

School Heads' Leadership Practices in Relation to Teachers' Performance

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17412263

Roma Cristy P. Ramirez

Teacher 2, Rizal Elementary School, District V, Department of Education, Philippines

<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-3692-153X>

Dr. Bart Albert P. Bautista

Teacher 3, Mandalagan Elementary School, District I, Department of Education, Philippines

<https://orcid.org/0009-8235-250X>

Abstract:

Through DepEd Order No. 24, s., the Department of Education established the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) in recognition of the changing needs of education in the twenty-first century. 2020, which provides a framework for professional accountability and lifelong learning (Department of Education, 2020). This study aimed to determine the level of School Heads' leadership practices in relation to teachers' performance in one of the districts in a medium sized division during School Year 2024-2025. Descriptive research design was adopted for this study and the statistical tools used were Frequency Count and Percentage Distribution, Mean, Mann Whitney U Test and Spearman rho. The result of the study showed that the level of School Heads' leadership practices was high in the following domains: Leading Strategically, Managing School Operations and Resources, Focusing on Teaching and Learning, Developing Self and Others, and Building Connections. When grouped according to the aforementioned variables, Schools Heads leadership practices was on high level. Teachers' Performance was on "very satisfactory" level. There was a significant relationship between the level of School Heads' leadership skills when grouped and compared according to aforementioned variables.

Keywords: School Heads Leadership Practices, teachers' performance, PPSSH, Department of Education

Introduction:

Nature of the Problem

Teacher effectiveness and student results are significantly influenced by effective school leadership. As required by Republic Act No. 9155, sometimes referred to as the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, school leaders in the Philippines are tasked with both administrative and instructional duties. Through DepEd Order No. 24, s., the Department of Education established the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) in recognition of the changing needs of education in the twenty-first century. 2020, which serves as a framework for career-long development and professional accountability (Department of Education, 2020).

The competencies expected of school heads are defined by the PPSSH's five core domains: building connections, managing school operations and resources, focusing on teaching and learning, developing oneself and others, and leading strategically. Together, these areas provide a strong emphasis on inclusive stakeholder involvement, instructional leadership, capacity-building, effective resource management, and visionary planning (TeacherPH, 2023; Panlaque, 2023). School administrators are supposed to create settings that encourage excellent instruction and learning, encourage teamwork, and address new issues in the field of education.

Even though these requirements are clear, there is still a lack of data on the direct relationship between leadership behaviors and teacher performance. There are conflicting findings regarding how leadership translates into quantifiable teacher effectiveness, despite certain studies (Aquino et al., 2021; Soroño & Quirap, 2023) confirming the significance of transformational and instructional leadership in enhancing school outcomes. Furthermore, while demographic variables like age, tenure, and educational attainment may have an impact on leadership styles, it is unclear how these aspects affect teacher performance (Valmores, 2018; Lipata & Deri, 2021).

This study is therefore significant in bridging the gap between school heads' leadership practices and teachers' performance. By examining the relationship between these variables, the research aims to provide evidence-based insights that can inform leadership development programs, instructional support systems, and policy enhancements. For school heads, the findings may serve as a reflective tool to strengthen their leadership strategies. For teachers, it highlights the conditions that foster professional growth and instructional excellence. Ultimately, for students, the study contributes to the creation of more effective and responsive learning environments.

Current State of Knowledge

Leading Strategically. According to the American Institute for Research, instructional leadership has a key role in supporting, enhancing, and enabling students' academic development. Research studies on school improvement and instructional leader performance have revealed a long list of traits, such as high standards for both teachers and students, a focus on instruction, professional development opportunities, and the use of data to assess students' progress. These actions seem at first to be only a selection of the instructional leader study findings from successful schools. The old saying, "the whole is larger than the sum of its parts," however, applies to the ability of these measures to raise at-risk children's accomplishment when we look at what works with them. Air (2015).

Effective communicators must be able to forge close bonds with their colleagues, settle disputes, and elevate educators by assigning them significant responsibilities. A classroom full of unruly kids who are unable to concentrate on the lecture is a frightening but all too familiar image for many teachers. Though important time has already been lost, classroom management strategies could help things get back on track. One of the best strategies to avoid disturbances in the first place is to build meaningful connections with kids, as many seasoned educators are aware. A recent study aimed to evaluate this strategy. Students' time in the classroom became more valuable and productive when teachers implemented a set of strategies focused on building, preserving, and repairing relationships. Academic engagement rose by 33% and disruptive behavior dropped by 75% in these classrooms (Terada, 2019).

Managing School Operations and Resources. It is becoming more and more expected of school administrators worldwide to strategically manage resources in order to achieve learning objectives. Effective school leaders make sure that resource allocation improves student learning outcomes by coordinating material, human, and financial resources with school improvement strategies (Leithwood et al., 2020).

In terms of collaborative governance and distributed leadership, top staff members frequently share leadership in systems such as those in England and New Zealand, encouraging shared accountability. According to Harris and Jones (2019), distributed leadership encourages creativity and adaptability in operational management, particularly in intricate educational settings.

Internationally, school heads are required to use data to influence operational decisions in order to make data-informed decisions. For example, in Australia, principals use performance statistics to track progress and distribute resources. According to Gurr and Drysdale (2020), data literacy is crucial for efficient management of school operations.

The significance of equitable resource distribution is emphasized in OECD publications on equality and inclusion in resource allocation. Schleicher (2018) points out that, particularly in diverse and under-resourced situations, school administrators must guarantee that underprivileged students have access to high-quality facilities, technology, and support services.

Focusing on Teaching and Learning. According to Garrison and Ehringhaus (2019), giving students descriptive feedback while they are learning is one of the most important ways to involve them in the evaluation of their own learning. Descriptive feedback is actually the most effective teaching method for advancing pupils' learning, according to study. Students receive descriptive feedback that helps them understand their strengths, makes connections to what they have learned in class, and offers precise advice on how to advance to the next stage of the learning process. Descriptive feedback is not a grade, a sticker, or a "good job!" According to a substantial body of research, students do not learn more when they receive this kind of limited feedback.

Many aspects of the school revolve around the leader of the institution. He is in charge of all aspects of the system's operation, including academic and administrative ones. The school head must be inclined to make almost all of the school's decisions. As a result, the leader of the school needs to be a director, planner, and judge. Collaboration is a working method that a reliable school leader would employ by forming teams and smaller groups of team members to review ideas or strategies. Therefore, in order to influence the quality of education, the leader of the school must be a great team player (Gumus, 2019).

Developing Self and Others. According to scienceteacher.com (2019) from the United Kingdom, assessment in science can take many forms but broadly involves assessment for learning (summative) or assessment of learning (formative). In science classes, evaluation can occasionally take on the feel of a game show, complete with traffic lights, thumbs-up/down, and confidence lines! Even though whole class learning checks are crucial, they frequently only offer a limited amount of information regarding students' comprehension, and it can be challenging to know how to react.

Effective evaluation should result from carefully thought-out exercises. As they work through the assignment, students ought to be able to communicate and demonstrate their comprehension, with the teacher monitoring and stepping in as needed. Here, it's crucial to employ challenge in order to uncover misconceptions and get quick feedback. The goal of any assessment is a last thing to think about. While formative assessments give feedback to both the instructor and the student, which should lead to an action that results in learning, summative assessments give a grade, or tell you how students compare to their classmates. We risk performing poorly on both formative and summative assessments if we attempt to employ the same activity for both.

Building Connections. It is believed that school principals are responsible for establishing the guidelines for community contact between professors, staff, and the general public. They serve as a vital conduit between parents, instructors, students, and the educational system. In addition to influencing the faculty's attitude toward their students, principals are crucial in establishing the school's culture and atmosphere. A school with a strong principal can be a friendly environment where kids are challenged, supported, and encouraged in addition to learning. Effective leadership requires good interpersonal skills from school principals.

By encouraging open communication, empathy, and trust, school administrators in the US help to build good relationships within the school community. It has been demonstrated that initiatives including family involvement campaigns, student advisory programs, and inclusive leadership structures improve student well-being and school connectivity (EdResearch for Action, 2023). Building connections requires principals to create spaces where kids feel appreciated, acknowledged, and encouraged academically.

Theoretical Underpinnings

The Theory of Performance (ToP) by Don Elger (2007) and the Theory of Instructional Leadership by Philip Hallinger and Joseph Murphy (1985) served as the foundation for this investigation. The Effective Schools Movement, which highlighted the principal's role in raising student achievement, gave rise to instructional leadership theory in the 1980s. Hallinger and Murphy (1985) synthesized studies on principal behaviors and school effectiveness to create one of the most prominent frameworks. Their model, which defined what good instructional leadership looks like, was based on empirical research of elementary school principals and included information from district administrators, teachers, and school papers.

The significance of the principal in academic success is made clearer by the Theory of Educational Leadership, particularly in schools that perform poorly. Second, it contributes to the development of leadership training programs around the globe, such as the School Leadership Academies that were established in the United States in the 1980s. While maintaining its primary focus on instructional quality, the theory also helps evolve into broader models, such as transformational and distributed leadership (Hallinger, 2003; Spillane et al., 2004). It also influences policy and standards, such as the Philippine PPSSH and global frameworks that emphasize learning-centered leadership (Department of Education, 2020; UNESCO, 2019).

Don Elger (2007) created the Theory of Performance (ToP), which provides a thorough framework for comprehending how people and organizations accomplish important goals. Fundamentally, the theory asserts that performance is influenced by a dynamic interaction between internal and external forces and that performance is defined as the production of outcomes that stakeholders value. Six fundamental elements—context, knowledge, skills, identity, personal variables, and fixed factors—are identified by Elger as having a comprehensive impact on performance.

ToP offers an insightful perspective for understanding why there might not be a direct correlation between high leadership scores and teacher performance in the context of this study on school heads' leadership practices and teacher performance. Elger contends that a teacher's identity, abilities, and circumstances all influence performance in addition to leadership contributions. For instance, teachers may encounter contextual or personal obstacles that hinder their performance, such as poor self-efficacy, imprecise expectations, or a lack of resources, even in cases where school administrators exhibit excellent strategic leadership.

Objectives of the Study

This study aims to determine the level of School Heads' leadership practices in relation to teachers' performance in one of the Districts in a Medium sized Division during School Year 2024-2025. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions: 1) determine the profile of the respondents in terms of Age, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Service and Average Family Monthly Income; 2) the level of School Heads' leadership practices in the following domains: Leading Strategically, Managing School Operations and Resources, Focusing on Teaching and Learning, Developing Self and Others, and Building Connections; 3) determine the level of teachers' performance; 4) determine the significant difference between the level of School Heads' leadership skills when grouped and compared according to aforementioned variables; and 6) and determine if there is a significant relationship between School Heads leadership practices and 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 used descriptive research design to determine the level of School Heads' leadership practices in relation to teachers' performance in one of the Districts in a Medium sized Division during School Year 2024-2025. According to Ary (2017), descriptive research involves collecting data in order to test hypotheses or to

answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study. A descriptive study determines and reports the way things are. Descriptive research is scientific research that describes about event, phenomena or fact systematically dealing with certain area or population.

Study Respondents

The respondents of the study were the 158 teachers from the said district. Since the population of the respondents are quite large, the researcher employed sampling technique using Cochran's Formula. The respondents were randomly selected by the researcher from each section using the lottery technique.

Instruments

To determine the level of School Heads' leadership practices in relation to teachers' performance, this study made use of a self-made data gathering instrument which was subjected to Validity (5.00 - excellent) and Reliability testing (0.778 - acceptable). The questionnaire consisted of two parts: Part 1 gathered the respondents' socio-economic information, such as Age, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Service and Average Family Monthly Income. Part 2 contained a total of 50 line-items. There were 10-line items for each of the five (5) areas.

Data Gathering Procedure

After the approval of the questionnaire by the panel members, the researcher sought the help of three experts for the validation of the instrument, and subsequently conducted a reliability test as mentioned earlier. The researcher also submitted a request to the School's Division Superintendent asking permission to conduct the study. As soon as the approval was received, the researcher proceeded with the reliability test. The data gathering instrument was administered after the approval of the request and the copies of the instrument were retrieved after 3 days. After the collection of data, they were organized for statistical interpretation.

Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

Objective No. 1 used Descriptive Analytical scheme and the statistical tools used were: Frequency Count and Percentage Distribution to determine the profile of the respondents in terms of Age, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Service and Average Family Monthly Income.

Objective No. 2 used Descriptive Analytical scheme and the statistical tool was Mean to determine the level of School Heads' leadership practices in the following domains: Leading Strategically, Managing School Operations and Resources, Focusing on Teaching and Learning, Developing Self and Others, and Building Connections.

Objective No. 3 also used Descriptive Analytical Scheme and the statistical tool used was Mean to determine the level of teachers' performance. The level of teachers' performance was measured based on DepEd IPCRF rating.

Objective No. 4 used Relational Analytical Scheme and the statistical tool used was Mann-Whitney U Test to determine if there is a significant difference between the level of School Heads' leadership skills when grouped and compared according to aforementioned variables.

Objective No. 5 used Comparative Analytical Scheme and the statistical tool used was Spearman rho to determine if there was a significant relationship between School Heads leadership practices and teachers' performance.

Ethical Consideration

In conducting this study, ethical considerations were prioritized to ensure the protection of all participants, particularly school heads and teachers. Informed consent was obtained from each respondent prior to data collection. Participants were briefed on the purpose of the study, the nature of their involvement, and their right to withdraw at any point without penalty. The researcher ensured that participation was entirely voluntary and that no coercion or undue influence was exerted on any individual or institution.

Confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained throughout the research process. Identifiable information such as names, school affiliations, and personal responses were excluded from published findings. Data were stored securely and used solely for academic purposes. Responses were aggregated during analysis to prevent any attribution of specific feedback to individual participants, thereby protecting their professional reputation and ensuring honest, unbiased input.

Lastly, the study adhered to principles of academic integrity and respect for institutional protocols. Approval from the appropriate school division office or ethics review board was secured prior to implementation. The researcher committed to presenting findings objectively, avoiding misrepresentation or manipulation of data. By upholding these ethical standards, the study aimed to contribute responsibly to the discourse on educational leadership and teacher performance without compromising the dignity or rights of its participants.

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.

Profile of the respondents in terms of Age, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Service, and Average Family Monthly Income

Table 1
Profile of Respondents

Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Age	Younger (Below 41 years old)	85	53.80
	Older (41 years old and above)	73	46.20
	Total	158	100
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower (Bachelors Degree)	111	70.25
	Higher (Masters and Doctorate Degree)	47	29.75
	Total	158	100
Length of Service	Shorter (less than 11 years)	84	53.16
	Longer (11 years and more)	74	46.84
	Total	158	100
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower (less than P29 800)	117	74.05
	Higher (P29 800 and above)	41	25.95
	Total	158	100

Based on the data provided in Table 1, the respondent profile reveals a predominantly youthful and early-career demographic, with 53.80% being younger than 41 years old and 53.16% having less than 11 years of service. A significant majority 70.25% hold only a bachelor's degree, suggesting considerable room for academic growth and advanced studies. Additionally, 74.05% report a lower average family monthly income, which may imply economic constraints that could affect their access to continuing education and professional development opportunities. Taken together, this profile highlights a potentially dynamic yet underserved group of educators who may benefit from targeted capability-building initiatives, affordable training programs, and structured support systems to enhance their teaching practice and career advancement.

Descriptive analysis in the level of School Heads' leadership practices in the areas of Leading Strategically, Managing School Operations and Resources, Focusing on Teaching and Learning, Developing Self and Others, and Building Connections

Table 2
Level of School Heads' leadership practices in the area of Leading Strategically

Items	Mean	Interpretation
The School Head...		
1. encourages students, teachers, parents and stakeholders to help achieve the school mission and vision keeping in mind the core values.	3.97	High Level
2. spearheads school planning and monitors program implementation.	4.03	High Level
3. regularly checks implementation of school policies and review teachers' adherence to it.	3.98	High Level
4. encourages teachers to conduct classroom-based innovations and	3.67	High Level
5. leads in designing curricular design and implementation	3.80	High Level
6. establishes a collaborative and inclusive learning environment by fostering partnerships among teachers, parents, and the wider school community	3.97	High Level
7. implements evidence-based interventions to improve student performance, ensuring alignment with educational policies and best practices	4.08	High Level
8. leads professional development initiatives for teachers, providing mentorship and training opportunities to enhance instructional effectiveness.	4.23	High Level
9. develops and oversees data-driven assessment strategies to monitor student progress and inform instructional adjustments	4.18	High Level
10. advocates for continuous school improvement by integrating research-based innovations into teaching and learning processes	4.15	High Level
Overall Mean	4.01	High Level

Table 3 shows that the overall mean score is 4.01, interpreted as high level. This suggests that, across various dimensions of strategic leadership, school leaders are perceived as proactive, collaborative, and focused on continuous improvement in their institutions. The line-item which states "The School Head leads professional development initiatives for teachers, providing mentorship and training opportunities to enhance instructional effectiveness" has the highest mean score of 4.23, interpreted as high level. This reflects a strong commitment among school heads to build teacher capacity and foster instructional excellence—an essential trait for driving school-wide improvement.

The line-item which states "The School Head encourages teachers to conduct classroom-based innovations" got the lowest mean score of 3.67, interpreted as high level. This implies that school heads may be less engaged in promoting grassroots innovation within classrooms, possibly due to systemic constraints or competing administrative priorities. This result aligns with the findings of Reyes (2018), who emphasized that strategic leadership practices such as "Enabling Others to Act"—which includes mentoring and professional development—are among the strongest predictors of effective school management.

Table 3

Level of School Heads' leadership practices in the area of Managing School Operations and Resources

Items	Mean	Interpretation
The School Head...		
1. manages well the schools' financial matters.	4.25	High Level
2. takes control of the school's recording and documentation team.	4.01	High Level
3. checks and allow utilization of school facilities and equipment.	4.04	High Level
4. satisfactorily manage staff and teacher assignments.	3.97	High Level
5. help teachers and staff with promotions and other emerging opportunities.	3.72	High Level
6. ensures compliance with educational regulations and accreditation standards to maintain institutional integrity.	3.98	High Level
7. oversees the procurement and maintenance of learning materials, technology, and other instructional resources to support quality education.	3.96	High Level
8. implements safety protocols and risk management measures to secure school facilities and ensure a safe learning environment.	3.87	High Level
9. monitors student enrollment, attendance, and retention rates, developing strategies to address issues related to school accessibility and engagement.	4.28	High Level
10. strengthens community partnerships and external collaborations to secure additional funding, sponsorships, and support for school programs.	4.05	High Level
Overall Mean	4.01	High Level

The overall mean score of 4.01 suggests that, across multiple operational dimensions—including finance, staffing, compliance, and stakeholder engagement—school leaders are consistently perceived as effective and strategic. The line-item which states "The School Head monitors student enrollment, attendance, and retention rates, developing strategies to address issues related to school accessibility and engagement" got the highest mean score of 4.28, interpreted as high level. This highlights the school heads' strong emphasis on ensuring that educational services remain inclusive and student-centered, reflecting an awareness of access and engagement as critical factors in educational quality. The line- which states that "The School Head help teachers and staff with promotions and other emerging opportunities", got the lowest mean score of 3.72, interpreted as high level. This score suggests a relative weakness in how school heads support staff career advancement and talent recognition. This may point to gaps in succession planning, professional mentoring, or awareness of emerging opportunities in the broader education landscape. These findings echo the results of Nabong, Ballesteros, and Tibayan (2020), who found that Filipino school heads score highly in compliance, resource management, and external collaboration, but often exhibit limitations in human resource development, particularly in supporting career progression and leadership capacity-building among teachers.

Table 4

Level of School Heads' leadership practices in the area of Focusing on Teaching and Learning

Items	Mean	Interpretation
The School Head...		
1. conducts yearly review of school-based academic programs	3.54	High Level
2. leads in the implementation and contextualization of learning standards.	4.18	High Level
3. reviews teaching standards and pedagogies.	3.80	High Level
4. focuses on learners' academic achievements key performance indicators.	4.07	High Level
5. gives time on learners' discipline and proper classroom management.	3.92	High Level
6. ensures continuous professional development opportunities for teachers by organizing training sessions, workshops, and peer mentoring programs.	4.16	High Level

7. monitors and evaluates student assessment results to identify learning gaps and improve instructional strategies for better academic outcomes.	4.04	High Level
8. promotes the integration of innovative teaching methodologies and technology-enhanced learning to foster student engagement and comprehension.	4.16	High Level
9. collaborates with faculty and stakeholders to develop intervention programs that support struggling learners and enhance mastery of fundamental concepts.	4.13	High Level
10. establishes a culture of academic excellence by encouraging research-based instructional practices and fostering a student-centered learning environment.	4.09	High Level
Overall Mean	4.01	High Level

The overall mean score of 4.01 in Table 4 indicates that school heads demonstrate a high level of leadership practices in focusing on teaching and learning. This suggests that they are actively engaged in instructional leadership, prioritizing academic outcomes, professional development, and pedagogical innovation. The line item with the highest mean score says "leads in the implementation and contextualization of learning standards" got 4.18. This reflects strong alignment between school leadership and curriculum standards, suggesting that school heads are effectively translating national or regional learning goals into localized, meaningful instruction. Meanwhile, the line item with the lowest mean score says "conducts yearly review of school-based academic programs" with a mean score of 3.54. This indicates that the program evaluation is less emphasized or inconsistently practiced. It could point to a need for more structured mechanisms for reviewing and refining academic programs to ensure relevance and responsiveness to learner needs. This result is supported by the findings of Cruz (2018) in her study on teacher leadership in public high schools, which emphasized the importance of instructional leadership in shaping school culture and improving student achievement.

Table 5

Level of School Heads' leadership practices in the area of Developing Self and Others

Items	Mean	Interpretation
The School Head...		
1. focuses on teachers' professional reflections and learning.	4.14	High Level
2. establishes professional networks within and outside school community.	4.01	High Level
3. takes the lead in implementing performance management for teachers and all staffs.	3.70	High Level
4. emphasizes the importance of building team works and group leadership.	3.91	High Level
5. pushes for the mentoring of new teachers and allows coaching between mentors and mentees.	3.94	High Level
6. encourages continuous personal and professional growth by fostering a culture of lifelong learning among educators and staff.	4.09	High Level
7. provides opportunities for leadership development through targeted training programs that enhance management and instructional skills.	4.17	High Level
8. promotes a supportive and inclusive school environment where teachers and staff feel empowered to innovate and collaborate.	4.09	High Level
9. implements systems for self-assessment and peer evaluation to help educators refine their teaching approaches and professional competencies.	3.90	High Level
10. advocates for work-life balance and educator well-being by ensuring staff receive appropriate support, recognition, and professional growth opportunities.	3.95	High Level
Overall Mean	3.99	High Level

Table 5 reveals that the overall mean score of 3.99, interpreted as high level and this suggests that School Heads are actively fostering professional growth, collaboration, and well-being among teachers and staff, contributing to a positive and empowering school culture. The line item which states "The School Head provides opportunities for leadership development through targeted training programs that enhance management and instructional skills" got the highest mean score of 4.17, interpreted as high level. This reflects a strong commitment to cultivating leadership capacity within the school, enabling educators to take on more strategic roles and improve instructional effectiveness. On the other hand, the line item which states "The School Head takes the lead in implementing performance management for teachers and all staff" got the lowest mean score of 3.70, interpreted as high level. This shows that there are challenges in executing formal performance systems, possibly due to limited resources, lack of training, or discomfort with evaluative processes. This finding is supported by the study of McBrayer et al. (2020), which emphasized that leadership practices focused on professional development and instructional support significantly enhance school leaders' self-efficacy and contribute to school improvement. Similarly, AITSL (2018) highlighted that high-impact leadership involves

building staff capacity through fair treatment, continuous learning, and reflective practice—elements clearly evident in the data.

Table 6

Level of School Heads' leadership practices in the area of Building Connections

Items	Mean	Interpretation
The School Head...		
1. monitors and keep track of the activities of school organizations.	4.21	High Level
2. practices inclusivity especially in planning and decision-making.	4.24	High Level
3. takes the lead in collaborating with communities.	4.08	High Level
4. works with various organizations that promotes relationships across mixed cultural background.	4.12	High Level
5. communicates with all stakeholders and organizations in promoting equality and child protection issues in school.	4.09	High Level
6. strengthens partnerships with parents, guardians, and local leaders to foster a supportive learning environment that promotes student success.	4.03	High Level
7. encourages volunteerism and social responsibility by involving students, teachers, and staff in outreach programs and community service initiatives.	3.54	High Level
8. engages with educational institutions and industry professionals to explore opportunities for curriculum enrichment, professional development, and student learning experiences.	3.86	High Level
9. utilizes multiple communication channels to ensure transparency and open dialogue among all stakeholders, enhancing trust and collaboration.	3.75	High Level
10. advocates for inclusive policies that address the diverse needs of students, ensuring equitable access to learning resources and opportunities for academic growth.	4.06	High Level
Overall Mean	4.00	High Level

The overall mean score of 4.00 in Table 6 indicates that school heads demonstrate a high level of leadership practices in the area of Building Connections. This reflects their consistent efforts to foster inclusive, collaborative, and community-oriented environments that support student success and institutional growth. The line item which states "The School Head practices inclusivity especially in planning and decision-making" got the lowest mean score of 4.24, interpreted as high level. This suggests that school heads are strongly committed to ensuring that diverse voices—teachers, parents, students, and stakeholders—are meaningfully involved in shaping school policies and initiatives.

On the other hand, the line item which states that "The School Head encourages volunteerism and social responsibility by involving students, teachers, and staff in outreach programs and community service initiatives" got the lowest mean score of 3.54, interpreted as high level. This indicates that the outreach and service-learning programs are less emphasized or inconsistently implemented. This can be attributed to logistical challenges, limited resources, or competing academic priorities.

These findings align with the study of Jung and Sheldon (2020), which emphasized that transformational and collaborative leadership significantly enhance the quality of school–family partnerships and teacher engagement in community initiatives. Their research found that inclusive decision-making and strong stakeholder communication were key predictors of successful partnership programs.

Descriptive analysis in the level of Teachers' Performance

Table 7

Level of Teachers' Performance

Variable	Mean	Interpretation
Teachers' Performance	4.34	Very Satisfactory

Table 7 summarizes teachers' performance which was recorded at 4.34, interpreted as "very satisfactory". This suggests that teachers are consistently meeting and often exceeding expectations in their professional duties, including instructional delivery, classroom management, and student engagement. The result show high level of performance and this reflects a strong commitment to teaching excellence and may be attributed to effective leadership practices, supportive school environments, and ongoing professional development initiatives. This indicates that students can be assured of the benefits of high-quality instruction and a positive learning climate.

This result is supported by the study of Baluyos, Rivera, and Baluyos (2019), which found that teachers in Misamis Occidental exhibited very satisfactory performance levels, closely linked to their job satisfaction and the quality of school leadership. The study emphasized that when teachers feel supported and secure in their roles, their performance improves significantly, contributing to overall school success.

Comparative Analysis in the level of School Heads' leadership practices in the areas of 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, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Service, and Average Family Monthly Income

Table 8

Difference in the level of School Heads' leadership practices in the area of Leading Strategically when grouped and compared according to variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	85	88.68	2322.580	0.006	0.05	Significant
	Older	73	68.82				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	111	83.33	2183.000	0.103	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	47	70.45				
Length of Service	Shorter	84	88.01	2393.500	0.012	0.05	Significant
	Longer	74	69.84				
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	117	80.76	2251.500	0.557	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	41	75.91				

Table 8 reveals a statistically significant difference in the level of teachers' leadership practices in the area of Leading Strategically when grouped according to Age and Length of Service. The p-value for Age is 0.006, and for Length of Service is 0.012—both below the 0.05 threshold—leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis for these variables. Younger teachers (Mean Rank = 88.68) and those with shorter service durations (Mean Rank = 88.01) demonstrated stronger strategic leadership practices compared to their older and more tenured counterparts. This suggests that emerging educators may be more attuned to current pedagogical frameworks, adaptive planning, and data-informed decision-making—possibly influenced by recent training and exposure to digital learning environments. On the other hand, there was “no significant difference” observed when teachers' strategic leadership practices were grouped according to Highest Educational Attainment ($p = 0.103$) and Average Family Monthly Income ($p = 0.557$). These p-values exceeded the 0.05 significance level, resulting in the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This indicates that formal education and socioeconomic status do not substantially influence how teachers lead strategically, reinforcing the notion that leadership capacity stems more from professional growth and situational experience than personal background (Bush, 2018; UNESCO IIEP, 2021). Consequently, division leaders should focus on competency-based leadership frameworks and inclusive capacity-building initiatives that promote equity and encourage reflective practice across demographic groups. Ensuring access to strategic leadership development opportunities—regardless of educational attainment or income—can foster a more resilient, innovative, and cohesive teaching force.

Table 9

Difference in the level of School Heads' leadership practices in the area of Managing School Operations and Resources when grouped and compared according to variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	85	88.15	2367.500	0.010	0.05	Significant
	Older	73	69.43				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	111	79.39	2596.000	0.962	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	47	79.77				
Length of Service	Shorter	84	87.33	2450.000	0.021	0.05	Significant
	Longer	74	70.61				
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	117	80.15	2322.500	0.761	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	41	77.65				

Table 9 reveals that there is a statistically significant difference in the level of teachers' leadership practices in the area of Managing School Operations and Resources when grouped according to Age and Length of Service. The p-value for Age is 0.010 and for Length of Service is 0.021—both below the significance level of 0.05—resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis. Younger teachers (Mean Rank = 88.15) and those with shorter service duration (Mean Rank = 87.33) exhibited stronger operational leadership practices compared to older and longer-serving counterparts. This suggests that newer educators may be more adaptable to current administrative systems, resource planning, or school-wide coordination practices—possibly owing to contemporary training or early-career motivation. On the other hand, the results reveal no significant difference in leadership practices when grouped according to Highest Educational Attainment ($p = 0.962$) and Average Family Monthly Income ($p = 0.761$). These p-values exceed the 0.05 threshold, leading to the acceptance of the

null hypothesis. This implies that whether a teacher holds a higher educational qualification or comes from a higher-income household has no substantial impact on how they manage school operations and resources. According to Bush (2018), leadership effectiveness in school systems is less determined by socio-academic background and more by contextual engagement and professional development. Therefore, division offices should promote inclusive leadership enhancement programs that do not rely on demographic variables but instead assess competencies and readiness to lead operationally. This can help ensure equitable participation in school management tasks and increase organizational effectiveness across teaching populations.

Table 10

Difference in the level of School Heads' leadership practices in the area of Focusing on Teaching and Learning when grouped and compared according to variables

When grouped and compared according to variables							
Variable	Categor y	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	85	85.45	2596.50	0.074	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	73	72.57	0			
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	111	82.39	2288.00	0.217		Not Significant
	Higher	47	72.68	0			
Leng of Service	Shorter	84	83.64	2760.50	0.220		Not Significant
	Longer	74	74.80	0			
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	117	77.45	2158.50	0.335		Not Significant
	Higher	41	85.35	0			

Table 10 reveals that there is no statistically significant difference in the level of teachers' leadership practices in the area of Focusing on Teaching and Learning when grouped according to Age ($p = 0.074$), Highest Educational Attainment ($p = 0.217$), Length of Service ($p = 0.220$), and Average Family Monthly Income ($p = 0.335$). All p-values exceed the 0.05 significant level, thus the hypothesis is hereby accepted. This suggests that regardless of generational cohort, academic qualifications, tenure, or economic status, teachers exhibit comparable commitment to instructional quality and learner outcomes.

According to Bush (2018), leadership in the teaching domain is often shaped more by professional learning opportunities and collaborative culture than demographic factors. Thus, school and division-level operations should prioritize universal access to pedagogical enhancement programs, encouraging reflective practice and instructional leadership across all teacher profiles. Emphasizing competence rather than background ensures more equitable and impactful teaching systems, especially in contexts striving for inclusive education.

Table 11

Difference in the level of School Heads' leadership practices in the area of Developing Self and Others when grouped and compared according to variables

Grouped and compared according to variables							
Variable	Categor y	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	85	88.36	2349.50	0.008	0.05	Significant
	Older	73	69.18	0			
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	111	78.35	2480.50	0.622		Not Significant
	Higher	47	82.22	0			
Leng of Service	Shorter	84	88.35	2365.00	0.009		Significant
	Longer	74	69.46	0			
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	117	82.39	2060.00	0.175		Not Significant
	Higher	41	71.24	0			

Table 11 reveals that there is a statistically significant difference in the level of teachers' leadership practices in the area of Developing Self and Others when grouped according to Age ($p = 0.008$) and Length of Service ($p = 0.009$). These p-values fall below the 0.05 significance threshold, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis for these variables. Teachers who are younger (Mean Rank = 88.36) and those with shorter service duration (Mean Rank = 88.35) demonstrated stronger practices in personal and professional development compared to their older and longer-serving counterparts. This may reflect the influence of recent training, exposure to contemporary pedagogical models, or higher motivation to engage in growth-oriented activities. According to UNESCO MGIEP (2018), cultivating social-emotional competencies such as self-awareness and compassion is essential for educators to foster inclusive and adaptive learning environments. These findings suggest that school divisions should invest in intergenerational mentoring programs and reflective leadership coaching to bridge generational gaps and sustain professional growth across all career stages.

On the other hand, there were no significant differences leadership practices were grouped according to Highest Educational Attainment ($p = 0.622$) and Average Family Monthly Income ($p = 0.175$). These results support the acceptance of the null hypothesis, indicating that formal qualifications and socioeconomic status do not substantially influence teachers' capacity to develop themselves and others. This aligns with Bush (2018), who emphasized that leadership effectiveness is more closely tied to contextual engagement and experiential learning than to academic credentials. As such, school and division leaders should prioritize competency-based development frameworks and inclusive access to leadership training, ensuring that all educators—regardless of background—are empowered to lead and grow professionally.

Table 12

Difference in the level of School Heads' leadership practices in the area of Building Connections when grouped and compared according to variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	85	78.64	3029.000	0.797	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	73	80.51				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	111	80.21	2529.500	0.763	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	47	77.82				
Leng of Service	Shorter	84	79.63	3097.500	0.971	0.05	Not Significant
	Longer	74	79.36				
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	117	82.18	2085.500	0.212	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	41	71.87				

Table 12 reveals that there is no statistically significant difference in the level of teachers' leadership practices in the area of Building Connections when grouped according to Age ($p = 0.797$), Highest Educational Attainment ($p = 0.763$), Length of Service ($p = 0.971$), and Average Family Monthly Income ($p = 0.212$). All p-values exceed the 0.05 significance threshold, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis that demographic variables do not influence teachers' ability to build professional and community relationships. This result suggests that regardless of generational cohort, academic qualifications, tenure, or socioeconomic background, teachers demonstrate comparable levels of engagement in fostering connections with stakeholders. According to Bush (2018), effective leadership in education is more closely tied to relational competencies and contextual responsiveness than to personal demographics. Moreover, UNESCO IIEP (2021) emphasizes that inclusive and collaborative school environments thrive when all educators are empowered to engage meaningfully with families, communities, and institutional partners.

Relational Analysis between the level of School Heads' leadership practices and the level of teachers' performance

Table 13

Relationship between the level of School Heads' leadership practices and the level of teachers' performance

Variable	rho	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Level of School Heads' Leadership Practices	-0.042	0.597	0.05	Not Significant
Level of Teachers' Performance				

Table 13 reveals that there is no statistically significant relationship between the level of school heads' leadership practices and the level of teachers' performance, as indicated by a Spearman's rho of -0.042 and a p-value of 0.597 , which exceeds the 0.05 significance threshold. This leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis, suggesting that variations in leadership practices do not correspond meaningfully with changes in teacher performance within the sampled context. This result implies that while leadership practices may influence other aspects of school culture or operations, they do not directly correlate with measurable differences in teacher performance. It is possible that teacher performance is shaped more by individual competencies, professional development access, instructional resources, or peer collaboration than by the leadership style of school heads alone.

According to Bush (2018), leadership effectiveness often depends on contextual responsiveness rather than uniform influence across all domains of school functioning. Similarly, UNESCO IIEP (2021) emphasizes that teacher performance is best supported through targeted instructional coaching and systemic capacity-building, rather than relying solely on top-down leadership interventions.

Conclusions:

The demographic profile of respondents indicates that the majority are young, less tenured, have not pursued postgraduate education, and belong to lower-income households. This composition suggests a workforce characterized by early-career educators who may be navigating leadership responsibilities alongside economic and academic limitations. Despite these demographic characteristics, School Heads consistently demonstrated high levels of leadership practices across critical domains—Leading Strategically, Managing School Operations and Resources, Focusing on Teaching and Learning, Developing Self and Others, and Building Connections. This reflects a commendable breadth of engagement in strategic and operational leadership, regardless of their personal background.

Analysis of leadership practices grouped according to variables such as age, tenure, educational attainment, and income revealed that high levels of leadership persisted across all categories. This consistency suggests that demographic factors do not diminish the overall leadership capacity of School Heads in key domains. The level of teachers' performance was rated as "very satisfactory," indicating strong instructional delivery and professional competence. This performance reflects a committed teaching force, capable of maintaining educational quality regardless of demographic variation. A significant difference was found between the level of School Heads' leadership practices when grouped and compared across demographic variables. This finding highlights that certain background characteristics may influence how leadership is exercised, warranting targeted development interventions to sustain leadership quality across varied contexts. However, there was no significant relationship between School Heads' leadership practices and teachers' performance, implying that leadership behaviors alone may not directly influence instructional outcomes. This emphasizes the need for integrated approaches that combine leadership capacity with teacher support systems to strengthen the alignment between leadership and pedagogical impact.

Acknowledgement

The researcher would like to sincerely thanks her adviser and the res of the panel members for their efforts in ensuring that this manuscript is at par with scholarly requirements.

References:

- Academia.edu. (2024). School heads' leadership styles and teachers' performance.
- Akol, W. D. (2024). Managerial Behavioral Functions and Competence of Administrators Among Selected Junior High Schools in Bacoar City: Basis for Training Program Model. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 6 (3).
- Almazan, A. R. C. (2024). Servant Leadership Practices, School Heads' Decision-Making Skills, and Teachers' Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 2(11).
- AITSL. (2019). Developing self and others: Leading for impact. Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership. Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL). (2018). Developing Self and Others.
- Aquino, C. J., 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.
- Avery, G., & Bergsteiner, H. (2011). Sustainable leadership: Practices for enhancing business resilience and performance. *Strategy & Leadership*, 39(3), 5–15.
- Balbuena, C. M. B., Capacio, J. P. B., & Ocdenaria, J. M. E. (2025). Leadership Perspectives of Filipino School Heads in Diverse International Contexts: A Multiple Case Study. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, May 2025.
- Balfanz, Robert. (2024). STRENGTHENING SCHOOL CONNECTEDNESS TO INCREASE STUDENT SUCCESS. Education Research for Action. Brief # 29.
- Baluyos, G. R., Rivera, H. L., & Baluyos, E. L. (2019). Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Work Performance. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(8), 206–221.
- Barola, R. (2022). Profile and Level of Performance of Elementary School Heads in Leading Strategically: Basis for the Development of Policy Recommendations. *Jurnal Pendidikan Progresif*, 12(3), 2022–2034.
- Buenvinida, L. P., & Ramos, M. T. S. (2019). Transformational Leadership Practices of School Heads and Performance of City Schools in the Division of First District of Laguna, Philippines. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(3), 799–812.
- Bush, T. (2018). Leadership and context: Why one-size does not fit all. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1), 3–4.
- Cabigao, J. R. (2019). Professional competencies of school heads and their impact on school outcome, organizational culture, and principals' performance [Unpublished doctoral dissertation].
- Camino, H. O. (2021). Aging in Teaching: What Does It Bring? *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education*, 12(3), 5279–5289
- Camua, B. (2025, July 8). PBEed urges DepEd to give school heads more decision-making power. *Rappler*.
- Casas, R. R. L. (2023). Family Income Classification on Students' Academic Performance: A Correlational Study. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 12, 833–836.
- Chong, W. H., Loh, W. M., & Mak, M. C. (2020). School Leadership and Teacher Professional Learning in Singapore: A Study of Teachers' Perceptions. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(2), 263–283.

- Cruz, J. A., & Madarang, A. S. (2021). Leadership and Management Practices of Multi-Grade School Heads in the Division of Camarines Norte. *IRE Journals*, 4(10), 1–10.
- Cruz, M. G. (2018). The Impact of Teacher Leadership in Public High School. De La Salle University Research Congress Proceedings.
- Dawang, J. R., & Genuba, R. S. (2024). Authentic leadership and work engagement among public school heads: Self-efficacy as a mediating variable. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Management Engineering*, 3(9), 89–101.
- 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.
- Department of Education. (2020). DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020: National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads.
- Eddy-Spicer, D., Crawford, M., Earley, P., James, C., & Bubb, S. (2014). Effectively managing headteacher performance. Department for Education, UK.
- 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.
- Gaol, Nasib. (2021). School leadership in Indonesia: A systematic literature review. SAGE Journals Publication. 51(4).
- Generalao, I. N., Ducanes, G., Yee, K. M., & David, C. C. (2022). Teacher Education in the Philippines: Meeting the Demand for Quality? *Philippine Journal of Public Policy*.
- 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.
- Guiab, M. R., & Ganal, N. N. (2020). Demographic Profile of Public School Heads and School-Related Problems. Philippine Normal University-Isabela Campus.
- 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.
- Indon, E. C. (2024). Managerial Competence of School Heads in the Implementation of Educational Procedures: Basis for a Development Plan. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 8(4), 40–57
- Gangmei, E. (2019). Trends of Recent Research on Effective Leadership in Relation to School Education. *International Journal of Innovative Studies in Sociology and Humanities*. 4(5).
- Gustafsson, J.-E., Yang Hansen, K., & Rosén, M. (2018). Socioeconomic Status and School Performance. In D. Leu, C. McVee, & J. G. Cromley (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Literacy and Diversity* (pp. 145–160).
- Groenewald, J., Mokoena, S., & Naidoo, P. (2024). Contextual leadership in South African schools: A strategic perspective. *South African Journal of Education Leadership*, 42(1), 15–32.
- Hacker, S. (2019). Transformational leadership: Creating Organizations of Meaning. Quality Press.
- Hairon, S., & Goh, J. W. P. (2020). Predictors of instructional leadership in Singapore school system. The HEAD Foundation.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the Instructional Management Behavior of Principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–247.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2019). Leading professional learning with impact. *School Leadership & Management*, 39(1), 1–4.
- Indon, E. C. (2021). Managerial Competence of School Heads in the Implementation of Educational Procedures: Basis for a Development Plan. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(8), 40–57
- Jabonillo, E. (2022). School culture and its implications to leadership practices and school effectiveness. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 5(11), 942–953.
- Jung, S. B., & Sheldon, S. B. (2020). Connecting Dimensions of School Leadership for Partnerships with School and Teacher Practices of Family Engagement. *School Community Journal*, 30(1).
- Laerd Statistics. (2018). Mann-Whitney U test using SPSS Statistics.
- Leithwood, K., Azah, V. N., & Harris, J. (2020). An international perspective on school leadership effects. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(2), 312–342.
- Lipata, 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.
- Liou, Y. H. (2015). School Leaders' Strategic Thinking and Innovation. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 43(5), 755–770.
- Lingam, G. Leadership and Management Training for School Heads: A Milestone Achievement for Fiji. (2024).
- McBrayer, J. S., Akins, C., Gutierrez de Blume, A., Cleveland, R., & Pannell, S. (2020). Instructional Leadership Practices and School Leaders' Self-Efficacy. *School Leadership Review*, 15(1).
- Menon, M. E., & Mubeen, S. A. (2018). School Leadership for Teacher Development: A Systematic Review of the Empirical Literature. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 21(3), 310–328.
- Merano, E. S. (2023). Financial Management Competence of School Heads and Performance of Schools in Leyte Division. *International Journal of Science and Technology Research Archive*, 5(2), 60–77.
- Nabong, A. R., Ballesteros, L. G., & Tibayan, R. V. (2020). Operational Leadership Practices of Public School Heads in the Philippines: Basis for Capacity Development. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(4), 677–695

- Naguit, J. Z. (2024). Instructional leadership practices of school heads and performance of teachers in instructional supervision. *International Journal of Academic Management Studies*.
- OECD. (2019). The Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) 2018: Australian Report Volume 1
- Orignes, M. A. N. E. (2022). School-Based Management and School Heads' Competencies and Practices. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 104(1)
- 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.
- Osman, E. Z. (2023). Transformational leadership in Singapore schools: Insights from a groundbreaking study. *Eduxtrum*.
- Paladio, C. M. G. (2023). Strategic Leadership Performance of the School Heads in DepEd Masbate City Division. *International Journal of Novel Research and Development*, 4(1), 1-15.
- 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.
- Panlaque, R. S. (2023). The essence of Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads. DepEd Bataan.
- Pollock, K., & Hauseman, D. C. (2021). Principals' work and wellbeing in Canada: The impact of COVID-19. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, (196), 1-34.
- 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.
- Precioso, J. T., & Chua, M. D. (2025). Performance of School Heads and Teachers in Public Elementary Schools. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 8(5), 2772-2784.
- 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.
- Reyes, Y. D. (2018). Teachers' and School Administrators' Perception on the Strategic Leadership Practices of School Administrators. *The Educational Review, USA*, 2(8), 432-446.
- Rico, K. B. (2021). Utilization of Financial Resources and Development of School Facilities and Services for Students and Teachers of Esperanza National High School. *Randwick International of Education and Linguistics Science Journal*, 2(3), 325-338
- Rivera, L. K. (2023). School Leadership Practices to the School-Based Management Performance. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 123(1), 288-297
- Salleh, Hairon. (2020). PREDICTORS OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IN SINGAPORE SCHOOL SYSTEM. [headfoundation.org/ Working Papers Series No. 4/2020](http://headfoundation.org/Working%20Papers%20Series%20No.%204/2020).
- Schleicher, A. (2018). Valuing our teachers and raising their status: How communities can help. OECD Publishing.
- Silva, P. M., & Andal, E. Z. (2023). School Head's Governance in Managing School Operations and Resources as Correlate of Public Elementary School's Performance. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 127(1), 537-548
- Shah, M. A. H., Hussain, S., & Khoso, A. A. (2021). Investigating the Relationship Between Family Income and Students' Academic Achievement at the Secondary Level. *International Research Journal of Education and Innovation*, 2(2), 1-12.
- Soroño, C. G., & Quirap, E. A. (2023). School heads' instructional leadership and teachers' performance. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 125(1), 356-366.
- Statology. (2022). How to interpret the Mann-Whitney U test.
- Tan, C. H.. (2023). Understanding Singaporean Educational Leadership. *Educational Leadership and Asian Culture*. Research Gate. 170-190. The University of Hong Kong.
- TeacherPH. (2023). Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH).
- UNESCO. (2018). School Leadership and Learning Outcomes.
- UNESCO IIEP. (2021). IIEP in action 2020-2021.
- Valenzuela, E. S., & Buenvenida, L. P. (2021). Managing School Operations and Resources in the New Normal and Performance of Public Schools in One School Division in the Philippines. *IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 3(2), 149-157.
- Valmores, C. P. (2021). School Heads' Administrative and Leadership Skills: Its Influence on School Performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications*, 4(3), 1-15