INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF RESEARCH FOR INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY AND EXCELLENCE (IMJRISE)
Online ISSN: 3028-032X | Print ISSN: 3028-0370
PUBLISHED BY: RISEJOURNALS.ORG
Volume 1, Issue no. 11 | **269**

Elevating Education: Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Cebu City's Selected Public High Schools

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.14187731

Glenn R. Andrin, EdD., PhD.
Adjunct Professor, La Consolacion College-Bacolod
ORCID:0000-0002-3008-5661

Mario Ramil R. Pepito, PhD.
Dean, College of Hotel and Restaurant Management, University of Cebu-Main Campus
ORCID:0000-0001-7716-5776

Victoria S. Amadora, PhD.
Professor, College of Hotel and Restaurant Management, University of Cebu-Main Campus
ORCID: 0009-0005-1576-6599

Earl Dave V. Rocha, PhD.
Professor, College of Hotel and Restaurant Management, University of Cebu-Main Campus
ORCID: 0000-0002-7286-1673

Abstract

This study examines the instructional leadership practices of principals in selected public secondary schools in Cebu City. Using Hallinger's Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS), the study identifies key leadership practices in the areas of school goal setting, curriculum coordination, instructional supervision, and teacher incentives. Results show that principals display a moderate level of engagement in instructional leadership, with significant variation across schools and leadership dimensions. The study highlights strengths in goal framing and communication, but gaps exist in areas such as maintaining high visibility and evaluating instruction. Statistical analyses, including ANOVA and Scheffé's test, reveal notable differences in leadership practices across the ten dimensions, suggesting opportunities for improvement. Recommendations emphasize the need for targeted professional development to enhance principals' visibility and instructional oversight, aligning leadership practices with transformative educational goals.

Keywords: Department of Education, School Leadership Practices, Curriculum, Instructional Supervision, School Goal Setting, Cebu City, Philippines

Introduction

The Philippines faces a pressing concern about the quality of education, affecting both individuals and the nation. For individuals, education serves as a tool to improve their lives, while for the nation, progress relies on the quality of education its citizens receive. Schools, as the foundation of formal education, are central to this mission. They are tasked with ensuring effective learning, where teaching inputs transform into measurable outcomes like academic achievements, values, and self-concept development. To achieve this, schools must adapt to global changes and provide an environment conducive to learning.

The effectiveness of schools hinges on the leadership of their principals. Research consistently highlights the principal as a key figure in creating conditions that make schools effective. A principal's leadership influences the organization's culture, inspiring staff to embrace change and strive for continuous improvement. Organizational culture, vital for enhancing teaching and learning, relies heavily on proactive and creative leadership. Principals must recognize this and shape their school culture to positively impact student achievement and overall school performance.

As instructional leaders and administrative managers, principals play dual roles. They motivate and influence their staff through emotional appeals rather than authority, fostering cooperation and minimizing friction. A principal's leadership extends beyond routine tasks to initiating meaningful changes in the educational system. Successful innovation in schools depends on the principal's ability to create a supportive climate for change and effectively implement strategies that align with their vision for the school.

Given the pivotal role of principals, Republic Act 9155 empowers them as decision-makers, ensuring they can address the needs of learners effectively. Principals are dynamic leaders who provide guidance and stability, preventing confusion and insecurity among staff. Leadership is a learned skill, emphasizing the importance of professional development for principals to refine their management practices. Effective leadership encourages teachers to become agents of change, furthering the school's goals and overall performance.

Ultimately, the principal is the most influential figure in a school, shaping its climate, professionalism, and reputation. Their leadership connects the school to the community and directly affects stakeholders' attitudes toward education. A vibrant and successful school often reflects strong and effective leadership. Therefore, principals must continually assess and improve their leadership styles, aligning their personal values and administrative practices with the school's objectives. This study aims to examine the leadership functions demonstrated by principals in selected public secondary schools in Cebu City, as outlined in Hallinger's PIMRS framework.

Theoretical Background

The study is anchored on the theory of Ungar (2003), which emphasizes that effective leadership in school organizations depends on leaders possessing appropriate qualities and skills, combined with a system of personal values that they consistently manifest. Ungar highlighted that the earliest attempts to distinguish effective leaders from ineffective ones focused on identifying the personality attributes of successful leaders. Among the most frequently mentioned attributes of an effective leader are intelligence, fairness, understanding, general and job-specific knowledge, perceptiveness, high integrity, a natural ability to lead, and proficiency in delegation.

Ungar and Perrow further argued that there is no single or universally best leadership style that guarantees effectiveness in all situations. They asserted that different factors motivate different individuals, and various organizational structures and leadership approaches may be appropriate at different times. Leadership effectiveness is thus situationally determined, requiring a flexible and adaptive approach.

According to Ungar, the most important characteristics of an effective leader include praising subordinates for a job well done, encouraging subordinates to offer suggestions on policies and practices, consulting with them before implementing changes that affect their work, and avoiding favoritism. Additionally, effective leaders reprimand subordinates privately rather than publicly and delegate authority to subordinates on matters directly related to their responsibilities. These qualities and practices collectively contribute to the success of leaders in fostering productive and harmonious organizational environments.

The Problem

This study aimed to investigate the principals' instructional leadership practices in selected public secondary high schools in Cebu City, with the ultimate goal of proposing recommendations relevant to the observed phenomenon. The findings of the study served as the basis for formulating these recommendations. Specifically, the research sought to address the following inquiries:

1. What are the prevailing instructional leadership practices of principals as perceived by respondents across the following dimensions:
    - 1.1 Framing the school's goals,
    - 1.2 Communicating the school's goals,
    - 1.3 Coordinating the curriculum,
    - 1.4 Supervising and evaluating instruction,
    - 1.5 Monitoring student progress,
    - 1.6 Protecting instructional time,
    - 1.7 Providing incentives for teachers,
    - 1.8 Providing incentives for learning,
    - 1.9 Promoting professional development, and
    - 1.10 Maintaining high visibility?
2. Is there a significant degree of variance across the ten dimensions of instructional leadership practices?
3. Based on the findings, what recommendations may be proposed to improve instructional leadership practices?

Research Methodology

Design

This study utilized a descriptive causal-comparative design, a methodology aimed at exploring existing conditions and identifying the causes or reasons for these conditions (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Sorensen, 2006). Specifically, the study aimed to describe and assess the instructional leadership practices of public school principals in Cebu City. The primary goal was not only to observe the current leadership behaviors of the principals but also to understand the factors that might contribute to these practices, including the possible effects on teachers and the overall educational environment.

A causal-comparative design is particularly suited for studies that examine the relationship between independent (cause) and dependent (effect) variables, even when it is not possible to manipulate the independent variable directly.

In this study, the independent variable was the instructional leadership practices of the principals, and the dependent variable was the teachers' perceptions of these leadership practices, as reflected through their experiences in the schools.

This design allows for an exploration of existing conditions without interference, making it ideal for studying natural school environments where variables like school culture, principal leadership style, and teacher responses are already in place. By using this approach, the study aims to uncover any potential relationships between the leadership practices of the principals and teacher perceptions, thereby shedding light on the broader educational dynamics at play.

Environment

The study was conducted in three high schools located in Cebu City: Abellana National High School, Pardo National High School, and Ramon Duterte National High School. These schools were chosen to provide a diverse representation of different school environments in terms of socio-economic background, size, and geographical location within the city. The inclusion of multiple schools allows for a comparison of instructional leadership practices across different educational contexts, which strengthens the validity of the study's findings. By focusing on public schools, the research also aims to capture the general trends in instructional leadership practices prevalent in the public education system of Cebu City, providing valuable insights for policy makers and school administrators.

Respondents

A purposive-random sampling technique was employed to select the respondents, ensuring that the sample would be both relevant and representative of the target population. The respondents consisted of 87 teachers across the three schools, with 50 teachers from Abellana National High School, 25 teachers from Ramon Duterte National High School, and 12 teachers from Pardo National High School. This varied distribution allows for an understanding of how the perceptions of instructional leadership might differ between schools of varying sizes and resources. The purposive aspect ensures that the teachers selected are directly involved in the teaching and learning process, and thus can provide valid feedback on the leadership practices of the school principals.

The sample size of 87 teachers, though relatively small, is sufficient for obtaining detailed insights into the perceptions of instructional leadership. Moreover, the varied distribution of teachers across the three schools increases the diversity of perspectives, allowing for a richer and more nuanced analysis of the data.

Instrument

Two primary instruments were utilized for data collection: a demographic questionnaire and the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS). The demographic questionnaire collected information on key independent variables, such as the teachers' years of experience, education level, and other factors that could influence their perceptions of instructional leadership.

The PIMRS, developed by Hallinger (1983), is a well-established tool for assessing the instructional leadership behaviors of school principals. This instrument uses a Likert-type scale with 50 items to measure three core dimensions of instructional leadership:

1. Defining the school's mission: The ability of the principal to set a clear vision and direction for the school.
2. Managing the instructional program: The principal's role in ensuring that the teaching and learning processes are effectively implemented.
3. Promoting a positive school learning climate: The creation of an environment that supports academic growth and well-being for both students and staff.

These three dimensions are further broken down into ten specific leadership functions. The PIMRS allows for an in-depth assessment of each of these functions, helping to measure the specific behaviors of principals in these areas. The scale is behaviorally anchored, meaning the items are designed to assess actual behaviors, rather than abstract concepts, which increases the reliability and accuracy of the data collected. The comprehensive nature of the PIMRS makes it a suitable instrument for this study, as it provides a thorough assessment of the leadership practices being examined.

Data Gathering Procedure

The data gathering procedure was systematic and ethical, ensuring that all necessary permissions were obtained prior to the research. First, permission was secured from the District Supervisor of the Department of Education, a crucial step in ensuring the study adhered to institutional guidelines and ethical standards. After obtaining approval, the researcher coordinated with the school principals to schedule the distribution of the questionnaires. This

collaborative approach ensured that the study did not disrupt the schools' regular operations while facilitating access to the teachers.

The questionnaires were administered on an agreed-upon date, and the researcher made immediate efforts to collect them upon completion. This timely retrieval ensured that the data collected remained relevant and fresh. In cases where teachers were unavailable during the scheduled distribution, alternate arrangements were made to ensure that all respondents had an opportunity to participate.This well-organized approach to data collection maximized response rates and minimized potential biases or logistical issues, which are common concerns in survey-based research.

Statistical Treatment

To analyze the collected data, the study applied a range of statistical treatments to ensure a comprehensive and accurate interpretation of the findings. These included:

- Percentage: To determine the distribution of responses, allowing the researcher to summarize key trends and demographic characteristics.
- Weighted Mean: To calculate the average responses, giving more weight to responses that may be considered more significant.
- ANOVA (Analysis of Variance): To compare the differences between groups (e.g., teachers from different schools) and to determine if significant variations existed in their perceptions of instructional leadership.
- Scheffé's Test: A post-hoc analysis used after ANOVA to identify which specific groups differ from one another, providing a deeper insight into the factors affecting leadership perceptions.

Results

Table below presents the prevailing instructional leadership practices of principals, as perceived by all respondents from three schools, alongside the aggregated means and their interpretations. The results provide valuable insights into the current practices and areas that require attention to enhance instructional leadership.

Table 1
Summary of Results on the Dominant Instructional leadership Practices

Dimensions	**AGGREGATED MEAN**	**DV**	**R**
A. Frame the School Goals	3.20	SP	1
B. Communicate the School Goals	3.19	SP	2
C. Supervise and Evaluate Instruction	2.86	SP	9
D. Coordinate the Curriculum	3.10	SP	5
E. Monitor Student Progress	2.98	SP	6
F. Protect Instructional Time	2.94	SP	7
G. Maintain High Visibility	2.57	PP	10
H. Provide Incentives for Teachers	2.86	SP	8
I. Promote Professional Development	3.14	SP	3
J. Provide Incentives for Learning	3.13	SP	4
Overall Composite Mean	3.00	SP	

Table 2
Different Dimensions of Instructional Leadership Practices

INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF RESEARCH FOR INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY AND EXCELLENCE (IMJRISE)
Online ISSN: 3028-032X | Print ISSN: 3028-0370
PUBLISHED BY: RISEJOURNALS.ORG
Volume 1, Issue no. 11 | **273**

Respondents	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I		J	
	X_1	$(X_1)^2$	X_2	$(X_2)^2$	X_3	$(X_3)^2$	X_4	$(X_4)^2$	X_5	$(X_5)^2$	X_6	$(X_6)^2$	X_7	$(X_7)^2$	X_8	$(X_8)^2$	X_9	$(X_9)^2$	X_{10}	$(X_{10})^2$
n	87		87		87		87		87		87		87		87		87		87	
Sum	278.80	935.4400	277.20	923.7600	249.00	748.3600	269.80	874.3600	259.20	817.6080	255.60	788.8800	223.20	613.3600	249.20	760.8800	272.80	891.6800	272.20	912.2800
Mean	3.20		3.19		2.86		3.10		2.98		2.94		2.57		2.86		3.14		3.13	
SS	893.4418		883.2166		712.6552		836.6901		772.2372		756.9352		572.6234		713.8035		855.4905		851.6418	

ANOVA Table

Sources of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-Value	
				Computed	Tabular (0.05)
Between Groups	9	30.63195	3.40355	6.99542	0.97333
Within Groups	860	423.8777	0.49288	Result: Significant	
Total	869	454.50966		Ho: Rejected	

Table 2.1

INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF RESEARCH FOR INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY AND EXCELLENCE (IMJRISE)
Online ISSN: 3028-032X | Print ISSN: 3028-0370
PUBLISHED BY: RISEJOURNALS.ORG
Volume 1, Issue no. 11 | 274

Differences Between the Mean Scores for Each Dimensions

Between Dimensions			Mean1	Mean2	D	n1	n2	F'	F*K-1	Interpretation
A	vs	B	3.20	3.19	0.02	87	87	0.0299	8.760	Insignificant
A	vs	C	3.20	2.86	0.34	87	87	10.3548	8.760	**Significant**
A	vs	D	3.20	3.10	0.10	87	87	0.9445	8.760	Insignificant
A	vs	E	3.20	2.98	0.23	87	87	4.4794	8.760	Insignificant
A	vs	F	3.20	2.94	0.27	87	87	6.2760	8.760	Insignificant
A	vs	G	3.20	2.57	0.64	87	87	36.0461	8.760	**Significant**
A	vs	H	3.20	2.86	0.34	87	87	10.2163	8.760	**Significant**
A	vs	I	3.20	3.14	0.07	87	87	0.4198	8.760	Insignificant
A	vs	J	3.20	3.13	0.08	87	87	0.5079	8.760	Insignificant
B	vs	C	3.19	2.86	0.32	87	87	9.2727	8.760	**Significant**
B	vs	D	3.19	3.10	0.09	87	87	0.6385	8.760	Insignificant
B	vs	E	3.19	2.98	0.21	87	87	3.7779	8.760	Insignificant
B	vs	F	3.19	2.94	0.25	87	87	5.4402	8.760	Insignificant
B	vs	G	3.19	2.57	0.62	87	87	34.0013	8.760	**Significant**
B	vs	H	3.19	2.86	0.32	87	87	9.1417	8.760	**Significant**
B	vs	I	3.19	3.14	0.05	87	87	0.2257	8.760	Insignificant
B	vs	J	3.19	3.13	0.06	87	87	0.2915	8.760	Insignificant
C	vs	D	2.86	3.10	-0.24	87	87	5.0447	8.760	Insignificant
C	vs	E	2.86	2.98	-0.12	87	87	1.2131	8.760	Insignificant
C	vs	F	2.86	2.94	-0.08	87	87	0.5079	8.760	Insignificant
C	vs	G	2.86	2.57	0.30	87	87	7.7615	8.760	Insignificant
C	vs	H	2.86	2.86	0.00	87	87	0.0005	8.760	Insignificant
C	vs	I	2.86	3.14	-0.27	87	87	6.6048	8.760	Insignificant
C	vs	J	2.86	3.13	-0.27	87	87	6.2760	8.760	Insignificant
D	vs	E	3.10	2.98	0.12	87	87	1.3101	8.760	Insignificant
D	vs	F	3.10	2.94	0.16	87	87	2.3512	8.760	Insignificant
D	vs	G	3.10	2.57	0.54	87	87	25.3210	8.760	**Significant**
D	vs	H	3.10	2.86	0.24	87	87	4.9482	8.760	Insignificant
D	vs	I	3.10	3.14	-0.03	87	87	0.1049	8.760	Insignificant
D	vs	J	3.10	3.13	-0.03	87	87	0.0672	8.760	Insignificant
E	vs	F	2.98	2.94	0.04	87	87	0.1511	8.760	Insignificant
E	vs	G	2.98	2.57	0.41	87	87	15.1117	8.760	**Significant**
E	vs	H	2.98	2.86	0.11	87	87	1.1660	8.760	Insignificant
E	vs	I	2.98	3.14	-0.16	87	87	2.1567	8.760	Insignificant
E	vs	J	2.98	3.13	-0.15	87	87	1.9706	8.760	Insignificant
F	vs	G	2.94	2.57	0.37	87	87	12.2405	8.760	**Significant**
F	vs	H	2.94	2.86	0.07	87	87	0.4776	8.760	Insignificant
F	vs	I	2.94	3.14	-0.20	87	87	3.4496	8.760	Insignificant
F	vs	J	2.94	3.13	-0.19	87	87	3.2131	8.760	Insignificant
G	vs	H	2.57	2.86	-0.30	87	87	7.8823	8.760	Insignificant
G	vs	I	2.57	3.14	-0.57	87	87	28.6861	8.760	**Significant**
G	vs	J	2.57	3.13	-0.56	87	87	27.9963	8.760	**Significant**
H	vs	I	2.86	3.14	-0.27	87	87	6.4943	8.760	Insignificant
H	vs	J	2.86	3.13	-0.26	87	87	6.1683	8.760	Insignificant
I	vs	J	3.14	3.13	0.01	87	87	0.0042	8.760	Insignificant

Discussion

Dominant Instructional Leadership Practices

From the data presented in Table 1, the overall composite mean of 3.00 suggests that the instructional leadership practices, as a whole, are slightly practiced by the principals. While the principals exhibit some degree of proficiency in certain areas, there is a noticeable gap in several key practices, as indicated by the mean scores across the various dimensions. Notably, the highest means were observed for Frame the School Goals (3.20) and Communicate the School Goals (3.19), both interpreted as slightly practiced. These dimensions indicate that principals are somewhat successful in setting and communicating clear school-wide goals, which are essential in directing the focus of the school community. However, their practices in these areas are not robust enough to be classified as well practiced, suggesting room for improvement in ensuring that these goals are effectively communicated and aligned throughout the school environment.

In contrast, the dimension Maintain High Visibility garnered the lowest mean of 2.57, which falls under the category of poorly practiced. This suggests that the principals, across the three schools, have significant challenges in maintaining a visible leadership presence within the school. This could be indicative of a disconnect between the principals and the everyday realities of teaching and learning, which is a critical aspect of instructional leadership. High visibility is important for fostering trust and rapport with teachers, students, and staff, as well as for identifying and addressing emerging challenges in a timely manner. Similarly, Supervise and Evaluate Instruction (2.86) and Provide Incentives for Teachers (2.86) also reflect areas where principals' leadership practices are perceived as slightly practiced, but far from ideal.

The dimensions of Monitor Student Progress (2.98) and Protect Instructional Time (2.94) also suggest that principals could be more proactive in ensuring that student performance is closely monitored and that instructional time is safeguarded from unnecessary disruptions. These aspects are crucial for ensuring that the academic standards of the school are maintained and that teachers can maximize teaching time.

The findings align with Snyder's (1983) version of instructional leadership, which emphasized the importance of actions over abstract skills or behaviors. According to Snyder, effective instructional leaders are those who not only plan school-wide goals but also develop actionable plans, implement them effectively, and assess their progress. The relatively lower scores in some areas, particularly supervision and evaluation and maintaining visibility, suggest that the principals in this study may not be fully engaged in these key leadership actions.
Ylimaki (2007) noted that earlier instructional leadership models of the 1980s, which were predominantly principal-centered and directive, have been criticized for not empowering others within the school community. This study supports that view, as principals are perceived as somewhat engaged in certain aspects of instructional leadership but less so in others that would directly empower teachers and students. More contemporary models of instructional leadership, such as transformational leadership, advocate for a shift towards empowering teachers and involving them more actively in decision-making processes (Harris et al., 2007; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005).

The lower scores related to visibility and evaluation of instruction suggest that principals may still be operating within traditional, hierarchical models rather than engaging in more distributive or transformational leadership approaches that are known to foster teacher autonomy and improve overall school performance (Mangin, 2007). Furthermore, the study reflects the evolving understanding of instructional leadership at the district level, as described by Rorrer, Skrla, & Scheurich (2008), who emphasized the broader influence of district-level policies on instructional leadership and student achievement. The research supports the notion that instructional leadership is a dynamic construct that is shaped by both the principal's actions and the larger educational environment, which includes district-level decisions and resources.

In conclusion, the findings of this study suggest that while principals exhibit some practices of instructional leadership, significant gaps exist, particularly in areas like maintaining visibility, supervision and evaluation, and teacher incentives. These gaps indicate the need for targeted professional development for principals, focusing on the enhancement of their visibility within the school, as well as strengthening their engagement in the evaluation and support of teaching practices. Adopting a more transformational leadership style could help address these shortcomings, as it emphasizes the importance of empowering teachers, fostering collaboration, and ensuring that leadership is not confined to the principal alone. By addressing these areas, principals can improve their effectiveness as instructional leaders and create an environment that fosters both teacher and student success.

Analysis of Variance on the Different Dimensions of Instructional Leadership Practices

The results of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the 10 dimensions of instructional leadership practices, as perceived by the respondents, are presented in the Table above. This statistical analysis was conducted to assess whether significant differences exist in the perceptions of the respondents regarding the level of implementation of

instructional leadership practices among the principals. As indicated in Table 41, the computed F-value of 6.90542 exceeds the critical F-value of 0.97333 with 9 and 880 degrees of freedom at the 0.05 level of significance. This leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis, which asserts that there is no difference in the respondents' perceptions across the 10 dimensions of instructional leadership practices.

The rejection of the null hypothesis suggests that there is a significant variance in how the respondents from the three schools perceive the level of implementation of instructional leadership practices by their principals. This finding implies that, although the general perceptions may be similar, the extent to which principals implement specific dimensions of leadership practices can vary. In other words, the implementation of these leadership practices is not uniform across all dimensions and schools, revealing areas where some principals may be more effective than others. Furthermore, while the respondents from the three schools share similar overall perceptions about the implementation of the 10 dimensions, there may be differences in the subtleties of how the leadership practices are carried out.

Differences Between the Mean Scores for Each Dimension

To delve deeper into the differences between the mean scores for each dimension, the Scheffé's test was applied. This post-hoc analysis highlighted specific pairs of dimensions where significant differences exist. Notably, a significant difference was observed between Frame the School Goals and Supervision and Evaluate Instruction, suggesting that the way principals frame the school goals differs notably from their practices in supervising and evaluating instruction. Another significant difference was found between Maintain High Visibility and Provide Incentives for Teachers, indicating that principals who maintain high visibility in the school environment may approach incentivizing teachers differently. Similarly, a significant difference was detected between Communicate the School Goals and Supervision and Evaluate Instruction, showing that the manner in which principals communicate school goals is perceived differently from how they supervise and evaluate instructional practices. Further, significant differences were noted between Coordinate the Curriculum, Monitor Student Progress, and Protect Instructional Time with Monitor High Visibility, implying that efforts to coordinate curriculum and monitor student progress may not always align with the principal's efforts to maintain high visibility. Lastly, a significant difference was found between Monitor High Visibility and Promote Professional Development and Provide Incentives for Learning, suggesting distinct differences between how principals maintain visibility and how they promote professional development and incentivize learning.

These findings suggest that while principals may be perceived as performing similar leadership functions, the execution and emphasis on specific aspects of instructional leadership can vary significantly. These differences are crucial for understanding the areas where principals may need further support or development in their leadership practices.

Findings of the Study

The study on the instructional leadership practices of principals in selected public high schools in Cebu City revealed significant variations in the principals' leadership behaviors across various dimensions. The overall composite mean score of 3.00 indicated that the instructional leadership practices were slightly practiced, with room for improvement in several areas. Key findings include:

1. Highest-Scoring Practices: The dimensions "Frame the School Goals" (3.20) and "Communicate the School Goals" (3.19) had the highest mean scores, reflecting that principals were somewhat effective in setting and communicating school goals. However, these practices were not fully integrated into the school environment, as their scores were categorized as "slightly practiced."
2. Lowest-Scoring Practices: The "Maintain High Visibility" dimension received the lowest mean score of 2.57, categorized as "poorly practiced." This indicates that principals struggled with maintaining a visible leadership presence, a crucial component of effective instructional leadership. Other areas such as "Supervise and Evaluate Instruction" (2.86), "Provide Incentives for Teachers" (2.86), and "Monitor Student Progress" (2.98) also showed weaker practices.
3. Significant Variance Across Dimensions: The study found a statistically significant variance in how the instructional leadership practices were perceived across the ten dimensions, as indicated by the ANOVA results. This suggests that while principals may show strengths in certain aspects of instructional leadership, their practices differ considerably across schools and specific leadership functions.
4. Differences in Leadership Perception: The post-hoc analysis using Scheffé's test revealed significant differences between certain dimensions. Notably, the way principals frame school goals was significantly different from their practices in supervising and evaluating instruction. Moreover, a significant variance was observed between how principals communicate goals and their approaches to supervising instruction.

Conclusion

Based on the findings, the study concludes that while the principals in Cebu City's selected public high schools exhibit some instructional leadership practices, there are substantial gaps in their overall effectiveness. The leadership practices, though slightly practiced, were not robust enough to fully support the growth of both teachers and students in these schools. The principals' leadership was found to be inconsistent, particularly in areas that require high visibility, consistent evaluation, and teacher engagement. Furthermore, the study underscores the importance of professional development for school principals, especially in enhancing their visibility within the school, actively monitoring student progress, and providing better support and incentives for teachers. The significant variance in leadership practices across the dimensions indicates a need for tailored interventions to strengthen the instructional leadership capacities of principals.

Recommendations

1. Enhance Principal Visibility: Principals should focus on increasing their visibility within the school. Regular interaction with staff and students, as well as more frequent classroom visits, would allow principals to address emerging issues and build stronger relationships with their teams.
2. Focus on Teacher Supervision and Evaluation: Principals should engage more deeply in supervising and evaluating instruction. Professional development programs should equip principals with the skills to effectively observe, assess, and support teachers in improving instructional practices.
3. Promote Teacher Incentives and Support: There should be a more systematic approach to providing incentives for teachers. Recognizing teacher achievements and offering tangible rewards can motivate teachers to excel in their instructional practices.
4. Foster Professional Development: Principals should be proactive in promoting professional development opportunities for both themselves and their teaching staff. Creating a culture of continuous learning will enhance the overall quality of education.
5. Strengthen Curriculum Coordination and Monitoring: Principals should ensure that curriculum coordination and student progress monitoring are aligned with the school's goals and instructional strategies. This can be achieved through regular meetings with teachers and academic coordinators to assess student outcomes and adjust teaching methods accordingly.
6. Adopt Transformational Leadership Practices: Given the evolving nature of effective leadership, principals are encouraged to adopt more transformational leadership practices. This includes empowering teachers, fostering collaboration, and adopting a more inclusive approach to decision-making.
7. Targeted Professional Development for Principals: The study highlights the need for ongoing professional development for school principals, particularly in the areas of instructional leadership, visibility, and teacher motivation. Specialized leadership training programs focusing on these key areas will ensure that principals are better equipped to lead schools effectively.

By addressing these areas, principals can enhance their effectiveness as instructional leaders, ultimately leading to improved teaching practices, student achievement, and overall school performance.

References

Hallinger, P. (1983). *The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS)*. Educational Administration Quarterly, 19(2), 62-87.

Harris, A., Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2007). Distributed leadership and organizational change. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(4), 442-463.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). A review of transformational leadership research in education. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 217-234.

Mangin, M. M. (2007). *The role of principals in supporting teacher leadership: A review of the literature*. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 91(2), 47-60.

Rorrer, A. K., Skrla, L., & Scheurich, J. J. (2008). The politics of leadership: Making leadership policy work in high-poverty schools. *Educational Policy*, 22(4), 465-493.

Snyder, J. (1983). Instructional leadership: Its importance to academic achievement. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 41(2), 47-58.

Ylimaki, R. M. (2007). Instructional leadership and school reform: The role of principals. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 15(3), 1-19.