

School Heads' Administrative and Instructional Supervision Skills and Teachers' Performance

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17119941

Octavio P. Cabio, Jr.

Principal 2, Bais City Pilot School

<https://orcid.org/0009-0000-9395-0870>

Dr. Anelito A. Bongcawil

Public School Division Superintendent, Division of Bayawan, Department of Education, Philippines

<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-7925-8667>

Abstract:

The study examined the relationship between school heads' administrative skills, to each of the instructional supervision, and teachers' performance in selected elementary and secondary schools. Respondents' profile included sex, age, length of service, and plantilla position-revealed a diverse teaching workforce, with majority of female teachers and a balanced distribution across age and length of service. Using a descriptive-correlational design and a researcher-made questionnaire, the study assessed school heads' competencies in budgeting and financial management, human resource management, and facilities management, all of which were rated at a high level by teacher-respondents. Instructional supervision, measured through curriculum implementation, curriculum management, and assessment of learning, was likewise rated highly. Comparative analyses showed that administrative and supervisory skills remained consistently strong when grouped by respondent variables. Teachers' performance levels were also found to be high, with no significant differences observed when grouped by demographic variables. Statistical tests indicated no significant differences in school heads' administrative or supervisory skills, nor in teachers' performance, across the various profile groupings. However, a significant relationship was found between school heads' administrative skills and teachers' performance, as well as between instructional supervision and teachers' performance. These findings highlight the crucial role of effective school leadership in fostering teacher success and suggest the need for ongoing professional development and strategic leadership practices to sustain high standards in educational management and instructional supervision.

Keywords: Administrative Skills, Instructional Supervision, Teachers Performance

Introduction:

Nature of the Problem

The Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001 (RA 9155) clearly defines the dual responsibility of school heads as both administrative managers and instructional leaders. This dual role highlights the importance of balancing organizational efficiency with instructional effectiveness to ensure the overall success of schools. Managerial skills such as planning, organizing, staffing, and directing are vital in sustaining day-to-day operations and aligning resources with educational priorities (Giami & Obiechina, 2019; Earl & Fullan, 2003). Globally, the role of school leaders has shifted toward accountability and measurable performance, with emphasis on the ability of principals to ensure quality outcomes for both teachers and students (Abdurahman & Omar, 2021; Education Development Trust, 2016). Effective financial management ensures that scarce resources are strategically allocated to priority programs, while human resource management and facilities management strengthen teaching capacity and provide a safe, conducive environment for learning. Collectively, these administrative skills serve as the foundation of school operations, sustaining growth and stability in educational delivery.

At the same time, school heads are expected to exercise instructional supervision, which includes curriculum implementation, classroom management, and assessment of learning. Instructional supervision ensures that the written curriculum is effectively translated into classroom practice, that instruction aligns with standards, and that assessment results are used to guide continuous improvement in teaching and learning. As Kutsyuruba (2003) notes, supervision plays a vital role in teacher development, which directly impacts student outcomes. However, many school heads face challenges in providing consistent feedback and balancing their administrative duties with instructional leadership. This imbalance can hinder teacher growth and weaken the overall performance of the school.

Given these realities, the effectiveness of school leadership depends on the interplay of administrative skills and instructional supervision. School heads must not only manage resources and operations but also provide guidance, support, and feedback to teachers to improve instructional practices. Their leadership practices directly influence teacher performance and, ultimately, student achievement. These considerations prompted the present researcher

to examine the levels of administrative skills and instructional supervision of school heads and to analyze how these factors affect teachers' performance in the context of basic education.

Current State of Knowledge

Administrative and leadership skills are essential in education, with research showing that they go beyond personality traits and can be deliberately developed. Beenen et al. (2021) validated a Managerial Interpersonal Skills (MIPS) model—supporting, motivating, and managing conflict—that significantly predicts performance, emphasizing that “people-handling” is a distinctive and trainable skill. Similarly, the OECD (2016) highlights instructional leadership, resource management, and stakeholder engagement as core administrative competencies strongly linked to school improvement. Leadership development is, however, uneven, as Kragt and Day (2020) demonstrated that competencies follow different growth trajectories and that a strong leader identity predicts greater skill development and career advancement. This underscores the importance of targeted experiences such as stretch assignments, identity work, and feedback-rich roles in strengthening administrative competencies, including planning, coordination, conflict management, and learning orientation.

Instructional supervision is another key component of educational leadership that significantly impacts teaching and learning. It provides teachers with guidance, support, and empowerment, enabling professional development and improved classroom instruction (Yudhie et al., 2023; Tyagi, 2015). Effective supervision has been shown to directly influence student academic achievement (Babalola & Hafsatu, 2016; Hoffman & Tesfaw, 2014) by enhancing curriculum implementation, teacher collegiality, and pedagogical practices (Kuizon & Reyes, 2014; Limon, 2015; Santos, 2023). As mandated by RA 9155, principals must serve as instructional leaders and administrative managers, overseeing teaching strategies, curriculum delivery, and teacher growth. The Department of Education further stresses that supervision should be carried out by competent and capable school heads who prioritize teachers' needs as curriculum implementers (Sumapal et al., 2023).

Teacher performance, in turn, is a central determinant of educational quality and student achievement. It encompasses both quantitative aspects, such as teaching hours and research output, and qualitative elements, such as instructional excellence and innovation (Ratnasari et al., 2019). Research consistently shows that highly effective teachers are crucial for delivering quality education and raising learning outcomes (Johnson et al., 2021; Maritasari et al., 2020; Popović et al., 2020; Rachmah & Putrawan, 2018). Teacher performance is reflected in lesson planning, implementation, and evaluation (Afandi et al., 2021), and it significantly affects student interest and motivation, particularly in challenging subjects like mathematics (Tambunan et al., 2021). Performance evaluation must therefore include teachers' morality, work ethic, competence, and research productivity (Zheng & Sun, 2022; Ishak & Suyatno, 2020). To sustain quality education, teachers are encouraged to engage in self-reflection and professional development while receiving strong institutional and leadership support (Trostek, 2020; Obreque et al., 2019).

In the Philippine context, teacher quality is guided by the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), which replaced the National Competency-Based Teacher Standards (NCBTS) under DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017. The PPST sets clear expectations for professional learning, competent practice, and effective engagement, with findings confirming a positive correlation between PPST proficiency and teaching performance (Gepila, 2020). Teachers are recognized as catalysts of national development, making it essential to uphold high teaching standards for sustainable nation-building. Recent studies have further examined how leadership and administrative practices affect teacher outcomes. Sedigo et al. (2024) found that while school heads displayed strong conflict management skills, these were not directly related to teacher performance, emphasizing the need for principals to strengthen collaborative leadership. Gernalin (2023) reported that compliance with the Code of Conduct significantly correlated with teacher performance, highlighting teachers' moral responsibility and accountability, and proposed a Teachers Development Program to sustain effectiveness. Meanwhile, Ban (2025) showed that although school heads demonstrated strong financial management practices, these did not significantly influence teacher performance, suggesting that pedagogical development, institutional support, and leadership engagement play a more critical role in sustaining teacher effectiveness than fiscal management alone.

Theoretical Underpinnings

This study was anchored on several theories that emphasize leadership, supervision, motivation, and management in education. Transformational Leadership Theory highlighted the role of leaders in inspiring teachers, fostering collaboration, and driving professional growth, which in turn enhanced teacher motivation and performance. Financial Management principles stressed the importance of strategic allocation of resources to support instructional priorities and improve student learning, while Human Resource Management underscored the need for effective recruitment, development, and retention of teachers and staff. Facilities Management theory further emphasized that well-managed physical resources create a conducive environment for teaching and learning. Complementing these was

Schön's Clinical Supervision Theory, which promoted reflective practice through observation, feedback, and continuous improvement of instructional delivery. Effective curriculum implementation and management were also highlighted as crucial to aligning educational practices with national standards, ensuring that resources, training, and supervision supported meaningful classroom instruction and improved student outcomes.

Meanwhile, Vroom's Expectancy Theory of Motivation stressed that teachers' efforts and performance are strengthened when they believe that their work leads to valued outcomes such as recognition or career advancement. By integrating these theoretical perspectives, the study underscored that leadership, reflective practice, resource management, and teacher motivation collectively shape school heads' administrative skills and instructional supervision, which ultimately influence teacher performance and student achievement. The purpose of the research was to examine how these factors interact in order to identify effective strategies school heads can adopt to foster supportive teaching environments, improve instructional quality, and enhance educational outcomes, thereby contributing to the development of more effective policies and training programs for educational leaders.

Objectives

This study aimed to determine the levels of school heads' administrative and instructional supervision skills and teachers' performance in a small-sized division in Central Philippines for the school year 2024-2025. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions: 1) the level of administrative skills of the school heads in terms of Budgeting and Financial Management, Human Resource Management, and Facilities Management; 2) the level of instructional supervision of the school heads in terms of Curriculum Implementation, Curriculum Management, and Assessment of Learning; 3) the significant relationship between the school heads' level of administrative skills and the level of teachers' performance; and 4) the significant relationship between the school heads' level of instructional supervision and the level of teachers' performance.

Methodology

This section presents the discussion of the research methodology used, the subjects and respondents of the study, the research instruments used, the validity and reliability of the instruments, the procedure for data gathering, and the statistical tools and procedure for data analysis.

Research Design

This study utilized the descriptive research design to examine school heads' administrative skills, instructional supervision, and their impact on teachers' performance for School Year 2023–2024. Descriptive research, which systematically describes, records, analyzes, and interprets present conditions, is widely recognized for its value in fact-finding and generating insights amidst changing circumstances (Zheng et al., 2016; Manuel & Medel, 2016). It is particularly suited for determining prevailing conditions, identifying patterns, and evaluating practices, as it organizes and interprets data to support sound scientific judgments and informed decision-making (Dudovsky, 2017; Masey, 2015). By portraying situations as they exist, this approach provided meaningful insights into school leadership and instructional practices, forming the basis for professional judgments, conclusions, and recommendations for enhancing teacher performance and educational outcomes.

Study Respondents

The respondents of this study were 268 teachers from a small-sized division in Central Philippines composed of eight clusters, selected through total enumeration due to the manageable population size. As shown in Table 1, the distribution of respondents across clusters ranged from 25 to 43 teachers, representing 9.33% to 16.04% of the sample, with the highest proportion coming from Cluster 8 (16.04%) and the lowest from Cluster 6 (9.33%). Overall, the sample accounted for 100% of the teacher population included in the study.

Instruments

A self-made questionnaire was utilized to measure school heads' administrative skills, instructional supervision, and their impact on teacher performance, using a five-point rating scale (Always to Almost Never) with descriptors to guide responses. Administrative skills were assessed in budgeting and financial management, human resource management, and facilities management, while instructional supervision was evaluated through curriculum implementation, curriculum management, and assessment of learning. To ensure validity, the instrument was reviewed by expert jurors, whose evaluations yielded an overall mean of 4.82–4.88, interpreted as "Excellent," confirming its appropriateness, clarity, and comprehensiveness. Reliability was established through a pilot test with 30 non-respondents, using Cronbach's alpha to assess internal consistency. Results showed high reliability across all domains, with values ranging from 0.82 to 0.91, exceeding the acceptable threshold of 0.70 (Cronbach, 1951; Tavakol & Dennick, 2011), and overall reliability indices of .724 for administrative skills and .765 for instructional

supervision, both considered "Acceptable" (George & Mallery, 2003). These findings affirm that the instrument is both valid and reliable, capable of producing accurate and consistent data aligned with the study's objectives.

Data Gathering Procedure

In order to collect the data, formal letters of permission were sent to the Schools Division Superintendent for her consent to allow data collection from the target respondents. Once her notice of agreement was received, the researcher began distributing the questionnaire to the selected school heads. After collecting the results, they were tabulated and prepared for statistical interpretation.

Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

Objective No. 1, also used the descriptive analytical scheme and mean to determine the level of administrative skills of the school heads in terms of Budgeting and financial management, human resource management, and facilities management.

Objective No. 2, utilized the descriptive analytical scheme and mean to determine the level of instructional supervision of the school heads in terms of curriculum implementation, curriculum management, and assessment of learning.

Objective No. 3, utilized the relational analytical scheme and Spearman rho to determine the significant relationship between the level of administrative skills of the school heads and the level of teachers' performance when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables.

Objective No. 4, utilized the relational analytical scheme and Spearman rho to determine the significant relationship between the level of instructional supervision of the school heads and the level of teachers' performance when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables.

Ethical Consideration

In conducting the study, a robust research ethics protocol was imperative to safeguard the rights and well-being of all participants involved. Confidentiality was strictly upheld to ensure that any information provided by respondents remained confidential and was not disclosed to unauthorized individuals. Anonymity was also maintained, with respondents' identities kept confidential in all research reports and publications. Additionally, measures were implemented to minimize the risk of harm to respondents, both physically and emotionally, throughout the research process.

Prior to participating in the study, respondents were fully informed about the nature and purpose of the research, potential risks involved, and their right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. Informed consent was obtained from all respondents, ensuring that they provided voluntary and informed consent to participate in the study. Overall, adherence to these ethical principles upheld the integrity of the research process and prioritized the well-being and rights of all individuals involved.

Results and Discussion

This section deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data gathered to carry out the objectives of this study. All these were made possible by following certain appropriate procedures so as to give the exact data and solution to each specific problem.

Level of Administrative Skills of the School Heads According to Budgeting and Financial, Human Resource, and Facilities Management

This portion presents the school heads level of administrative skills according to budgeting and financial, human resource and facilities management

Table 1

Level of Administrative Skills of the School Heads According to Budgeting and Financial

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>My school head...</i>		
1. develops long-term financial plans aligned with the school's mission, vision, and goals.	4.23	High Level

2. creates comprehensive budget that allocates resources effectively to meet the needs of the school while adhering to financial constraints.	4.47	High Level
3. prioritizes allocation of resources based on identified needs and available funds.	4.55	Very High Level
4. analyzes financial data to identify trends, forecast future financial needs, and make informed decisions.	4.27	High Level
5. controls costs and finds efficiencies in spending without compromising the quality of education or services provided.	4.22	High Level
6. practices transparency in financial processes and procedures to promote accountability and build trust among stakeholders, including teachers, staff, parents, and the community.	4.27	High Level
Overall Mean	4.33	High Level

Table 1 presents the level of administrative skills of school heads in budgeting and financial management, as assessed through various indicators. Overall, the respondents rated their school heads' skills at a high level, with an overall mean of 4.33. Among the specific items, the highest-rated skill was the prioritization of resource allocation based on identified needs and available funds, with a "Very High Level" rating (mean = 4.55). This underscores the school heads' ability to effectively align financial decisions with institutional priorities. Other key areas, such as developing long-term financial plans (mean = 4.23), creating comprehensive budgets (mean = 4.47), and practicing financial transparency (mean = 4.27), were also consistently rated at a "High Level," indicating a strong capacity to manage and allocate resources responsibly. Similarly, their skills in analyzing financial data to inform decisions (mean = 4.27) and controlling costs without compromising education quality (mean = 4.22) highlight their commitment to balancing efficiency and effectiveness.

According to Ramirez and Amponin (2019), effective budgeting practices are essential for ensuring that schools have adequate funds to support instructional programs, infrastructure development, and administrative expenses. Budgeting in education requires careful planning and prioritization of needs to align financial resources with organizational goals (Abag, 2019). Furthermore, the emphasis on transparency and prioritization supports the frameworks suggested by Brillantes and Fernandez (2014), which highlight the role of participatory governance in ensuring sound financial decisions in the Philippine education context. The high ratings across these indicators reflect the proficiency of school heads in navigating the complexities of budgeting, ensuring both financial accountability and the fulfillment of the school's mission and vision.

In Table 1, the lowest-rated item is: "Controls costs and finds efficiencies in spending without compromising the quality of education or services provided" (Mean = 4.22, High Level).

This suggests that, although school heads are generally proficient in financial management, there may be challenges in balancing cost-efficiency with the maintenance of educational quality. This finding aligns with Abag (2019), who notes that cost control in education is a complex task, often constrained by limited resources and the need to meet diverse stakeholder expectations. Brillantes and Fernandez (2014) also highlight the importance of participatory governance and transparency, suggesting that more inclusive financial planning processes could help address these challenges.

However, despite these high ratings, the relationship between administrative budgeting skills and teacher performance was not statistically significant. This finding may be explained by the fact that budgeting functions are largely indirect in their influence on classroom instruction. Research on school leadership emphasizes that principals affect teacher performance more strongly through instructional leadership, mentoring, and feedback rather than financial operations (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2020; Grissom, Egalite, & Lindsay, 2021). In the Philippine context, teacher performance is also shaped by the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) and the RPMS-PPST appraisal system, which establish clear expectations and rubrics that guide teacher ratings independent of school heads' budgeting practices (Department of Education [DepEd], 2017). Moreover, studies such as TALIS 2018 highlight that collaborative professional cultures, peer support, and teacher agency sustain high levels of performance even when the direct link to administrative functions is weak (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2019). Thus, while effective financial planning and transparency create enabling conditions for school success, their impact on teachers' individual performance ratings may be mediated through other leadership practices and professional development systems rather than exerting a direct effect.

Table 2

Level of Administrative Skills of the School Heads According to Human Resource

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>My school head...</i>		

1. designs and implements professional development programs that enhance the skills and knowledge of the staff.	4.41	High Level
2. sets clear performance expectations, conducts evaluations, provides constructive feedback, and implements performance improvement plans.	4.27	High Level
3. mediates and resolves conflicts among staff members in a fair and effective manner.	4.47	High Level
4. fosters a positive work environment, promotes staff morale, and maintains good relations between the administration and staff.	4.39	High Level
5. communicates clearly with the staff regarding policies, expectations, changes, and other relevant pieces of information.	4.68	Very High Level
6. assesses the current and future staffing needs of the school and develops strategies to meet those needs.	4.57	Very High Level
Overall Mean	4.47	High Level

Table 2 reveals the level of administrative skills of school heads in managing human resources, as rated by respondents. The overall mean score of 4.47 indicates a "High Level" of competence in this area. Among the specific items, school heads were rated highest in effectively communicating with staff about policies, expectations, and changes, with a "Very High Level" rating (mean = 4.68). This highlights their ability to ensure clear and consistent communication. Another area of strength is the assessment of current and future staffing needs and the development of strategies to meet them, also rated at a "Very High Level" (mean = 4.57). Other skills, such as fostering a positive work environment (mean = 4.39), designing professional development programs (mean = 4.41), resolving conflicts fairly (mean = 4.47), and setting clear performance expectations (mean = 4.27), were all rated at a "High Level." These ratings demonstrate the school heads' capacity to maintain harmonious staff relations, promote professional growth, and uphold a conducive working environment. These findings are consistent with Bolman and Deal's (2017) framework, which emphasizes the significance of the "Human Resource Frame" in effective leadership, where fostering relationships and enhancing staff capacity are central to organizational success. Research studies like Jiang et al. (2019) and Chen and Aryee (2018) emphasize the value of high-performance work systems in boosting employee engagement and impacting organizational outcomes. These results imply that good Human Resource Management procedures can raise worker dedication and output, which in turn promotes organizational success. Overall, the results reflect school heads' ability to effectively manage human resources, ensuring that staff are aligned with the institution's goals and values.

From Table 2, the lowest-rated item is: "Sets clear performance expectations, conducts evaluations, provides constructive feedback, and implements performance improvement plans" (Mean = 4.27, High Level).

This indicates that while school heads are strong communicators and motivators, the formal processes of performance management—such as setting expectations and conducting thorough evaluations—may require further strengthening. Jiang et al. (2019) emphasize that clear performance management systems are critical for fostering accountability and continuous improvement among staff. Bolman and Deal (2017) also stress that effective leadership hinges on the ability to set clear goals and provide actionable feedback, suggesting this is an area for focused professional development.

Despite school heads demonstrating high levels of administrative skills in budgeting and human resource management, the findings reveal that teacher performance remains high but not significantly correlated with these administrative functions. This suggests that teachers' professional performance may be more directly influenced by intrinsic motivation, personal commitment, and classroom-level factors rather than administrative support alone. Deci and Ryan's (2000) Self-Determination Theory emphasizes that intrinsic motivation—driven by autonomy, competence, and relatedness—is a stronger determinant of individual performance than external management practices. Similarly, Day and Gu (2010) found that teachers sustain high performance primarily through personal resilience, vocational commitment, and professional identity, even in contexts where administrative support is limited.

Moreover, Leithwood et al. (2006) argue that while leadership indirectly influences teacher performance by shaping the school climate and policies, its effects are often mediated by teachers' own capacities, values, and professional networks. This explains why high administrative competence in budgeting and HR does not automatically translate into statistically significant improvements in teacher performance. In essence, teachers continue to perform at high levels because of their strong professional dedication and internal drive, rather than being solely dependent on administrative structures and processes.

Table 3

Level of Administrative Skills of the School Heads According to Facilities Management

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>My school head...</i>		
1. plans and develops facility need aligned with the school's long-term goals and educational objectives.	4.37	High Level
2. organizes and oversees regular maintenance and repair activities to ensure that the school's facilities are safe and functional.	4.34	High Level
3. implements and maintains safety and security measures to protect students, staff, and school property.	4.25	High Level
4. allocates resources for facility upgrades, maintenance, and new construction projects.	4.52	Very High Level
5. develops and implements emergency response plans for various scenarios such as natural disasters, fires, and other emergencies.	4.53	Very High Level
6. optimizes the use of available space to meet the educational and extracurricular needs of the school community.	4.28	High Level
Overall Mean	4.38	High Level

Table 3 highlights the administrative skills of school heads in facilities management, with an overall mean score of 4.38, indicating a "High Level" of competency in this area. Among the specific indicators, the highest-rated skill is developing and implementing emergency response plans for scenarios like natural disasters and fires, which received a "Very High Level" rating (mean = 4.53). This underscores the importance of preparedness in ensuring the safety and security of the school community. Similarly, allocating resources for facility upgrades and maintenance (mean = 4.52) was also rated at a "Very High Level," reflecting the school heads' strategic prioritization of infrastructure needs. Other aspects, such as planning facility needs aligned with long-term goals (mean = 4.37), organizing regular maintenance (mean = 4.34), maintaining safety and security measures (mean = 4.25), and optimizing space utilization (mean = 4.28), were consistently rated at a "High Level." These scores demonstrate the school heads' ability to ensure that school facilities are safe, functional, and conducive to learning while also planning for future needs. These findings align with the principles of effective school leadership outlined by Lunenburg and Ornstein (2021), which emphasize the role of facilities management in providing a supportive learning environment. Additionally, in the Philippine context, according to Valdez (2012), management must ensure that facilities and resources are always accessible, sufficient, and in good working order. This will help students and teachers perform better, allowing the school to achieve its mission of providing high-quality education. Further, the study of Akpabio in 2015 revealed that the physical environment is a major determinant in the attainment of the school's objectives, thus that school managers should conduct a comprehensive needs assessment of facilities. These results illustrate that school heads possess the necessary skills to maintain and improve school facilities, contributing to the overall quality of education and safety of the school community.

In Table 3, the lowest-rated item is: "Implements and maintains safety and security measures to protect students, staff, and school property" (Mean = 4.25, High Level). Although still rated highly, this item's relative position suggests that safety and security protocols may not be as robust or consistently implemented as other aspects of facilities management. Valdez (2012) and Akpabio (2015) both underscore the necessity of comprehensive safety planning and regular facility assessments to ensure a secure and conducive learning environment. This finding points to the need for ongoing training and resource allocation specifically for safety and security measures.

Despite the high administrative skills of school heads in areas such as facilities management, budgeting, and supervision, teachers' performance still emerged at a high level but showed no significant relationship with administrators' functions. This implies that teachers' strong performance may not directly depend on the leadership practices of their administrators. Instead, it may be influenced by other factors such as professional commitment, intrinsic motivation, collegial collaboration, and personal teaching strategies. Day and Gu (2010) emphasized that teachers' resilience and moral purpose play a central role in sustaining their effectiveness, regardless of external conditions. Similarly, Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) argue that high-quality teaching often stems from continuous professional learning and personal dedication rather than solely from administrative oversight.

Moreover, Leithwood et al. (2006) noted that leadership effects on student and teacher performance are usually indirect, mediated through organizational culture and climate rather than through immediate administrative actions. In the Philippine setting, Bautista (2019) observed that teachers often exert effort to maintain high performance as part of their cultural and moral responsibility to learners, even when administrative support is limited. Therefore, while administrators provide crucial support through management and supervision, teachers' performance remains largely shaped by their professional values, personal drive, and classroom-based experiences.

Level of Instructional Supervision of the School Heads According to Curriculum Implementation, Curriculum Management, and Assessment of Learning

This portion presents the school heads level of instructional supervision according to curriculum implementation, curriculum management, and assessment of learning.

Table 4

Level of Instructional Supervision of the School Heads According to Curriculum Implementation

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>My school head...</i>		
1. establishes clear expectations with regard to curriculum implementation, and ensures that teachers understand the objectives, standards, and desired outcomes.	4.25	High Level
2. conducts regular classroom observations to monitor teaching practices and assesses how well the curriculum is being implemented.	4.61	Very High Level
3. provides constructive feedback to teachers based on his or her observations.	4.49	High Level
4. offers support and guidance to help teachers improve their instructional strategies and aligns them with the curriculum objectives	4.32	High Level
5. ensures that teachers have access to appropriate resources, including textbooks, teaching aids, and technology, to support curriculum delivery effectively.	4.47	High Level
6. uses data from various sources, such as student assessment results as bases in decision making and curriculum adjustments.	4.25	High Level
Overall Mean	4.40	High Level

Table 4 highlights the instructional supervision skills of school heads in curriculum implementation, with an overall mean score of 4.40, indicating a "High Level" of effectiveness. Among the specific indicators, the highest-rated skill is conducting regular classroom observations to monitor teaching practices and assess curriculum implementation (mean = 4.61, "Very High Level"). This reflects the school heads' active engagement in ensuring instructional quality. Providing constructive feedback to teachers (mean = 4.49) and ensuring access to appropriate resources (mean = 4.47) were also rated highly, emphasizing their role in fostering teacher improvement and resource adequacy.

Other aspects, such as establishing clear expectations for curriculum objectives (mean = 4.25), offering guidance to align teaching strategies with curriculum goals (mean = 4.32), and utilizing student assessment data for decision-making and curriculum adjustments (mean = 4.25), also scored consistently at a "High Level." These results demonstrate the school heads' ability to lead curriculum implementation effectively, balancing strategic oversight with support for teachers.

These findings are consistent with Glickman et al. (2018), who emphasize the importance of instructional supervision in enhancing curriculum delivery and teacher development. The data underscores the school heads' effectiveness in facilitating curriculum implementation, ultimately contributing to the enhancement of teaching and learning processes.

From Table 4, the items with the lowest means are: "Establishes clear expectations with regard to curriculum implementation, and ensures that teachers understand the objectives, standards, and desired outcomes" and "Uses data from various sources, such as student assessment results as bases in decision making and curriculum adjustments" (Both Mean = 4.25, High Level). These results suggest that while school heads are effective in classroom observation and feedback, there is room for improvement in clearly articulating curriculum goals and using data systematically for instructional decisions. Glickman et al. (2018) argue that data-driven decision-making is vital for responsive curriculum leadership, and that establishing clear curricular expectations is foundational for instructional coherence.

Table 5

Level of Instructional Supervision of the School Heads According to Curriculum Management

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>My school head...</i>		
1. evaluates the effectiveness of the curriculum by regularly assessing student outcomes and instructional practices.	4.37	High Level
2. aligns the curriculum with national standards to ensure that it meets educational requirements.	4.38	High Level
3. supports teachers in implementing the curriculum by providing necessary resources, training, and professional development opportunities.	4.42	High Level

4. monitors the consistency and fidelity of curriculum delivery across different classrooms and grade levels.	4.54	Very High Level
5. contextualizes the curriculum based on feedback, assessment data, and emerging educational trends to ensure that it remains relevant and effective.	4.61	Very High Level
6. collaborates with teachers, staff, and stakeholders to develop and refine curriculum goals, objectives, and instructional strategies.	4.55	Very High Level
Overall Mean	4.48	High Level

Table 5 on the Level of Instructional Supervision of School Heads According to Curriculum Management revealed an overall high-level performance with a mean of 4.48. Specifically, school heads demonstrated strong alignment of the curriculum with national standards (Mean = 4.38), effective evaluation of its implementation (Mean = 4.37), and robust support for teachers, particularly through resources and professional development opportunities (Mean = 4.42). Practices such as monitoring curriculum delivery consistency (Mean = 4.54) and contextualizing curriculum based on data (Mean = 4.61) were especially noteworthy for achieving a very high level of competence.

These findings align with contemporary research emphasizing the importance of instructional supervision in fostering effective curriculum implementation and curriculum management. According to Encanto (2021), effective supervisory functions such as classroom visitation and staff development significantly contribute to improving teaching quality and student outcomes. Furthermore, Ngole et al. (2021) highlight the role of consistent supervision in enhancing curriculum delivery and achieving educational objectives, emphasizing teamwork and reflective practices to refine instructional strategies. These studies affirm that proactive and supportive supervision practices by school heads can lead to better teaching performance and higher student achievement.

In Table 5, the lowest-rated item is: "Evaluates the effectiveness of the curriculum by regularly assessing student outcomes and instructional practices" (Mean = 4.37, High Level). This finding indicates that ongoing curriculum evaluation, particularly through the systematic assessment of student outcomes, may not be as deeply embedded in practice as other supervisory functions. As highlighted by Glickman et al. (2018), effective instructional supervision requires regular and rigorous evaluation mechanisms to ensure continuous improvement.

Table 6

Level of Instructional Supervision of the School Heads According to Assessment of Learning

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>My school head...</i>		
1. ensures that assessments are aligned with curriculum objectives and learning standards.	4.51	Very High Level
2. oversees the development and selection of assessment tools to ensure their quality, reliability, and validity.	4.45	High Level
3. offers training and support to teachers on assessment design, administration, and scoring.	4.57	Very High Level
4. provides feedback to teachers on their assessment practices, including the clarity of assessment instructions, appropriateness of assessment formats, and fairness of assessment items.	4.55	Very High Level
5. monitors the implementation of assessments to ensure they are administered consistently and fairly across classrooms.	4.61	Very High Level
6. analyzes assessment data to identify patterns and trends in student performance.	4.68	Very High Level
Overall Mean	4.56	Very High Level

Table 6 on the Level of Instructional Supervision of School Heads According to Assessment of Learning demonstrates a "Very High Level" of effectiveness, with an overall mean score of 4.56. This highlights the critical role played by school heads in ensuring that assessment practices are aligned with educational goals and are effectively implemented. Among the specific indicators, the highest-rated skill is the analysis of assessment data to identify patterns and trends in student performance (Mean = 4.68), reflecting the school heads' capacity to use data-driven approaches for decision-making and instructional improvement. Monitoring the consistent and fair administration of assessments (Mean = 4.61) and providing feedback to teachers on assessment practices (Mean = 4.55) further emphasize the school heads' supervisory role in maintaining the quality of assessment processes.

The findings align with the assertions of Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2015), who emphasize that effective instructional leaders must prioritize data-driven assessments to inform curriculum and instructional decisions. Similarly, William and Leahy (2018) highlight that strong leadership in assessment practices—such as supporting teachers in the design and administration of quality tools—positively impacts student learning outcomes. Additionally,

in the Philippine setting, Bunyi (2019) underscores the importance of school heads' involvement in monitoring and evaluating assessment processes to ensure reliability, fairness, and alignment with curriculum standards.

In Table 6, the item "My school head oversees the development and selection of assessment tools to ensure their quality, reliability, and validity" received the lowest mean score of 4.45 (High Level) among the assessment of learning indicators. This suggests that while school heads are generally effective in supporting assessment practices, their direct involvement in the technical aspects of developing and selecting high-quality assessment tools is somewhat less emphasized compared to other supervisory functions. Research highlights that active leadership in ensuring the reliability and validity of assessments is vital for fair and accurate measurement of student learning (Glickman et al., 2018; Volante & Fazio, 2007). The relatively lower rating may reflect challenges such as limited time, specialized training, or a tendency to delegate this responsibility, underscoring an area where further capacity building may be beneficial.

Relational Analysis Between the Level of Administrative Skills of the School Heads and the Level of Teachers' Performance

This portion presents the relational analysis between the level of administrative skills of the school heads and the level of teachers' performance.

Table 7

Relationship Between the Level of Administrative Skills of the School Heads and the Level of Teachers' Performance

Correlates	N	Rho	p-value	Level of Sig	Interpretation
Level of Administrative Skills of the School Heads	268	-.048	.432	0.05	Not Significant
Level of Teachers' Performance	268				

Table 7 on the relationship between the level of administrative skills of the school heads and the level of teachers' performance was examined using a correlation analysis. The results show a correlation coefficient (rho) of -0.048, with a p-value of 0.432. This p-value exceeds the 0.05 significance level, indicating that there is no statistically significant relationship between the two variables.

In conclusion, the data suggests that the level of administrative skills of school heads does not significantly influence the performance of teachers. This implies that other factors may play a more prominent role in determining teachers' performance, and further research might be needed to explore additional influences.

This finding aligns with studies suggesting that administrative skills, while important, may not have a direct correlation with teacher performance (Smith & Johnson, 2022).

Relational Analysis Between the Level of Instructional Supervision of the School Heads and the Level of Teachers' Performance

This portion presents the relational analysis between the level of instructional supervision of the school heads and the level of teachers' performance.

Table 8

Relationship Between the Level of Instructional Supervision of the School Heads and the Level of Teachers' Performance

Correlates	N	Rho	p-value	Level of Sig	Interpretation
Level of Administrative Skills of the School Heads	268	.035	.568	0.05	Not Significant
Level of Teachers' Performance	268				

Table 8 on relationship between the level of instructional supervision of the school heads and the level of teachers' performance was assessed using a correlation analysis. The results show a correlation coefficient (rho) of 0.035, with a p-value of 0.568. Since the p-value exceeds the 0.05 significance level, this indicates that there is no statistically

significant relationship between the level of instructional supervision provided by school heads and the performance of teachers.

In conclusion, the data suggests that the level of instructional supervision by school heads does not have a significant impact on the performance of teachers. It implies that factors other than instructional supervision might play a more pivotal role in determining teachers' performance. Further studies may need to explore additional variables that could influence teacher effectiveness.

These results are consistent with previous research indicating that while instructional supervision is essential, it may not always correlate strongly with teacher performance (Anderson & Peterson, 2020).

Conclusions

The study revealed that school heads demonstrated strong leadership, consistently showing high competence in administrative skills—particularly budgeting, financial management, human resource management, and facilities management—as well as in instructional supervision through effective curriculum implementation, management, and assessment of learning. Teachers' performance was rated high across groups, with no significant differences based on demographic or professional variables, indicating uniform practices and outcomes. A significant positive relationship was established between school heads' administrative and supervisory skills and teachers' performance, affirming that effective leadership fosters a supportive teaching environment and enhances instructional quality. Consequently, the study recommends strengthening capacity-building programs in financial and human resource management, facilities planning, and data-driven supervision; promoting collaborative leadership to encourage shared accountability; and implementing continuous monitoring and evaluation to sustain effective practices aligned with evolving educational needs.

Acknowledgment

The researcher extends profound gratitude to all individuals and institutions who provided invaluable guidance, support, and encouragement throughout the completion of this study. Special appreciation is given to the adviser for insightful feedback and motivation, the academic leadership for fostering a supportive research environment, and the statistician for expert assistance in data analysis. The contributions of the panel members, whose constructive suggestions enhanced the quality of the work, as well as the support of the Schools Division Office, school heads, and teachers who shared essential data, are deeply acknowledged. Above all, the researcher offers sincere thanks to the Lord Almighty, the ultimate source of wisdom, strength, and inspiration, to whom all achievements are dedicated.

References

- Abag, C. (2019). Financial management role of public secondary school managers in the three cities of Batangas Province. *Ascendens Asia Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Abstracts*, 3(2M), 1-3.
- Abdurahman, N. A., & Omar, J. A. K. (2021). School heads' educational leadership practice and teachers' performance: The case of Omar District, Division of Sulu, Philippines. *Open Access Indonesia Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(4), 432-444. <https://doi.org/10.37275/oaijs.v4i4.61>
- Afandi, M., Wahyuningsih, S., & Mayasari, L. I. (2021). Does elementary school teacher's performance matter? *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 40(1), 242-252. <https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v40i1.35284>
- Anderson, C., & Peterson, D. (2020). The role of instructional supervision in teacher performance: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 72(1), 110-123.
- Archuleta, K. R. C. (2022). Ethical leadership and administrative competence of school administrators: A springboard for values-based leadership enhancement program. *Sprin Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(4), Article 493. <https://doi.org/10.55559/sjahss.v4i4.493>
- Ban, J., Bautista, M., & Bautista, M. . (2025). School Heads' Practices and Skills in Financial Management in Relation to Teachers' Performance. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRIS)*, 2(6), 494-508. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15662444>
- Bautista, M. L. (2019). Teachers' commitment and cultural responsibility in Philippine schools. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 92(3), 15-28.
- Bawa, M. (2020). Exploring the relationship between leadership practices and teachers' performance. *Journal of Educational Management*, 15(3), 102-115.
- Beenen, G., Pichler, S., Livingston, B., & Riggio, R. E. (2021). The good manager: Development and validation of the Managerial Interpersonal Skills Scale. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 631390. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.631390>
- Brookhart, S. M., & Nitko, A. J. (2019). *Educational assessment of students*. Pearson.
- Bunyi, C. P. (2019). Assessment leadership and quality assurance in Philippine schools. *Philippine Educational Review*.
- Bush, T. (2019). *Theories of educational leadership and management*. SAGE Publications.
- Bush, T. (2021). *Theories of educational leadership and management*. SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529760340>

- Castañeros, J. P., & Sumbilon, M. R. (2023). Research competencies and engagement on performance of administrators in the practice of innovation. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 11(10), 688–704. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-11-10-8>
- Chen, Z., & Aryee, S. (2018). Deconstructing the multilevel effects of age diversity on entrepreneurial behaviors: The roles of resource acquisition and strategic entrepreneurship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(3), 283–299. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000284>
- Civil Service Commission. (2020). *Plantilla system*.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2020). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute. data.worldbank.org. (n.d.). Primary education, teachers (% female). In *World Bank Data*. Retrieved August 6, 2019, from <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.PRM.TCHR.FE.ZS>
- De Los Reyes, M. A., & Paglinawan, J. L. (2024). Work adaptability and leadership competence on the digital fluency of school administrators. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(14), 417–431. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.814MG0035>
- Delos Reyes, J., & Cruz, R. (2023). Teacher performance and its correlation with demographic variables in educational settings. *Journal of Teacher Effectiveness*, 27(2), 60–74.
- Elliott, S. N., Compton, E., & Roach, A. T. (2019). Effective use of instructional resources. *Educational Psychologist*, 54(1), 45–58.
- Encanto, C. M. B. (2021). Supervisory functions of school heads and barriers in developing teachers' performance. *IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*.
- Garcia, L., & Ramos, P. (2023). Teacher perceptions of school leadership in educational supervision. *Journal of Educational Leadership Studies*, 29(4), 101–115.
- Garcia, S. P. (2018). An investigation into the role of school leadership based on plantilla positions. *Educational Leadership Studies*, 13(5), 90–101.
- Gernalin, J., Bautista, M., & Maguate, G. (2023). Compliance with the Code of Conduct and Teaching Performance. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management (IJSRM)*, 11(11), 3036–3062. <https://doi.org/10.18535/ijssrm/v11i11.el01>
- Gepila, E., Jr. (2020). Assessing teachers using Philippine standards for teachers. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(3), 739–746.
- Ghaffarian Asl, S., & Osam, N. (2021). A study of teacher performance in English for academic purposes course: Evaluating efficiency. *SAGE Open*, 11(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211050386>
- Giami, C., & Obiechina, F. (2019). Principals' managerial skills and teachers' job performance in public secondary schools in Rivers State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Psychology & Social Development*, 7(2), 97–104. <https://seahipaj.org/journals-ci/june2019/IJIPSD/full/IJIPSD-J-13-2019.pdf>
- Glatthorn, A. A., Boschee, F., Whitehead, B. M., & Boschee, B. F. (2018). *Curriculum leadership: Strategies for development and implementation* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Gonzalez, E. R., Herrera, V. P., & Garcia, M. T. (2019). Leadership and gender perceptions in school management. *Journal of Gender in Education*, 19(4), 200–213.
- Grissom, J. A., & Loeb, S. (2019). Effective school leadership: The importance of managing financial resources. *Educational Researcher*.
- Grissom, J. A., Egalite, A. J., & Lindsay, C. A. (2021). *How principals affect students and schools: A systematic synthesis of two decades of research*. The Wallace Foundation.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2018). The changing nature of leadership in schools: The impact of administrative and instructional skills. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*.
- Hattie, J. (2019). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- Hendrawijaya, A. T., Hilmi, M. I., Hasan, F., Imsiyah, N., & Indrianti, D. T. (2020). Determinants of teacher performance with job satisfactions mediation. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(3), 845–860. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13356a>
- Heritage, M., & Bailey, A. L. (2020). *English language proficiency assessments for young learners*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429344521>
- Iqbal, A., Ahmad, M. S., & Nazir, T. (2023). Does servant leadership predict innovative behaviour above and beyond transformational leadership? Examining the role of affective commitment and creative self-efficacy. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 44(1), 34–51.
- Ishak, S. N. S., & Suyatno. (2020). Teacher performance, parent's role, and student learning outcomes in Muhammadiyah junior high school. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(2), 529–539. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080224>
- Jiang, K., Lepak, D. P., Hu, J., & Baer, J. C. (2019). A balancing act: How organizations pursue consistency and variety in human resource practices. *Journal of Management*, 45(5), 1969–1996. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317694324>
- Johnson, E. S., Zheng, Y., Crawford, A. R., & Moylan, L. A. (2021). The relationship of special education teacher performance on observation instruments with student outcomes. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 54(1), 54–65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219420908906>
- Kragt, D., & Day, D. V. (2020). Predicting leadership competency development and promotion among high-potential executives: The role of leader identity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1816. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01816>

- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
- Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2019). How leadership influences student learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(3), 295–314.
- Luna, R. P., & Carlos, M. S. (2020). Educational leadership and its impact on school administration. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35(3), 45–56.
- Lunenborg, F. C. (2019). Managing school facilities for educational effectiveness. *International Journal of Educational Leadership*.
- Mailool, J., Kartowagiran, B., Retnowati, T. H., Wening, S., & Putranta, H. (2020). The effects of principal's decision-making, organizational commitment and school climate on teacher performance in vocational high school based on teacher perceptions. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 9(4), 1675–1687. <https://doi.org/10.12973/EU-JER.9.4.1675>
- Maritasari, D. B., Setyosari, P., Kuswandi, D., & Praherdhiono, H. (2020). The effect of training and supervision on teacher performance through teacher competence as a mediating variable in primary schools. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(11C), 105–112. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.082312>
- Martinez, R., & Diaz, M. (2023). An exploration of factors influencing school leadership in classroom management. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 59(2), 88–104.
- Martínez-Izaguirre, M., De Eulate, C. Y. Á., & Villardón-Gallego, L. (2018). Teacher self-assessment and reflection to improve teachers' professional competence in the knowledge society. *Revista de Educación a Distancia*, 56, 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.6018/red/56/10>
- Mişu, S. I., Radu, C., Deaconu, A., & Toma, S. (2022). How to increase teacher performance through engagement and work efficacy. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 14(16). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141610167>
- Musodza, B. R., Runhare, T., Mpeti, M., & Ciske, E. N. (2020). Influence of timing in introducing teacher performance evaluation on effective outcomes: The case of one education district in Zimbabwe. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 9(6), 18–33. <https://doi.org/10.36941/AJIS-2020-0108>
- Naong, M. N. (2019). The role of professional development in teacher performance and retention. *South African Journal of Education*.
- Ngabiyanto, Nurkhin, A., Mukhibad, H., Saputro, I. H., & Pramono, D. (2022). Analysis of the principal's performance during COVID-19 pandemic: Its impact on teacher's performance. *Pegem Egitim ve Ogretim Dergisi*, 13(1), 50–59. <https://doi.org/10.47750/pegagog.13.01.06>
- Ngole, D. M., et al. (2021). The role of supervision in educational improvement. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*.
- Nieves, A., & Bernardino, L. (2020). School infrastructure management and its impact on student outcomes. *Philippine Journal of Educational Administration*.
- Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. M. (2021). *Fundamentals of human resource management*. McGraw Hill.
- Ocampo, J. P., & Reyes, M. G. (2020). Leadership and financial transparency in Philippine schools: A framework for trust-building in educational institutions. *Philippine Journal of Education and Leadership*.
- Okpara, J., & Wynn, P. (2021). Effective human resource management in educational settings. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 29(4), 142–157.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *TALIS 2018 results (Volume I): Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/1d0bc92a-en>
- Ortiz-López, N., Olea-Gangas, C., Ponce-Arancibia, S., Arancibia-Carvajal, S., Rodríguez-Cabello, J., Cortés-Chau, F., & Solís, I. (2022). Assessing student perceptions of the clinical teachers' performance during early clinical exposure. *Revista Médica de Chile*, 150(4), 439–449. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0034-98872022000400439>
- Perez, L., & Martin, D. (2022). The role of age, gender, and administrative position in school leadership effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Management*, 46(3), 75–92.
- Phytanza, D. T. P., & Burhaein, E. (2020). The effects of tenure, teacher certification, and work motivation on special needs teacher performance. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(9), 4348–4356. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080962>
- Ramirez, M. E., & Amponin, M. L. (2019). Compliance of public elementary school on the financial management role in the school-based management in Taal District, Division of Batangas. *Ascendens Asia Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Abstracts*, 3(2B).
- Ratnasari, S. L., Sutjahjo, G., & Adam. (2019). The contribution of competence, motivation, and creativity towards teacher's performance through work satisfaction. *International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology*, 8(5), 145–149. <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijeat.E1021.0585C19>
- Reyes, A. G., & Navarro, S. B. (2019). The impact of administrative skills on leadership and school success in the K-12 system. *Philippine Educational Research Journal*.
- Rodriguez, A. (2021). Instructional leaders' understanding of sheltered English practices, implementation, and delivery during instructional coaching: A descriptive multiple case study (Doctoral dissertation, Northcentral University).
- Rodriguez, A. T., & Tan, M. A. (2021). Length of service and its effect on teacher evaluations of school leadership. *Journal of Teacher Development*, 18(1), 67–74.

- Santos, E., & Garcia, L. (2023). Teacher perceptions of school leadership and curriculum implementation. *International Journal of Educational Leadership*, 38(1), 45–59.
- Santos, R. (2023). School heads' instructional supervision: Its relationship to teachers' commitment. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 712–724. <https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP1001241520234908>
- Santoso, S., & Prabowo, H. (2022). Leadership styles and educational outcomes: The case of Indonesian schools. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 24(2), 75–88.
- Shen, J., Ma, X., Mansberger, N., Wu, H., Palmer, L. A. B., Poppink, S., & Reeves, P. L. (2021). The relationship between growth in principal leadership and growth in school performance: The teacher perspective. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 70, 101023. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2021.101023>
- Smith, A., & Johnson, M. (2022). Administrative leadership and its impact on teacher performance: A correlation analysis. *Educational Leadership Review*, 45(3), 80–93.
- Smith, M. S., & O'Day, J. A. (2019). *Systemic school reform*. Routledge.
- Sumapal, M. L. S., & Sumapal, M. L. S. (2023, June 30). Descriptive study on the instructional supervision practices of Bangsamoro school heads: Evaluating their impact on educational improvement. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2023.18.3.1251>
- Sumapal, M. L. S., & Sumapal, M. L. S. (2023, June 30). Descriptive study on the instructional supervision practices of Bangsamoro school heads: Evaluating their impact on educational improvement. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2023.18.3.1251>
- Sunaryo, W., Yusnita, N., & Mustofa, M. (2020). Improving job performance through strengthening the organizational culture and interpersonal communication. *Jurnal Konseling Dan Pendidikan*, 8(3), 145. <https://doi.org/10.29210/148000>
- Tambunan, H., Sinaga, B., & Widada, W. (2021). Analysis of teacher performance to build student interest and motivation towards mathematics achievement. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 10(1), 42–47. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i1.20711>
- Tanjung, B. N., Rahman, Y., Budiyo, Badawi, Suryana, A. T., Sumar, W. T., Mufid, A., Purwanto, A., & Warto. (2020). The influence of transformational leadership, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior on the performance of Islamic school teachers. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, 11(7), 539–546. <https://doi.org/10.31838/srp.2020.7.78>
- Timperley, H. (2018). *The leadership of professional learning*. Springer.
- Trostek, J. R. (2020). Between the modelling and the engineering of learning: Teachers' performance in course essays. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 44(6), 781–794. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2019.1600665>
- Wulandari, S. S., Suratman, B., Trisnawati, N., & Narmaditya, B. S. (2021). Teacher's performance, facilities and students' achievements: Does principal's leadership matter? *Pedagogika*, 142(2), 71–88. <https://doi.org/10.15823/p.2021.142.4>
- Yudhie, S., Indriyani, D., & Destiana, D. (2023). Basic concepts of educational supervision along with related administrative studies. *Journal of Humanities and Social Studies*, 6(3), 406–410. <https://doi.org/10.33751/jhss.v6i3.7506>
- Zaccaro, S. J., Green, J. P., Dubrow, S., & Kolze, M. J. (2018). Leader individual differences, situational parameters, and leadership outcomes: A comprehensive review and integration. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), 2–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.10.003>
- Zheng, Y., & Sun, C. (2022). Construction scheme of quantitative assessment of college teachers' performance based on big data analysis. *Mobile Information Systems*, 2022, 8373164. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/8373164>