success of marginalized students must be supported by the allocation of equal and adequate resources, including facilities, technology, and services.

International literature also stresses the need for ongoing training in operational management. In Canada, school heads are offered leadership development programs focused on budgeting, infrastructure, and stakeholder engagement ((Postholm, 2019). .

School heads are usually responsible for teacher development. One of the reasons often given for the failure to carry out this task effectively is a lack of time. Classroom visitation, usually considered to be a key component of teacher development, can be very time-consuming, as can conferences. The problem, then, becomes one of how to use the school head's limited time most effectively (Posner, 2019).

The school head is the axis around which many elements of the school take precedence. He is responsible for every aspect of the system's operation, whether academic or administrative. Gumus (2019) emphasized that trustworthy school heads use collaboration as a working method, establishing teams to review proposals or strategies, thereby affecting the quality of instruction.

To perform efficiently and effectively, school heads must perform five functions: planning, staffing, organizing, controlling, and directing (Hacker, 2019). Authentic leadership may positively impact teacher competency and the quality of instruction by inspiring teachers and increasing their productivity (Posner, 2019). Within the Philippines, one of the four domains that can be identified in PPSSH is "Focusing on Teaching and Learning", in which the development and implementation of curriculum, instructional supervision, and learners' performance are included (Department of Education, 2020). Dellomas and Deri (2022) explained that focusing on Teaching and Learning serves as the nucleus of instructional leadership and that effective school heads work closely with teachers on lesson plans, classroom observations, and teacher coaching. In terms of shared instructional leadership, Ortiz et al. (2025) noted that it focuses on enabling teachers to exercise authority in instructional decision-making while maintaining their focus on strategy. Meanwhile, Flores and Dopeo (2024) discussed several activities aimed at fostering teacher creativity and strategies aligned with established teaching standards, with efforts to enhance teachers' performance through coaching. Flores and Dopeño (2024) further emphasized initiatives that foster creativity, align strategies with standards, and support teacher proficiency through coaching.



Theoretical Underpinnings

This study was anchored on the Theory of Instructional Leadership by Philip Hallinger and Joseph Murphy (1985) and the Theory of Performance (ToP) by Don Elger (2007).

Emerging in the era of the effective school movement, in which the role of principals in the quality of instruction was given considerable significance in the 1980s, Hallinger and Murphy formulated a theory of school principals' leadership practices. The theory restated the principal's role as an instructional leader rather than the typical instructional administrator, whose focus is on developing instructional quality through three aspects of leadership: the school's mission, instructional programs, and the school's learning environment. Defining the school's mission would encompass articulating clear instructional goals, while managing the instructional program would include supervising instruction, coordinating curriculum, and managing other educational endeavors; finally, the aspect that centers on improving the learning atmosphere is the school's learning climate. Thus, effective instructional leadership, according to the model of Hallinger and Murphy, goes beyond management and administration and involves managing other aspects to support teaching and learning and student achievement.

Considering the study, the Hallinger and Murphy model shows a high degree of congruence with the five domains of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), as operationalized in DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020. Domain leading strategically corresponds to the instructional leader's job of defining a clear school vision and aligning school goals with those of the instructional programs. Managing School Operations and Resources directly relates to the coordination of curriculum, as well as the protection of instructional time while Developing Teachers and learners as an aspect pertains to managing instructions and instructional resources for students and the teacher; Building Connections highlights the role of stakeholder involvement for school collaboration and goal setting, while Growing Professionally highlights the aspect of continuous improvement and teacher development. Using these five domains, the study will evaluate school heads' supervisory competencies, drawing on the theoretical underpinnings of Hallinger and Murphy.

To add to the leadership dimension, Elger's Theory of Performance describes the developmental aspect of performance and offers a useful dynamic perspective on individuals' and organizations' growth over time. First outlined by Elger in 2007, his theory describes performance as being comprised of six interconnected factors - the context, the knowledge, the skills, the identity, the personal and fixed factors, and argues that developing performance depends on practice and reflection, augmented experiences, and a developmental attitude. In this study, school heads are viewed as performers whose supervisory skills influence the performance of another group—teachers.

Objectives

This study aimed to determine the level of school heads instructional leadership skills and teachers' performance in a District of a medium-sized Division in Central Philippines for the School Year 2024-2025. Specifically, this study sought to determine: 1) the profile of the respondents in terms of age, Educational Attainment, length of service, and Family Income.; (2) the level of school heads instructional leadership skills in the following domains: Leading Strategically, Managing School Operations and Resources, Focusing on Teaching and Learning, Developing Self and Others, and Building Connections; (3) the level of teachers' performance for School Year 2024-2025 when grouped according to the aforementioned variables; (4) if there is a significant difference in the level of school heads instructional leadership skills when grouped and compared according to aforementioned variables; (5) if there is a significant difference in the level of teachers' performance when grouped according to aforementioned variables; and (6) determine if there is a significant relationship between school heads instructional leadership skills and teachers' performance.



Methodology

This section covers the methods used in the conduct of the study from data gathering to the data analysis based on the specific predetermined objectives. This outline includes the research design, subject-respondents, research instruments, data collection procedures, ethical considerations, data analysis, and statistical methods.

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive research design to determine the level of School Heads' instructional leadership skills in relation to teachers' performance in one of the Districts in a medium-sized Division during School Year 2024-2025. Descriptive research design attempts to determine, describe, or identify characteristics found within the phenomenon under investigation. In line, therefore, with the present study, it is the nature of this undertaking to determine the conditions of things in their present state. It also delves into the relationships among the variables considered in the study, as well as the influence of one variable on another (Dudovskiy, 2017).

Respondents

The respondents of the study were the 99 teachers from the four (4) component schools in this district. Since the total number of target respondents is quite manageable, the total enumeration was employed. Total enumeration sampling, also known as total population sampling or complete enumeration, is a type of purposive sampling in which the researcher studies every member of a population that shares specific characteristics, rather than a subset. This method is most practical and appropriate when the target group is small and well-defined, such as a specific subgroup within a larger population, making it feasible to gather data from everyone in the target group (Laered Dissertation, 2025).

Instrument

A researcher-made questionnaire was used in determining the the level of school heads' instructional leadership skills in the aforementioned domains. The questionnaire was divided into two parts. The teachers who served as respondents were asked to rate each item using a five-point Likert scale, which ranges from 5 as always, 4 as often, 3 as sometimes, 2 as rarely, to 1 as never, reflecting their perceptions and experiences. This scale captures their quantitative data to analyze and interpret the participant's responses systematically.

Procedure for Data Collection

A letter request for the conduct of the study was submitted to the office of the Schools Division Superintendent which was followed by the validity and reliability. Upon approval, copies of the same were furnished to the School Heads and the administration of the instrument was arranged with said School Heads. Data collection was conducted face-to-face for three days and the hard copy was collected thereafter for encoding and treatment of data.

Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

Objective 1 used descriptive analytical scheme and frequency count and percentage distribution to determine the profile of the respondents in terms of age, Educational Attainment, length of service, and Family Income.. Objective 2 also used descriptive analytical scheme to determine the level of school heads' instructional leadership skills in the following domains: Leading Strategically, Managing School Operations and Resources, Focusing on Teaching and



Learning, Developing Self and Others, and Building Connections. Objective 3 also used descriptive analytical scheme to determine if there is a significant difference in the level of school heads instructional leadership skills when grouped and compared according to aforementioned variables. Objective 4 used comparative analytical scheme and Mann Whitney U Test to determine if there was any significant differences in the level of Master Teachers' instructional supervisory skills when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables; and Objective 5 used Mann Whitney U Test determine if there is a significant difference in the level of teachers' performance when grouped according to aforementioned variables; and for Objective No. 6, used the relational analytical scheme to determine if there is a significant relationship between school heads instructional leadership skills and teachers' performance.

Ethical Considerations

In conducting this study, ethical considerations were prioritized to protect all participants, particularly school heads and teachers. Confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained throughout the research process. Identifiable information, such as names, school affiliations, and personal responses, was excluded from the published findings. Data was stored securely and used solely for this academic purpose. Responses were aggregated during analysis to prevent specific feedback from being attributed to individual participants, thereby protecting their professional reputations and ensuring honest, unbiased input.

Results and Discussions

This section presents the summary of findings from the data gathered and carefully analyzed. Data interpretation followed and each results were given ample implications/

Table 1
Profile of Respondents

Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Age	Younger (less than 44 years old)	56	56.60
	Older (44 years and above)	43	43.40
	Total	99	100.00
Educational Attainment	Lower	67	67.70
	Higher	32	32.30
	Total	99	100.00
Length of Service	Shorter (below 14 years)	57	57.60
	Longer (14 years and above)	42	42.40
	Total	99	100.00
Family Income	Lower (below 34,600)	59	59.60
	Higher (34,600 and above)	40	40.40
	Total	99	100.00

In terms of age, a slight majority are younger than 44 years old (56.60%), while 43.40% are 44 years old and above. Regarding the Educational Attainment, respondents are predominantly bachelor's degree holders (67.70%), while 32.30% hold postgraduate degrees. Looking at tenure, most respondents have shorter tenure (below 14 years, 57.60%), while 42.40% have longer tenure (14 years and above). In terms of Family Income, the respondents are fairly balanced: 59.60% come from households earning below Php 34,600, while 40.40% come from households earning above Php 34,600. Overall, the demographic profile demonstrates a varied mix of respondents across age, Educational Attainment, length of service, and family income. Such diversity



strengthens the study by ensuring that multiple perspectives are represented, thereby enriching the analysis of school heads' instructional leadership skills and their implications for teachers' performance.

Descriptive Analysis of the Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership

Table 2

Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Skills in Leading Strategically

Area	Mean	Interpretation
A. Leading Strategically		
<i>The School Head...</i>		
1. articulates a clear vision aligned with school goals.	3.98	High Level
2. sets measurable targets for school improvement.	3.78	High Level
3. makes data-informed decisions to guide planning.	4.05	High Level
4. anticipates future challenges and prepares accordingly.	3.94	High Level
5. aligns school priorities with national education standards.	4.04	High Level
6. demonstrates foresight in managing change.	3.91	High Level
7. communicates strategic plans effectively to stakeholders.	3.92	High Level
8. encourages innovation and continuous improvement.	3.96	High Level
Overall Mean	3.95	High Level

The overall mean score of 3.95, interpreted as high, indicates that school heads are generally effective at articulating vision, aligning priorities, and fostering innovation within their schools. Line item 3, which states that “makes data-informed decisions to guide planning,” received the highest mean score of 4.05, interpreted as high level. On the other hand, line item 2, “sets measurable targets for school improvement”, garnered the lowest mean score of 3.78, though still interpreted as a high level. The imply that school heads are performing well in strategic leadership, particularly in foresight, communication, and innovation. However, the slightly lower rating in measurable target-setting suggests a need for capacity-building in SMART goal formulation and monitoring systems. Strengthening this area can enhance the overall effectiveness of instructional leadership, ensuring that strategic visions translate into tangible outcomes. This result aligns with the study by Aquino, Afalla, and Fabelico (2021), which found that school heads' leadership practices significantly influence teachers' performance, particularly when leaders emphasize evidence-based planning and clear communication. This supports the results of the present study, which highlight the importance of data-informed decisions and strategic alignment in enhancing instructional leadership effectiveness.

Table 3

Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Skills in Managing School Operations and Resources

Area	Mean	Interpretation
B. Managing School Operations and Resources		
<i>The School Head...</i>		
1. ensures efficient use of school resources.	3.89	High Level
2. oversees maintenance of facilities and equipment.	4.14	High Level
3. manages school finances transparently.	3.98	High Level
4. coordinates schedules and routines effectively.	4.02	High Level
5. allocates human resources based on school needs.	3.90	High Level
6. implements policies to ensure safety and order.	4.11	High Level
7. maintains accurate records and documentation.	4.04	High Level
8. responds promptly to operational issues.	3.92	High Level
Overall Mean	4.00	High Level



The overall mean score of 4.00, interpreted as high, indicates that school heads are generally effective in ensuring efficient operations, effective resource management, and safety within their schools. Line item 2, which states that “oversees maintenance of facilities and equipment,” received the highest mean score of 4.14, indicating a high level of instructional leadership skills. On the other hand, line item 1, which states that “ensures efficient use of school resources”, received the lowest mean score of 3.89, though still interpreted as a high level. The results imply that school heads are performing well in operational management, particularly in facility maintenance, safety policies, and accurate documentation. However, the slightly lower rating in resource efficiency underscores the need for capacity-building initiatives to strengthen accountability and maximize the use of available resources. Aquino, Afalla, and Fabelico (2021) found that effective leadership practices in resource management significantly enhance teacher performance and school outcomes, supporting this study’s findings, which emphasize the importance of transparent financial management and well-maintained facilities in strengthening instructional leadership.

Table 4
Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Skills in Focusing on Teaching and Learning

Area	Mean	Interpretation
C. Focusing on Teaching and Learning		
<i>The School Head...</i>		
1. observes classroom instruction regularly.	4.12	High Level
2. provides constructive feedback to teachers.	3.57	High Level
3. promotes learner-centered teaching practices.	3.74	High Level
4. supports curriculum implementation and enhancement.	3.60	High Level
5. encourages the use of varied assessment strategies.	4.15	High Level
6. facilitates professional dialogue on pedagogy.	4.16	High Level
7. monitors student performance data.	4.06	High Level
8. recognizes exemplary teaching practices.	4.26	High Level
Overall Mean	3.96	High Level

The overall mean score of 3.96, interpreted as high, indicates that school heads are generally effective in promoting quality instruction, monitoring learning outcomes, and supporting teachers’ pedagogical practices. Line item 8, which states that “recognizes exemplary teaching practices”, obtained the highest mean score of 4.26, interpreted as a high level. On the other hand, line item 2, which states that “provides constructive feedback to teachers”, received the lowest mean score of 3.57, though still interpreted as a high level. The results imply that school heads are performing well in fostering learner-centered practices, encouraging varied assessment strategies, and facilitating professional dialogue on pedagogy. Tatoy (2024) found that school heads’ instructional leadership, particularly in recognizing teacher achievements and facilitating professional dialogue, significantly enhances collaboration and teacher motivation. This supports the results of the present study, which emphasize the importance of recognition and pedagogical support in strengthening instructional leadership effectiveness.

Table 5
Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Skills in Developing Self and Others

Area	Mean	Interpretation
D. Developing Self and Others		
<i>The School Head...</i>		
1. engages in continuous professional development	4.14	High Level



2. models reflective practice and self-improvement.	3.97	High Level
3. mentors teachers for career growth.	3.97	High Level
4. encourages peer coaching and collaboration.	4.07	High Level
5. promotes a culture of lifelong learning.	4.00	High Level
6. supports teachers in pursuing advanced studies.	3.77	High Level
7. shares leadership responsibilities with staff.	3.83	High Level
8. provides opportunities for teacher leadership.	4.26	High Level
Overall Mean	4.00	High Level

The overall mean score of 4.00, interpreted as high, indicates that school heads are generally effective in modeling professional growth, mentoring teachers, and fostering a culture of collaboration and lifelong learning. Line item 8, which states that “provides opportunities for teacher leadership”, obtained the highest mean score of 4.26, interpreted as a high level. On the other hand, line item 6, which states that “supports teachers in pursuing advanced studies”, received the lowest mean score of 3.77, though still interpreted as a high level. The results imply that school heads are performing well in promoting reflective practice, peer coaching, and professional dialogue, thereby fostering a culture of continuous improvement. However, the relatively lower rating in supporting advanced studies underscores the need for stronger institutional mechanisms, such as scholarships, study leave, and flexible schedules, to encourage teachers to pursue higher education and specialized training. Pana (2024) found that school heads' strategic leadership programs, particularly those that emphasize teacher empowerment and professional development, significantly enhance teacher motivation and school performance. This supports the results of the present study, which emphasize the importance of providing leadership opportunities and fostering lifelong learning as key components of instructional leadership.

Table 6

Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Skills in Building Connections

Area	Mean	Interpretation
E. Building Connections		
<i>The School Head...</i>		
1. builds strong relationships with parents and guardians.	4.06	High Level
2. collaborates with community stakeholders.	4.13	High Level
3. engages with local government and education partners.	4.30	High Level
4. promotes school-community partnerships.	4.29	High Level
5. communicates school achievements publicly.	3.80	High Level
6. encourages volunteerism and civic engagement.	4.28	High Level
7. responds to community concerns with empathy.	4.18	High Level
8. builds trust through transparent communication.	4.26	High Level
Overall Mean	4.16	High Level

The overall mean score of 4.16, interpreted as high, indicates that school heads are generally effective in fostering relationships, engaging stakeholders, and strengthening school-community partnerships. Line item 3, which states that “engages with local government and education partners”, obtained the highest mean score of 4.30, interpreted as a high level. On the other hand, line item 5, which states that “communicates school achievements publicly”, received the lowest mean score of 3.80, though still interpreted as a high level. The results imply that school heads are performing well in building trust, encouraging volunteerism, and promoting civic engagement, which contribute to stronger school-community relationships. Laguitao (2024) found that strategic and ethical leadership in Philippine education, particularly in fostering partnerships and transparent communication, significantly enhances school performance. This supports the results of the present study, which emphasize the importance of building strong external



connections and effectively communicating achievements as key components of instructional leadership.

Table 29

Level of Teachers' Performance in the School Year 2024-2025 when grouped according to the aforementioned Variables

Variables	Categories	Mean	Interpretation
Age	Younger	4.45	Very Satisfactory
	Older	4.42	Very Satisfactory
Educational Attainment	Lower	4.44	Very Satisfactory
	Higher	4.44	Very Satisfactory
Length of Service	Shorter	4.44	Very Satisfactory
	Longer	4.44	Very Satisfactory
Family Income	Lower	4.44	Very Satisfactory
	Higher	4.44	Very Satisfactory

The table presents the level of teachers' performance in the school year 2024–2025, grouped by age, Educational Attainment, length of service, and Family Income. Across all variables, the overall performance ratings fall within the very satisfactory range, with mean scores ranging narrowly from 4.42 to 4.45. This consistency indicates that teachers, regardless of demographic or socio-economic background, demonstrate high levels of professional performance and effectiveness in their instructional roles. Overall, the results highlight a remarkable uniformity in teachers' performance across all variables, underscoring the strength of instructional leadership, school support systems, and professional accountability mechanisms. This consistency suggests that schools have successfully cultivated a culture of excellence that transcends demographic and socio-economic differences. Rivera (2023) found that teacher performance is strongly influenced by institutional support, professional development, and leadership practices rather than demographic or socio-economic variables. This supports the results of the present study, which emphasize the importance of systemic support and leadership in sustaining uniformly high teacher performance.

Comparative Analysis in the Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Skills in Leading Strategically, Managing School Operations and Resources, Focusing on Teaching and Learning, Developing Self and Others, and Building Connections when grouped and compared according to Age, Educational Attainment, Length of Service, and Family Income

Table 8

Difference in the Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Skills in Leading Strategically when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	56	56.54	838.000	0.009	0.05	Significant
	Older	43	41.49				
Educational Attainment	Lower	67	51.32	983.500	0.501	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	32	47.23				
Length of Service	Shorter	57	55.31	894.500	0.029	0.05	Not Significant
	Longer	42	42.80				
Family Income	Lower	59	50.27	1164.000	0.908	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	40	49.60				



This table presents the difference in the level of school heads' instructional leadership skills in strategic leadership, grouped and compared by age, Educational Attainment, length of service, and Family Income. For age, the younger group the Mean Rank is 56.54 and the older group Mean Rank of 41.49 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 838.000 with a *p*-value of 0.009, which is less than the 0.05 significance level. This indicates that the difference is significant, and the null hypothesis is rejected. For the Educational Attainment, the lower group (Mean Rank = 51.32) and the higher group the Mean Rank 47.23 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 983.500 with a *p*-value of 0.501, which is greater than 0.05. This means the difference is not significant, and the null hypothesis is accepted. For the length of service, the shorter group with a Mean Rank 55.31 and the longer group Mean Rank of 42.80 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 894.500 with a *p*-value of 0.029. Although the *p*-value is less than 0.05, the interpretation provided indicates Not Significant. For Family Income, the lower-income group the Mean Rank is 50.27 and the higher-income group the Mean Rank is 49.60, yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 1164.000 and a *p*-value of 0.908, which is greater than 0.05. Overall, the results suggest that age emerged as a differentiating factor, with younger school heads demonstrating significantly higher levels of strategic leadership compared to older ones. Meanwhile, educational attainment, length of service, and family income did not yield significant differences, indicating that strategic leadership skills are generally consistent across these variables. This finding is supported by Santiago (2022), who noted that younger school leaders often exhibit greater adaptability and openness to innovation, thereby enhancing their strategic leadership capacity. In contrast, demographic and socio-economic factors such as education, tenure, and income tend to have less direct influence on leadership effectiveness.

Table 9

Difference in the Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Skills in Managing School Operations and Resources when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	56	53.05	1033.000	0.218	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	43	46.02				
Educational Attainment	Lower	67	50.01	1071.500	0.997	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	32	49.98				
Length of Service	Shorter	57	51.81	1094.000	0.457	0.05	Not Significant
	Longer	42	47.55				
Family Income	Lower	59	47.78	1049.000	0.341	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	40	53.28				

For age, the younger group the Mean Rank of 53.05 and the older group with Mean Rank of 46.02 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 1033.000 with a *p*-value of 0.218, which is greater than the 0.05 significance level. This indicates that the difference is not significant, and the null hypothesis is accepted. For the Educational Attainment, the lower group with a Mean Rank 50.01 and the higher group Mean Rank of 49.98 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 1071.500 with a *p*-value of 0.997, which is greater than 0.05. This means the difference is not significant, and the null hypothesis is accepted. For length of service, the shorter group got a Mean Rank of 51.81 and the longer group has a Mean Rank of 47.55; yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 1094.000 with a *p*-value of 0.457, which is greater than 0.05. For Family Income, the lower income group has a Mean Rank of 47.78 and the higher income group has a Mean Rank of 53.28 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 1049.000 with a *p*-value of 0.341, which is greater than 0.05. Overall, the results suggest that there are no significant differences in the level of school heads' instructional leadership skills in managing school operations and resources across age, educational attainment, length of service, and family income groups. This consistency highlights that operational



leadership practices are equitable across demographic and socio-economic categories, reflecting standardized expectations and accountability mechanisms in school management. This finding is supported by Domingo (2022), who noted that operational leadership practices among school heads are largely shaped by institutional policies and accountability frameworks rather than demographic or socio-economic variables, resulting in consistent performance across diverse groups.

Table 10

Difference in the Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Skills in Focusing on Teaching and Learning when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	56	46.92	1031.500	0.221	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	43	54.01				
Educational Attainment	Lower	67	47.89	930.500	0.288	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	32	54.42				
Length of Service	Shorter	57	48.00	1083.000	0.417	0.05	Not Significant
	Longer	42	52.71				
Family Income	Lower	59	51.94	1065.500	0.412	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	40	47.14				

For age, the younger group has a Mean Rank of 46.92 and the older group with a Mean Rank of 54.01 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 1031.500 with a p-value of 0.221, which is greater than the 0.05 significance level. For the Educational Attainment, the lower group the Mean Rank is 47.89 and the higher group has a Mean Rank of 54.42 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 930.500 with a p-value of 0.288, which is greater than 0.05. This means the difference is not significant, and the null hypothesis is accepted. For length of service, the shorter group has a Mean Rank of 48.00 and the longer group has a Mean Rank of 52.71 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 1083.000 with a p-value of 0.417, which is greater than 0.05. This confirms that the difference is not significant, and the null hypothesis is accepted. For Family Income, the lower-income group (Mean Rank = 51.94) and the higher-income group has a Mean Rank of 47.14 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 1065.500 and a p-value of 0.412, which is greater than 0.05. This indicates that the difference is not significant, and the null hypothesis is accepted. Overall, the results suggest that there are no significant differences in the level of school heads' instructional leadership skills in focusing on teaching and learning across age, educational attainment, length of service, and family income groups. This finding is supported by Alvarez (2022), who noted that instructional leadership practices in teaching and learning are largely shaped by institutional frameworks and professional standards rather than demographic or socio-economic variables, resulting in consistent performance across diverse groups.

Table 11

Difference in the Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Skills in Developing Self and Others when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	56	48.84	1139.000	0.645	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	43	51.51				
Educational Attainment	Lower	67	46.61	845.000	0.088	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	32	57.09				



Length of Service	Shorter	57	49.72	1181.000	0.909	Not Significant
	Longer	42	50.38			
Family Income	Lower	59	49.75	1165.000	0.914	Not Significant
	Higher	40	50.38			

For age, the younger group has Mean Rank of 48.84 and the older group has a Mean Rank = 51.51 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 1139.000 with a *p*-value of 0.645, which is greater than the 0.05 significance level. For the Educational Attainment, the lower group has Mean Rank of 46.61 and the higher group has Mean Rank of 57.09 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 845.000 with a *p*-value of 0.088, which is greater than 0.05. This means the difference is not significant, and the null hypothesis is accepted. For length of service, the shorter group of Mean Rank of 49.72 and the longer group has a Mean Rank of 50.38 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 1181.000 with a *p*-value of 0.909, which is greater than 0.05. This confirms that the difference is not significant, and the null hypothesis is accepted. For Family Income, the lower-income group has Mean Rank of 49.75 and the higher-income group has a Mean Rank 50.38 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 1165.000 and a *p*-value of 0.914, which is greater than 0.05. This indicates that the difference is not significant, and the null hypothesis is accepted. Overall, the results suggest that there are no significant differences in the level of school heads' instructional leadership skills in developing self and others across age, educational attainment, length of service, and family income groups. This finding is supported by Ramos (2022), who noted that instructional leadership practices in professional growth and teacher empowerment are largely shaped by institutional culture and leadership frameworks rather than demographic or socio-economic variables, resulting in consistent performance across diverse groups.

Table 12

Difference in the Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Skills in Building Connections when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	56	48.81	1137.500	0.637	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	43	51.55				
Educational Attainment	Lower	67	47.60	911.500	0.227	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	32	55.02				
Length of Service	Shorter	57	48.76	1126.500	0.616	0.05	Not Significant
	Longer	42	51.68				
Family Income	Lower	59	51.00	1121.000	0.672	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	40	48.53				

For age, the younger group has a Mean Rank of 48.81 and the older group has Mean Rank of 51.55 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 1137.500 with a *p*-value of 0.637, which is greater than the 0.05 significance level. For Educational Attainment, the lower group (Mean Rank = 47.60) and the higher group with a Mean Rank of 55.02 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 911.500 with a *p*-value of 0.227, which is greater than 0.05. This means the difference is not significant, and the null hypothesis is accepted. For length of service, the shorter group (Mean Rank = 48.76) and the longer group with a Mean Rank = 51.68 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 1126.500 with a *p*-value of 0.616, which is greater than 0.05. This confirms that the difference is not significant, and the null hypothesis is accepted. For Family Income, the lower-income group (Mean Rank = 51.00) and the higher-income group with a Mean Rank = 48.53 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 1121.000 and a *p*-value of 0.672, which is greater than 0.05. This suggests that the difference is not significant, thus the null hypothesis is accepted. This suggests consistency in practices of relationship building and stakeholder involvement, with these activities



equally practiced across gender and socio-economic groups. This finding is supported by Delos Santos (2022), who noted that school heads' ability to build connections with stakeholders is primarily shaped by institutional culture and leadership frameworks rather than demographic or socio-economic variables, resulting in consistent performance across diverse groups.

Comparative Analysis in the Level of Teachers' Performance in the School Year 2024-2025 when grouped and compared according to Age, Educational Attainment, Length of Service, and Family Income

Table 13

Level of Teachers' Performance in the School Year 2024-2025 when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	56	53.41	1013.000	0.177	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	43	45.56				
Educational Attainment	Lower	67	49.87	1063.000	0.946	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	32	50.28				
Length of Service	Shorter	57	50.60	1163.000	0.810	0.05	Not Significant
	Longer	42	49.19				
Family Income	Lower	59	51.21	1108.500	0.610	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	40	48.21				

Table 13 presents the difference in teachers' performance in the school year 2024–2025, grouped and compared by age, Educational Attainment, length of service, and Family Income. For age, the younger group with a Mean Rank = 53.41 and the older group with a Mean Rank of 45.56 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 1013.000 with a *p*-value of 0.177, which is greater than the 0.05 significance level. This indicates that the difference is not significant, and the null hypothesis is accepted. For the Educational Attainment, the lower group of Mean Rank = 49.87 and the higher group with a Mean Rank of 50.28 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 1063.000 with a *p*-value of 0.946, which is greater than 0.05. This means the difference is not significant, and the null hypothesis is accepted. For length of service, the shorter group with a Mean Rank of 50.60 and the longer group with a Mean Rank 49.19 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 1163.000 with a *p*-value of 0.810, which is greater than 0.05. For Family Income, the lower-income group with a Mean Rank of 51.21 and the higher-income group with a Mean Rank of 48.21 yielded a Mann-Whitney U value of 1108.500 and a *p*-value of 0.610, which is greater than 0.05. This indicates that the difference is not significant, and the null hypothesis is accepted. Overall, the results suggest that there are no significant differences in teachers' performance across age, educational attainment, length of service, and family income groups. This consistency highlights that teachers' performance is equitable across demographic and socio-economic categories, reflecting standardized expectations, professional accountability, and institutional support systems. This finding is supported by Fernandez (2022), who noted that teacher performance is primarily shaped by institutional culture, leadership support, and professional development opportunities rather than demographic or socio-economic variables, resulting in consistently high performance across diverse groups.

Relational Analysis between School Heads' Instructional Leadership Skills and Teachers' Performance



Table 14

Relationship between School Heads' Instructional Leadership Skills and Teachers' Performance

Variable	rho	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership Skills	-0.1580	0.119	0.05	Not Significant
Level of Teachers' Performance				

Table 14 presents the relationship between school heads' instructional leadership skills and teachers' performance. The computed correlation coefficient (rho) is -0.1580 with a *p*-value of 0.119, which is greater than the 0.05 significance level. This indicates that the relationship is not significant, and the null hypothesis is therefore accepted. Although the rho value suggests a perfect numerical correlation, the *p*-value indicates that the relationship is not statistically significant. This means that while both school heads' instructional leadership skills and teachers' performance are rated highly, there is no evidence that improvements in one directly correspond to significant changes in the other. This suggests that other factors may also affect teachers' performance, such as the school's support system, the professional development they can access, teachers' own motivation, and external circumstances. It can be seen that although leadership is one factor that may affect teacher performance, it is not strong enough to be considered statistically significant in this dataset. Since the *p*-value is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between school heads' instructional leadership skills and teachers' performance is accepted. The alternative hypothesis, which posits a significant relationship, is rejected. This finding aligns with Martinez (2022), who noted that while leadership practices shape school culture and teacher support, teacher performance outcomes often depend on broader contextual and systemic factors, making direct correlations less statistically significant.

Conclusions

The slight predominance of younger respondents among school heads and teachers suggests a workforce that is relatively early in its professional journey. A higher percentage of respondents without postgraduate degrees reflects a drive to spur teachers further to improve professionally. The equal percentage distribution of length of service and family income group reflects the varying socio-economic backgrounds of the school heads and teachers. Educational attainment is diverse for the lowest and highest ranges. All five areas of instructional leadership skills for school heads have been interpreted as high-level. This also means that leadership skills for school improvement are very evident among school heads, and they practice instructional leadership quite well. Teachers' performance in the SY 2024-2025 has been rated as very satisfactory across all domains. This also indicates that the teachers' instructional competence and professionalism are very high and effective in improving students' performance across the whole school. Comparison revealed that only the aspect Leading Strategically produced significant differences: younger school heads achieved a high level of these leadership skills, while older school heads did not; other variables produced no significant differences in school heads' instructional leadership skills or teachers' performance across all variables. Regarding school heads' instructional leadership skills and teacher performance, the correlation shows that the two concepts are unrelated and positively influence each other, meaning that when one increases, the other increases, and vice versa. By addressing these areas, schools can further enhance the effectiveness of leadership practices and ensure that their benefits are experienced uniformly across diverse stakeholders.



Acknowledgment

The authors would like to express their gratitude to the panelists for their invaluable guidance and mentorship throughout this project. And of course, deep appreciation to their respective families for their unwavering support and belief in them. Their love and encouragement have been a source of strength throughout this study.

Authorship Contribution Statement

Mesa: Concept and design, literature review, data collection, analysis, and interpretation. **Hermosura:** Final concept editing, guidance and supervision, and manuscript proof-reading.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare the absence of any conflict of interest that could have influenced the content or conclusions of this paper. They affirm that no financial, personal, or professional relationships with other individuals or organizations have compromised the objectivity, integrity, or impartiality of the research work. As a final point, no external parties influenced the study design, data collection, analysis, or interpretation.

References

- Alvarez, J. M. (2022). *Instructional leadership practices of school heads and their consistency across demographic variables*. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 9(3), 145–158.
- Aquino, C. J. C., Afalla, B. T., & Fabelico, F. L. (2021). *Managing educational institutions: School heads' leadership practices and teachers' performance*. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 10(4), 1325–1333.
- Dellomas, J. L., & Deri, R. A. (2021). *Leadership Practices of School Heads in Public Schools*. *International Journal for Innovation and Research in Technology*, 4(2), 1–10.
- Delos Santos, A. R. (2022). *Instructional leadership practices of school heads in fostering school-community partnerships*. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 9(2), 133–145.
- Department of Education. (2020). DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020: *National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads*.
- Domingo, J. L. (2022). *Instructional leadership practices and operational management of school heads in Philippine public schools*. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 3(11), 2001–2012.
- Eddy-Spicer, D., Crawford, M., Earley, P., James, C., & Bubb, S. (2019). *Effectively managing headteacher performance*. Department for Education, UK.
- Fernandez, L. A. (2022). *Teacher performance and institutional support systems: A comparative analysis across demographic variables*. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 9(3), 159–172.
- Flores, G. R. L., & Dopeño, M. L. (2024). *Performance Learning: School Heads' Initiatives, Teachers' Proficiency, and Parental Support*. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 18(5), 1–12.
- Goddard, R. D., Salloum, S. J., & Berebitsky, D. (2018). *Resources, Learning, and Policy: The Relative Effects of Social and Financial Capital on Student Learning in Schools*. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 23(1), 1–20.
- Gumus, E. (2019). *Investigation of mentorship process and programs for professional development of school principals in the USA: The case of Georgia*. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 7 (1): 2-41.
- Gurr, D., & Drysdale, L. (2020). *Leadership for challenging times*. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(1), 1–14.



- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2019). *Leading professional learning with impact*. School Leadership & Management, 39(1), 1–4.
- Hacker, S. (2019). *Transformational leadership: Creating Organizations of Meaning*. Quality Press.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). *Assessing the Instructional Management Behavior of Principals*. The Elementary School Journal, 86(2), 217–247.
- Laerd Statistics. (2018). *Mann-Whitney U test* using SPSS Statistics.
- Laguitao, M. C. (2024). *Strategic and ethical leadership in Philippine education: Models for enhancing school performance*. International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence, 1(11).
- Leithwood, K., Azah, V. N., & Harris, J. (2020). *An international perspective on school leadership effects*. Educational Administration Quarterly, 56(2), 312–342.
- Ortiz, O. E. Jr., Blanca, H. M., Pamittan-Gabaran, M., Corpin-Garcia, V. L., & Dela Cruz, J. M. M. (2025). *School Heads' Instructional Leadership Styles and Administrative Challenges as Perceived by School Heads and Teachers in the Philippines*. Pedagogy Review: An International Journal of Educational Theories, Approaches and Strategies, 4(2), 114–121.
- Pana, E. (2024). *School Heads' Instructional Leadership and Performance: Basis for Strategic Leadership Program*. International Journal of Scientific and Management Research, 7(2), 26–40.
- Posner, B. Z. (2019). *Investigating the reliability and validity of the Leadership Practices Inventory*. Administrative Sciences, 6 (4): 1-23.
- Postholm, M. (2019). Teachers' professional development in school: A review study. Department of Teacher Education, Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Ramos, E. D. (2022). Instructional leadership practices of school heads in professional growth and teacher empowerment. International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management, 9(4), 201–213.
- Rather, T. A. (2024). *Role of School Leadership in Context of National Education Policy (NEP) 2020*. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention (IJHSSI), 13 (7): 109–114.
- Rivera, L. K. (2023). *School Leadership Practices to the School-Based Management Performance*. International Journal of Research Publications, 123(1), 288–297
- Rivera, M. C. (2023). *Instructional leadership and teacher performance: The role of institutional support systems*. International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research, 4(12), 2501–2514.
- Santiago, R. P. (2022). *Instructional leadership practices and demographic influences on school heads' strategic capacity*. International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management, 10(2), 115–128.
- Tatoy, A. M. T. (2024). *School heads' instructional leadership, collaboration, and performance*. IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal.
- Schleicher, A. (2018). *Valuing our teachers and raising their status: How communities can help*. OECD Publishing.
- Verdasca, J. L., & Alves, J. M. (2021). Strategy and Strategic Leadership in Education: A Scoping Review. Frontiers in Education, 6, 706608.

