

# ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)



**ISRG PUBLISHERS**

Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci

**ISSN: 2583-7672 (Online)**

Journal homepage: <https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjahss>

Volume – IV Issue - III (May-June) 2026

Frequency: Bimonthly



## INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP, ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE: THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO LEARNERS' ACHIEVEMENTS

**SYLVIA SALVADOR MORAL**

CAGAYAN STATE UNIVERSITY, Aparri, Cagayan

| **Received:** 18.04.2026 | **Accepted:** 28.04.2026 | **Published:** 04.05.2026

**\*Corresponding author:** SYLVIA SALVADOR MORAL

### Abstract

*School heads play important role in helping schools provide equitable, learner-centered quality education through various leadership approaches. This study investigated the levels of instructional leadership, administrative support, and school performance, and their relationship to learners' achievements in the public secondary schools in Congressional District 1 of the Division of Cagayan. A descriptive–correlational research design was used involving 16 school heads and 279 teachers using validated survey questionnaire. Gathered data were analyzed using frequency counts and percentage distribution, weighted mean and Pearson  $r$  correlation.*

*Instructional leadership and administrative support were rated very high-level indicating school heads' strategic leadership, strong instructional supervision, efficient resource management and active partnership with stakeholders. School performance showed favorable results as evidenced by high promotion rates, very minimal failures, and low dropout rates. Learners' achievements were consistently reflected in classroom awards, academic excellence and special recognitions- mostly in the district level with minimal participation in regional and national competitions.*

*Significant positive correlations between instructional leadership and academic excellence were found while administrative support showed significant positive correlations between academic excellence and special recognition awards. However, no significant correlations were observed between instructional leadership and administrative support in relation to conduct- and attendance-based awards.*

*This concludes, that strong leadership is essential in improving learning outcomes and co-curricular achievement, although behavioral and school performance outcomes may be influenced by other external factors. Hence, school heads should intensify enrichment opportunities, reinforce stakeholder collaboration, and implement targeted learner development programs to sustain academic success and broaden achievement in higher-level competitions.*

**Keywords:** instructional leadership, administrative support, school performance, learners' achievements, PPSS

## Introduction

Schools carry the responsibility of fostering academic competence and instilling values and life skills needed by the learners. Their achievements serve as a significant reflection of the effectiveness of teaching and learning process within the school. However, learning outcomes remain a significant concern across the country.

The 2024 National Achievement Test (NAT) results show that Grade 12 learners across all regions and all SHS tracks, obtained an overall average of 41.12 percent, categorized as "low proficiency" (Tolentino, 2025). The Division of Negros Occidental attained Mean Percentage Score (MPS) of 34.47 in mathematics and 32.03 in science- both scores are also categorized as low proficient (Ojastro et. al, 2025). The same trend is observed in the 2022 Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) where Philippines ranked 76<sup>th</sup> among 81 participating countries. Furthermore, findings are consistent with the assessment made by the Department of Education (DepEd) within various schools that there are approximately three million out of 24 million enrolled learners exhibit learning gaps.

School-based factors associated with learner achievements like instructional leadership practices and administrative support of school heads merit further study. Instructional leadership entails practices that prioritize teaching quality and student achievement while promoting a collaborative culture among faculty (Mora-Ruano et al., 2020). This approach stresses school leaders' responsibility in influencing instructional practices and improving learners' outcomes through active involvement in curriculum implementation, contextualization, teacher support, and assessment strategies which contribute to improved teaching quality and learner performance. Administrative support includes the allocation of essential resources for the teaching and learning process as well as managing school operations to minimize non-teaching workload. Adequate administrative support, allows teachers to focus on effective instruction implementation thereby improving both teaching practices and entire learning experience which influences the school performance.

Learners' achievements and school performance rely not only on teachers' competence but is equally shaped by leadership practices of the school heads. This study examined the relationship between instructional leadership, administrative support, school performance and learners' achievements. The findings offer strategic insight to school heads to better support teachers and learners in improving outcomes and holistic achievements.

### Statement of the Problem

The study sought to investigate the level of instructional leadership, administrative support, school performance and their relationship to learners' achievement in the public secondary schools in Congressional District 1 of the Division of Cagayan.

Specifically, the study aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the school heads and teachers in terms of the following variables?
  - a. Age
  - b. Sex
  - c. Civil status
  - d. Educational attainment
  - e. Position

- f. School size
2. What is the level of instructional leadership of the school heads as perceived by the teachers and themselves along the following dimensions?
  - a. Establishing shared expectations
  - b. Strategic resourcing
  - c. Instructional program management
  - d. Positive school learning environment promotion
3. What is the level of administrative support provided by the school heads as perceived by the teachers and themselves along the following dimensions?
  - a. Leading strategically
  - b. Managing school operations and resources
  - c. Focusing on teaching and learning
  - d. Developing self and others
  - e. Building connections
4. What is the performance of the schools in terms of the following indicators?
  - a. Learner enrollment and promotion rate
  - b. Disciplinary referrals
  - c. Awards received
  - d. Classroom to teacher to learner ratios
5. What is the learners' achievements in terms of the following indicators?
  - a. Classroom awards
  - b. Academic excellence awards
  - c. Special recognitions
6. Is there a significant difference in the levels of instructional leadership and administrative support provided by the school heads as perceived by the teachers when grouped by profile?
7. Is there a significant relationship between the learners' achievements and the levels of instructional leadership and administrative support provided by the school heads?
8. What intervention plan can be deduced from the findings of the study?

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter elaborates on the methodologies, procedures, and data sources that were used in conducting the study. It consists of research design, study location, respondents and sampling procedure, research instrument, data collection procedure, data analysis procedure, and statistical instruments employed.

### Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-correlational design to achieve its objective of establishing the strength of the relationship between instructional leadership, administrative support, school performance, and learners' achievements. Additionally, it aids in investigating the differences among the variables and the responses

from the profiles of participants. Furthermore, the descriptive research design seeks to understand, describe, and elucidate the variables under investigation.

**Respondents and Sampling Technique**

The participants of this study were the school heads and teachers of identified public secondary schools in Congressional District 1 of the division of Cagayan.

The 279 participants from a total of 904 population size were selected by employing Stratified Random Sampling technique wherein the total number of participants were calculated using Lynch formula.

**Research Instruments**

The study utilized two sets of survey questionnaires for school heads (Set A) and teachers (Set B), each consisting of four parts. Part I gathered respondents’ demographic profiles. Parts II and III assessed instructional leadership practices and administrative support based on established frameworks and DepEd standards. Part IV for school heads focused on school profile and performance indicators, while for teachers, it examined learners’ achievements following DepEd Order No. 36, s. 2016. A 5-point Likert scale measured key variables, and Cronbach’s alpha ensured reliability. Other sections included supply-type responses to capture relevant quantitative and descriptive data.

**Data Gathering Procedure**

To gather the needed data for this study and encourage full and honest responses from the participants, a letter of permission was forwarded to the office of the Schools Division Superintendent of the Division of Cagayan seeking approval to conduct the study and gather data through the use of survey questionnaires which were answered by both the school head and teacher participants of the selected schools. Letters of permission were also be forwarded to the school heads of the participating secondary schools in the first district of Cagayan.

The data-gathering procedure involved informing the participants of the questionnaires' purposes and instructions before administering the survey questions. Furthermore, formal interviews with the participants were conducted to validate and support the data gathered through survey questionnaires.

**Data Analysis**

The study employed both descriptive and inferential statistics to analyze the data. Frequency counts and percentage distributions were used to categorize participant profiles, while weighted means described the level of instructional leadership and administrative support as well as learners’ achievements and school performance.

To test for significant differences, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used for multiple group comparisons (age, educational attainment, school size, and teaching position), and Independent Samples t-tests were used for profile variables with only two groups (sex and civil status). Pearson’s r correlation measured the relationships between learners’ achievements and the levels of instructional leadership and administrative support of school heads. No inferential test of correlation was conducted on school performance indicators since these were analyzed descriptively.

**Ethical considerations**

The study adhered to ethical standards by securing informed consent from all participants and ensuring voluntary participation. Confidentiality and anonymity of responses were strictly maintained. Permission was obtained from relevant authorities

prior to data collection. Participants were informed of their right to withdraw at any time. All collected data were used solely for research purposes and handled in compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This section analyzed and interpret the gathered data to determine relevant trends and patterns. It enriches existing knowledge, enhances understanding, discusses implications and limitations of finding that serve as springboard for future research.

**Profile of the Respondents**

**Profile of the School Heads**

Table 1a presents the distribution of school heads based on the selected profile variables. As shown, majority of the school heads are between 46 and 60 years of age, while 41 to 45 years of age (6.25 %) represent the smallest age group with a mean age of 52.38 years old hence, most of the school heads are in their mid- to late adulthood.

In terms of sex, 11 (68.75%) of the school heads are females, while 5 are males (31.25%). In terms of civil status, 13, or 81.25 percent, are married, while only 2, or 12.5. As to the Educational Attainment, majority of the school heads pursued a Doctorate Degree (75%), while 12.5 percent completed a Master’s Degree. As to the position, the highest mean recorded is 37.5 percent accounted for by those holding School Principal II position while the lowest mean is 6. 25 percent, equally shared among Head Teacher III, School Principal III and Teacher-in-charge suggesting that the majority of the respondents currently hold full-fledged principal positions.

In terms of the school size, 9 (60%) of the school heads are assigned to large schools while only 2 (13.33 %) are assigned to mega schools.

*Table 1a. Distribution of School Heads in terms of Profile Variables*

Age Group	F	Percentage (%)
41 – 45 years old	1	6.25
46 – 50 years old	5	31.25
51 – 55 years old	5	31.25
56 – 60 years old	5	31.25
Total	16 <i>mean: 52.38</i> <i>S.D. = 4.64</i>	100
Sex	Frequency (n= 16)	Percentage
Female	11	68.75
Male	5	31.25
Civil Status	Frequency (n= 16)	Percentage
Single	2	12.5
Married	13	81.25

Widow/Widower	1	6.25
<b>Educational Attainment</b>	<b>Frequency (n=16)</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Master's Academic Units	1	6.25
Master's Degree	2	12.5
Doctorate Academic Units	1	6.25
Doctorate Degree	12	75
<b>Position</b>	<b>Frequency (n=16)</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Head Teacher III	1	6.25
School Principal I	2	12.5
School Principal II	6	37.5
School Principal III	1	6.25
School Principal IV	3	18.75
Others: Master Teacher I/ Officer-in-charge	2	12.5
Others: Teacher-in-charge	1	6.25
<b>School Size</b>	<b>Frequency (n=16)</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Medium	5	33.33
Large	9	60.00
Mega	2	13.33

#### Profile of Teacher Participants

Table 1b presents the distribution of teacher participants in terms of their personal profile. As depicted, the largest group of teachers belong to 30–34 years age group, comprising 87 or 31.18 percent of the respondents while only 2.87 percent or 8 teachers belong to 55-60 age group with a mean age of 35.93 years old. In terms of sex, 199 or 71.33 percent of the teachers are female, while 80 or 28.67 percent are males. Regarding civil status, 187 or 67.03 percent of the teachers are married, while 3 or 1.08 percent are widowed.

With respect to the educational attainment, majority of the teaching workforce have pursued graduate studies. 103 or 36.92 percent have earned units in Master's Degree while 22 or 7.89 percent have completed their Doctorate Degree. In terms of position, the highest proportion of teachers are Teacher III, comprising 148 or 53.05 percent of the respondents while, 4 or 1.43 percent hold Master Teacher II position. Finally, in terms of school size, majority is assigned in large schools comprising of 174 teachers (62.3%) while 74 (26.52%) are assigned to mega schools.

Age (Years)	Frequency (n= 279)	Percentage
25-29	64	22.94
30-34	87	31.18

35-39	49	17.56
40-44	34	12.19
45-49	22	7.89
50-54	15	5.38
55-60	8	2.87
	<i>mean= 35.93</i>	<i>S.D.= 8</i>
<b>Sex</b>	<b>Frequency (n= 279)</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Female	199	71.33
Male	80	28.67
<b>Civil Status</b>	<b>Frequency (n= 279)</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Single	89	31.9
Married	187	67.03
Widow/Widower	3	1.08
<b>Educational Attainment</b>	<b>Frequency (n= 279)</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Bachelor's Degree	26	9.32
Master's Degree-Academic Units	103	36.92
Master's Degree	86	30.82
Doctorate Academic Units	42	15.05
Doctorate Degree	22	7.89
<b>Position</b>	<b>Frequency (n= 279)</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Teacher I	54	19.35
Teacher II	60	21.51
Teacher III	148	53.05
Master Teacher I	13	4.66
Master Teacher II	4	1.43
<b>School Size</b>	<b>Frequency (n= 279)</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Medium	31	11.11
Large	174	62.37
Mega	74	26.52

#### Level of Instructional Leadership of School Heads as Perceived by Teachers and Themselves

This portion describes the level of Instructional Leadership exhibited by the school heads as perceived both by teachers and school heads, along the following core elements; establishing shared expectations; strategic resourcing; instructional program management and positive school learning environment promotion.

### Establishing Shared Expectations

Table 2a indicates that both teachers and school heads rated “Establishing Shared Expectations” at a very high level, reflecting strong alignment in goal-setting practices. School heads demonstrated effectiveness in crafting clear, data-driven, and achievable objectives that guide school improvement. Teachers acknowledged these efforts, particularly in communicating vision

and supporting classroom practices. However, slightly lower ratings in some indicators suggest the need to strengthen informal interactions and ensure more consistent communication of goals. The variation in perceptions implies that while school heads focus on leadership and direction, teachers emphasize implementation, underscoring the importance of sustained collaboration and clarity in achieving shared educational goals.

*Table 2a. Level of Instructional Leadership of School Heads in Terms of the Core Element – Establishing Shared Expectations as Perceived by Teachers and School Heads*

Statements		Mean	Descriptive Interpretation	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
<i>The school head</i>		<i>Teachers</i>		<i>School Heads</i>	
1	establishes a vision for improving student achievement expecting that teachers will accept the vision and apply it consistently in their classrooms.	4.62	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
2	sets annual goals with annual focus, few in number and is applicable schoolwide.	4.49	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
3	sets goals that respond to the demands of the school’s environment, data informed and includes measurable targets and milestones.	4.56	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
4	communicates school goals creating a sense of shared purpose and priority.	4.54	Very High Level	4.81	Very High Level
5	communicates school goals formally during instructional, curriculum and budgetary decision-making processes.	4.47	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
6	communicates school goals informally through other interactions and modelling of exemplary behavior.	4.42	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>		<b>4.52</b>	<b>Very High Level</b>	<b>4.91</b>	<b>Very High Level</b>

### Strategic resourcing

Table 2b reveals that both teachers and school heads rated “Strategic Resourcing” at a very high level, indicating strong agreement on effective resource management. School heads are perceived as strategic in allocating materials and funding to support instruction. However, teachers highlighted concerns on limited resources and personal spending, suggesting gaps between

planning and actual provision. Both groups identified staffing and external coordination as areas needing improvement. School heads’ higher self-ratings reflect their broader awareness of procurement processes and financial constraints. Overall, findings suggest efficient resource management, though challenges in resource availability and utilization remain, emphasizing the need for improved support and optimization of existing resources.

*Table 2b. Level of Instructional Leadership of the School Head in terms of Core Element- Strategic Resourcing as Perceived by Teachers and School Heads Themselves*

Statements		Mean	Descriptive Interpretation	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
<i>The school head</i>		<i>Teachers</i>		<i>School Heads</i>	
1	combines an understanding of the instructional needs of a school with an ability to target resources to meet those needs.	4.44	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
2	secures resources that are aligned with teaching and learning.	4.53	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
3	plans, employs strategic relationships, and collaborates with staff for instructional resources	4.45	Very High Level	4.81	Very High Level
4	ensures that teachers have sufficient access to instructional material.	4.44	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
5	ensures that teachers have what they need to do the best possible job for students.	4.51	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level

6	hires appropriate staff and draw expertise from the wider school community to achieve goals.	4.43	Very High Level	4.69	Very High Level
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>		<b>4.47</b>	<b>Very High Level</b>	<b>4.84</b>	<b>Very High Level</b>

### Instructional Program Management

Table 2c shows that both teachers and school heads rated instructional program management at a very high level, indicating strong leadership in overseeing teaching and learning. Teachers particularly recognized the provision of feedback and technical assistance, though inconsistencies in actual observation practices

were noted. Lower ratings suggest a need to improve curriculum coordination and pacing. School heads rated themselves highly, reflecting confidence in monitoring learner progress and aligning instruction with school goals. Overall, findings affirm effective instructional management, while highlighting areas for improvement in curriculum implementation, observation practices, and ensuring coherent sequencing of learning competencies.

**Table 2c. Level of Instructional Leadership of the School Heads in terms of Core Element- Instructional Program Management as perceived by Teachers and School Heads Themselves**

Statements		Mean	Descriptive Interpretation	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
<i>The school head</i>		<i>Teachers</i>		<i>School Heads</i>	
1	coordinates the curriculum by managing the pacing, sequencing and coverage of content.	4.48	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
2	ensures continuity of learning across year levels and that students are exposed to the material on which they are tested.	4.57	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
3	monitors student progress as the key mechanism for line of sight into the classroom and quality assurance of the instructional program.	4.54	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
4	evaluates the quality of instruction, makes classroom allocations, diagnose program effectiveness, evaluates the results of changes in the instructional program, and measure progress towards school goals.	4.5	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
5	offers concrete, constructive suggestions to teachers, assisting them in improving their instructional practices	4.67	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
6	works with teachers to ensure that classroom objectives are directly connected to school goals and review classroom instruction using as many sources of information as possible -- formal and informal classroom observations, lesson plans, and student work products.	4.56	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>		<b>4.55</b>	<b>Very High Level</b>	<b>4.98</b>	<b>Very High Level</b>

### Positive School Learning Environment Promotion

Table 2.d shows that both teachers and school heads rated the promotion of a positive school learning environment at a very high level. Teachers particularly valued support for professional development, though lower ratings suggest a need for more meaningful recognition and incentives. School heads expressed

strong confidence in fostering teacher growth and academic excellence, while acknowledging challenges such as instructional disruptions. Overall, findings indicate that school heads effectively cultivate a supportive and collaborative school culture. However, enhancing teacher recognition and minimizing disruptions can further strengthen motivation, sustain professional engagement, and improve the overall quality of teaching and learning.

**Table 2d. Level of Instructional Leadership of the School Head in terms of Core Element- Positive school learning environment promotion as perceived by Teachers and School Heads Themselves**

Statements		Mean	Descriptive Interpretation	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
<i>The school head</i>		<i>Teachers</i>		<i>School Heads</i>	
1	minimizes disruptions to instruction by ensuring that classes are not interrupted by announcements, office requests, excessive paperwork and meetings, system and parental pressures, student absenteeism, or late arrivals.	4.54	Very High Level	4.69	Very High Level
2	promotes professional development by informing teachers of opportunities for staff development.	4.5	Very High Level	5	Very High Level

3	leads in-service training, ensuring professional development is closely linked to school goals and relevantly structured to groups and individuals.	4.6	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
4	provides incentives for teachers by establishing systems and practices that collaboratively engage staff in the collective effort of teaching and learning, provide them with personal and professional support and recognize teachers for their efforts.	4.38	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
5	provides incentives for students by recognizing their effort, progress and achievement, and fostering a positive and empowering culture of learning.	4.43	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
6	upholds academic standards by ensuring that students master basic skills and achieve defined skills before entering subsequent year levels.	4.53	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
7	maintains purposeful visibility around the school and in classrooms, increases interactions between school leaders, teachers and students.	4.51	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>		<b>4.5</b>	<b>Very High Level</b>	<b>4.92</b>	<b>Very High Level</b>

### Summary of Instructional Leadership

Table 2e shows the summary of dimension means and overall level of instructional leadership employed by school heads. The results show that school heads demonstrated very high levels of instructional leadership practices across all dimension, evident in the overall mean of 4.71 with a minimal variance (range 4.65-4.75) implying a holistic instructional leadership approach.

Specifically, the third dimension was rated the highest (4.75) implying the school heads' competence in overseeing the curriculum, monitoring learning outcomes and progress while ensuring the delivery of quality instruction. Meanwhile, both statements 1 and 4 rated the lowest (4.71) which still suggest that school heads efficiently maintained a supportive learning environment to promote student learning and engagement.

Table 2e. Summary of dimension means and overall level of instructional leadership of the school heads

Dimension	Mean	Descriptive Value
1. Establishing shared expectations	4.71	Very high
2. Strategic resourcing	4.65	Very high

3. Instructional program management	4.75	Very high
4. Positive school learning environment promotion	4.71	Very high
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>4.71</b>	<b>Very high</b>

### Level of Administrative Support of School Heads

Findings show that both teachers and school heads rated "Leading Strategically" at a very high level, indicating strong administrative support. School heads are seen to exemplify integrity, professionalism, and alignment with DepEd policies, fostering a positive school culture. However, both groups identified research engagement as an area for improvement, particularly in using data-driven strategies to enhance school operations and outcomes. School heads' higher self-ratings reflect confidence in inclusive and effective leadership. Overall, results confirm that school heads demonstrate excellent strategic leadership, while strengthening research practices can further improve school performance and innovation.

Table 3.a. Level of Administrative Support of School Heads across the Domain—Leading Strategically as Perceived by Teachers and School Heads Themselves

Statements		Mean	Descriptive Interpretation	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
<i>The school head</i>		<i>Teachers</i>		<i>School Heads</i>	
1	serves as a role model in the school and the wide school community in embodying the DepEd vision, mission and core values to sustain shared understanding and alignment of school policies, programs, projects and activities.	4.63	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
2	engages the school community in the development and implementation of school plans aligned with institutional goals and policies.	4.6	Very High Level	5	Very High Level

3	engages stakeholders in improving the implementation of reviewed policies to ensure consistency of school operations with national and local laws, regulations and issuances.	4.59	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
4	collaborates with school personnel in the conduct of research and utilization of findings in facilitating data-driven and evidence-based innovations to improve school performance.	4.43	Very High Level	4.75	Very High Level
5	designs and implements needs-based programs in school that support the development of learners.	4.49	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
6	designs and applies effective strategies in utilizing learner voice, such as feelings, views and/ or opinions to inform policy development and decision-making towards school improvement	4.48	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
7	designs supplemental monitoring and evaluation tools following standard process to promote learner achievement.	4.54	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>		<b>4.54</b>	<b>Very High Level</b>	<b>4.91</b>	<b>Very High Level</b>

### Managing school operations and resources

Table 3b indicates that both teachers and school heads rated “Managing School Operations and Resources” at a very high level, reflecting strong competence in resource management and accountability. Teachers recognized effective collaboration and facility maintenance, though minor improvements are needed in

financial management and adaptability to educational changes. School heads expressed high confidence in ICT use, financial responsibility, and inclusive practices, with slightly lower ratings in strengthening community partnerships during adversities. Overall, findings highlight efficient management practices while emphasizing the need to enhance responsiveness, adaptability, and stakeholder collaboration for sustained school improvement.

*Table 3b. Level of Administrative Support of School Heads across the Domain— Managing school operations and resources as Perceived by Teachers and School Heads*

Statements		Mean	Descriptive Interpretation	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
<i>The school head</i>		<i>Teachers</i>		<i>School Heads</i>	
1	capacitates school personnel in managing school data and information using technology, including ICT, to ensure efficient and effective school operations.	4.58	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
2	exhibits efficient and effective practices in the management of finances consistently adhering to policies, guidelines and issuances in allocation, procurement, disbursement and liquidation aligned with school plan.	4.57	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
3	establishes shared accountability in managing school facilities and equipment in adherence to policies, guidelines and issuances on acquisition, recording, utilization, repair and maintenance, storage and disposal.	4.61	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
4	engages school personnel in maintaining effective management of staff in adherence to laws, policies, guidelines and issuances based on the needs of the school.	4.58	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
5	works with the wider school community in managing school safety for disaster preparedness, mitigation and resiliency to maintain continuous delivery of instruction.	4.61	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level

6	capacitates school personnel in managing emerging opportunities and challenges to promote equality and equity in addressing the needs of learners, school personnel and other stakeholders.	4.57	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
Overall Weighted Mean		4.59	Very High Level	4.98	Very High Level

### Focusing on teaching and learning

Table 3c shows that both teachers and school heads rated “Focusing on Teaching and Learning” at a very high level, indicating strong instructional support. Teachers recognized effective guidance through technical assistance, though collaboration in identifying learning gaps needs enhancement.

School heads expressed high confidence in leading pedagogical improvements and implementing data-driven strategies. Slightly lower ratings suggest challenges in strengthening broader stakeholder partnerships. Overall, findings affirm that school heads provide strong leadership in improving teaching practices and learner outcomes, while highlighting the need to deepen collaboration and external engagement.

*Table 3c. Level of Administrative Support of School Heads across the Domain— Focusing on Teaching and Learning as perceived by Teachers and School Heads Themselves*

Statements		Mean	Descriptive Interpretation	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
<i>The school head</i>			<i>Teachers</i>		<i>School Heads</i>
1	works with teams in the conduct of review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards to assist teachers in making the curriculum relevant for learners.	4.51	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
2	engages school personnel such as master teachers, head teachers and department heads in providing technical assistance to teachers on teaching standards and pedagogies within and across learning areas to improve their teaching practice.	4.61	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
3	collaborates with school personnel in effectively using validated feedback obtained from learners, parents and other stakeholders to help teachers improve their performance.	4.55	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
4	engages the wider school community in developing data-based interventions to sustain learner achievement and attain other performance indicators.	4.57	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
5	works with personnel involved in evaluating teachers’ use of learning assessment tools, strategies and results consistent with curriculum requirements to ensure accountability in achieving higher learning outcomes.	4.57	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
6	engages the wider school community in maintaining a learner-friendly, inclusive and healthy learning environment.	4.57	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
7	undertakes initiatives in integrating career awareness and opportunities in the provision of learning experiences aligned with the curriculum.	4.53	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
8	ensures that learner discipline policies developed with stakeholders are integrated into various school processes and are applied consistently at all times, by all school personnel at all levels.	4.56	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>		<b>4.56</b>	<b>Very High Level</b>	<b>4.96</b>	<b>Very High Level</b>

### Developing self and others

Table 3d indicates that both teachers and school heads rated “Developing Self and Others” at a very high level, reflecting strong

support for professional growth. Teachers acknowledged school heads’ initiatives in promoting training and career development, though improvements are needed in addressing performance gaps and strengthening awareness of welfare programs. School heads

expressed high confidence in motivating staff and providing recognition. Overall, findings affirm that school heads effectively foster continuous professional development, while enhancing

targeted interventions and staff support systems can further strengthen personnel growth and shared governance.

*Table 3d. Level of Administrative Support of School Heads across the Domain— "Developing self and others" as perceived by Teachers and School Heads Themselves*

Statements		Mean	Descriptive Interpretation	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
<i>The school head</i>		<i>Teachers</i>		<i>School Heads</i>	
1	engages actively in professional networks within and across schools to advance knowledge, skills and practice.	4.59	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
2	monitors and evaluates with school personnel the implementation of the performance management system to ensure career advancement for individual school personnel and to improve office performance	4.59	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
3	monitors and evaluates the implementation of professional development initiatives in enhancing strengths and in addressing performance gaps among school personnel	4.52	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
4	capacitates individuals and teams to effectively perform leadership roles and responsibilities in fostering shared governance and accountability.	4.54	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
5	integrates laws, policies, guidelines and issuances on the rights, privileges and benefits of school personnel in school programs, projects and activities to ensure their general welfare.	4.52	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
6	works with school personnel to encourage stakeholders to support the implementation of the school rewards system in recognizing and motivating learners, school personnel and other stakeholders to sustain exemplary performance and/or continued support.	4.56	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>		<b>4.55</b>	<b>Very High Level</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>Very High Level</b>

### Building connections

Table 3e shows that both teachers and school heads rated “Building Connections” at a very high level, indicating strong stakeholder engagement. Teachers recognized school heads’ efforts in fostering collaboration and involving parents and community in school initiatives. However, improvement is needed in evaluating the

effectiveness of school organizations. School heads expressed high confidence in engaging stakeholders and implementing programs. Overall, findings affirm that school heads effectively build partnerships that support learner development and school goals, while strengthening evaluation mechanisms can further enhance community impact and program effectiveness.

*Table 3e. Level of Administrative Support of School Heads across the Domain— Building Connections as Perceived by Teachers and School Heads*

Statements		Mean	Descriptive Interpretation	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
<i>The school head</i>		<i>Teachers</i>		<i>School Heads</i>	
1	supports school personnel in strengthening relationships with authorities, colleagues, parents and other stakeholders to maintain an enabling and supportive environment for learners	4.54	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
2	evaluates the accomplishments of school organizations,	4.52	Very High Level	4.94	Very High Level

	such as learner organizations, faculty clubs and parent-teacher associations, to determine their impact on the attainment of institutional goals.				
3	engages the wider school community in promoting inclusive practices, such as gender sensitivity, physical and mental health awareness and culture responsiveness, to strengthen awareness, acceptance and respect.	4.55	Very High Level	4.9	Very High Level
4	communicates effectively in speaking and in writing to teachers, learners, parents and other stakeholders through positive use of communication platforms, to facilitate information sharing, collaboration and support.	4.54	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
5	empowers the community, such as parents, alumni, authorities and other stakeholders, to participate in addressing concerns on learner development, as well as school and community improvement.	4.59	Very High Level	5	Very High Level
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>		<b>4.55</b>	<b>Very High Level</b>	<b>4.97</b>	<b>Very High Level</b>

### School Performance

This section describes the performance of the schools in terms of (a) learner enrollment and promotion, (b) disciplinary referrals, (c) awards received and (d) classroom to teacher to learner ratios.

### Learner Enrollment and Promotion Rate

Table 4a reveals that most schools serve large learner populations, requiring sustained resources and facilities. Promotion rates remained consistently high across both school years, indicating effective instructional practices and learner support systems

(Department of Education [DepEd], 2020). Failure rates were minimal, with most schools reporting no failing learners, reflecting responsive interventions for at-risk students. Although a slight increase in dropout rates was observed, overall levels remained low, suggesting effective retention strategies such as early monitoring and home visitations. However, socio-economic factors, health issues, and family conditions continue to influence learner attrition (UNESCO, 2019).

*Table 4a. Distribution of the schools in terms of their performance in enrolment and promotion*

Indicators	SY 2023-2024		SY 2024-2025	
	Freq. (n=16)	Percentage	Freq. (n=16)	Percentage
<b>Enrolment (BOSY)</b>				
500 or below	4	25.0	4	25.0
501 to 1000	2	12.5	3	18.8
1001 to 1500	4	25.0	3	18.8
1501 to 2000	1	6.3	3	18.8
2001 or above	5	31.3	3	18.8
<i>Mean</i>	1327.88 learners		1272.19 learners	
<i>SD</i>	867.59		812.77	
<b>Promotion (% of BOSY Enrolment)</b>				
96% or below	1	6.3	1	6.3
96.01% to 98%	7	43.8	5	31.3
98.01% to 99%	3	18.8	6	37.5
100%	5	31.3	4	25.0
<i>Mean</i>	98.21%		98.58%	
<i>SD</i>	1.69		1.45	
<b>Failed (% of BOSY Enrolment)</b>				
0%	10	62.5	12	75.0
0.1% to 1.9%	3	18.8	4	25.0
2% to 2.9%	2	12.5	0	0.0

3% or more	1	6.3	0	0.0
<i>Mean</i>	0.64%		0.31%	
<i>SD</i>	1.15		0.62	
<b>Dropout (% of BOSY Enrolment)</b>				
0%	5	31.3	5	31.3
0.1% to 1.9%	6	37.5	9	56.3
2% to 2.9%	3	18.8	1	6.3
3% or more	2	12.5	1	6.3
<i>Mean</i>	1.26%		0.78%	
<i>SD</i>	1.33		0.99	

### Discipline Referrals

Table 4b indicates that most schools recorded moderate disciplinary referrals, with slight reductions observed in the succeeding year, suggesting improved behavior management. The decline in mean referrals reflects more consistent disciplinary practices, though variations remain across schools (Department of Education [DepEd], 2020). Common issues include tardiness,

absenteeism, bullying, and disruptive behavior, aligning with findings that behavioral concerns persist in school settings (UNICEF, 2021). Overall, results imply that schools effectively reinforce positive behavior, though continuous interventions are necessary to address recurring disciplinary issues.

**Table 4b. Distribution of the schools in terms of their performance in discipline referrals**

Indicators	SY 2023-2024		SY 2024-2025	
	Freq. (n=16)	Percentage	Freq. (n=16)	Percentage
<b>Discipline Referrals</b>				
5 or below	3	18.8	4	25.0
6 to 10	5	31.3	5	31.3
11 to 15	3	18.8	5	31.3
16 to 20	3	18.8	2	12.5
21 or above	2	12.5	0	0.0
<i>Mean</i>	11.63 referrals		10.38 referrals	
<i>SD</i>	7.16		5.38	

### Awards Received

Table 4c shows that most awards were from DepEd-recognized competitions, increasing to full participation in the succeeding year, reflecting schools' strong commitment to learner achievement (Department of Education [DepEd], 2020). The rise in awards from Local Government Units indicates improved collaboration and community engagement. However, the absence of NGO-related

awards suggests a need to expand partnerships. Overall, findings highlight active participation in programs while emphasizing the importance of broader stakeholder involvement to enhance school support systems.

**Table 4c. Distribution of the schools in terms of their performance in awards received**

Indicators	SY 2023-2024		SY 2024-2025	
	Freq. (n=16)	Percentage	Freq. (n=16)	Percentage
<b>Awards received*</b>				
Local Government	4	25.0	7	43.8
Non-Government Organization	0	-	0	-
Department of Education	15	93.8	16	100.0
Other agencies	2	12.5	2	12.5

\*multiple response set

### Classroom to Teacher to Learner Ratios

Table 4d indicates generally adequate teacher deployment, though classroom shortages persist. Most schools reported more than one teacher per classroom due to program specialization, not

overstaffing. Improvements in classroom-to-learner ratios suggest reduced congestion; however, some classes remain overcrowded, reflecting facility limitations (Department of Education [DepEd], 2020). Typhoon damage further constrained available classrooms, prompting alternative learning arrangements. Teacher-to-learner ratios indicate sufficient staffing, yet optimizing resource

allocation remains a challenge. Overall, while efforts improved class conditions, infrastructure limitations continue to affect the attainment of ideal learning environments.

**Table 4d. Distribution of the schools in terms of their performance in ratios**

Indicators	SY 2023-2024		SY 2024-2025	
	Freq. (n=16)	Percentage	Freq. (n=16)	Percentage
<b>Classroom to teacher ratio</b>				
1 is to 1 teacher	2	12.5	4	25.0
1 is to more than 1 teacher	14	87.5	12	75.0
<b>Classroom to learner ratio</b>				
1 is to less than 30 learners	2	12.5	13	81.3
1 is to 31 to 40 learners	9	56.3	2	12.5
1 is to more than 40 learners	5	31.3	1	6.3
<b>Teacher to learner ratio</b>				
1 is to less than 30 learners	12	75.0	3	18.8
1 is to 31 to 40 learners	2	12.5	9	56.3
1 is to more than 40 learners	2	12.5	4	25.0

\*multiple response set

**Awards Received by the Learners of the Teachers**

**Classroom Awards**

Table 5a shows a modest number of learners receiving conduct and perfect attendance awards, with slight declines across school years. This suggests generally stable classroom discipline, though emerging issues in attendance and behavior persist. Adolescent factors, such as autonomy and peer influence, contribute to these

challenges (Erik Erikson, 1968). External factors like academic pressure and family responsibilities also affect learner behavior (Jiang et al., 2022). Overall, findings highlight the need to strengthen discipline, punctuality, and attendance interventions to support learner development.

**Table 5a. Table 5.a. Distribution of Classroom Awards Received by Learners Under the Advisership of Teacher Participants for School Years 2023–2024 and 2024–2025**

Indicators	SY 2023-2024		SY 2024-2025	
	Freq. (n=16)	Percentage	Freq. (n=16)	Percentage
<b>Conduct award</b>				
3 or below	59	21.1	56	20.1
4 to 6	105	37.6	114	40.9
7 to 9	80	28.7	82	29.4
10 to 12	24	8.6	19	6.8
13 or above	11	3.9	8	2.9
<i>Mean</i>	6.13 learners per class		5.96 learners per class	
<i>SD</i>	3.02		2.79	
<b>Perfect attendance award</b>				
3 or below	31	11.1	87	31.2
4 to 6	127	45.5	112	40.1
7 to 9	56	20.1	49	17.6
10 to 12	39	14.0	24	8.6
13 or above	26	9.3	7	2.5
<i>Mean</i>	7.07 learners per class		5.44 learners per class	

### Academic Excellence Awards

Table 5b shows that most learners fall under the “With Honors” category, while fewer achieve higher distinctions, with a slight decline in awardees across school years. “With High Honors” and “With Highest Honors” remain limited, indicating that only a small proportion of learners reach advanced academic performance. These trends suggest consistent but moderate academic achievement levels among students. Factors such as instructional

quality, learner engagement, and academic stress may influence outcomes (Mascia et al., 2023; Jagiello, 2024). Overall, findings highlight the need for enrichment programs, differentiated instruction, and targeted interventions to support both struggling and high-performing learners.

*Table 5b. Distribution of academic excellence awards received by the learners under the advisership of Teacher Participants*

Indicators	SY 2023-2024		SY 2024-2025	
	Freq. (n=16)	Percentage	Freq. (n=16)	Percentage
<b>With Honors</b>				
4 or below	19	6.8	37	13.3
5 to 8	142	50.9	123	44.1
9 to 12	98	35.1	102	36.6
13 or above	20	7.2	17	6.1
<i>Mean</i>	8.32 learners per class		8.10 learners per class	
<i>SD</i>	2.84		3.16	
<b>With High Honors</b>				
None	54	19.4	70	25.1
1 to 2	135	48.4	166	59.5
3 to 4	83	29.7	41	14.7
5 or more	7	2.5	2	0.7
<i>Mean</i>	1.88 learners per class		1.44 learners per class	
<i>SD</i>	1.38		1.10	
<b>With Highest Honors</b>				
None	232	83.2	233	83.5
1 to 2	47	16.8	46	16.5
<i>Mean</i>	0.19 learners per class		0.16 learners per class	
<i>SD</i>	0.43		0.37	

### Special Recognition

Table 5c shows that most special recognitions were concentrated at the district level, particularly in academics, while international participation remained minimal. Athletic and socio-cultural awards increased slightly, indicating growing support for holistic learner development. However, limited representation in higher-level competitions suggests constraints in training, resources, and exposure opportunities. These findings align with studies

emphasizing the role of co-curricular activities in enhancing motivation and socio-emotional skills (Mascia et al., 2023; Wolters, 2025). Overall, schools demonstrate strong local competitiveness but need strengthened support for regional and global participation.

*Table 5c. Distribution of special recognition awards received by the learners under the advisership of Teacher Participants*

Indicators	SY 2023-2024		SY 2024-2025	
	Freq. (n=16)	Percentage	Freq. (n=16)	Percentage
<b>Academics</b>				
District/ Municipal	118	42.3	108	38.7
Congressional District	67	24.0	62	22.2
Division	70	25.1	78	28.0
Regional	26	9.3	11	3.9

National	11	3.9	3	1.1
International	3	1.1	0	0.0
<b>Athletics</b>				
District/ Municipal	76	27.2	94	33.7
Congressional District	38	13.6	41	14.7
Division	36	12.9	37	13.3
Regional	14	5.0	8	2.9
National	2	0.7	2	0.7
International	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Socio-Cultural and Arts</b>				
District/ Municipal	51	18.3	55	19.7
Congressional District	11	3.9	21	7.5
Division	21	7.5	13	4.7
Regional	4	1.4	5	1.8
National	2	0.7	5	1.8
International	0	0.0	5	1.8
<b>Others</b>				
District/ Municipal	0	0.0	3	1.1
Congressional District	0	0.0	1	0.4
Division	0	0.0	0	0.0
Regional	1	0.4	7	2.5
National	1	0.4	0	0.0
International	0	0.0	0	0.0

\*multiple response set

**Difference in the Levels of Instructional Leadership of the School Heads when grouped according to their Teachers' Profile**

Tables 6a and 6b show that teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership significantly vary according to age, teaching position, and school size at the 0.05 level. Age was found significant ( $F = 6.377, p = 0.000$ ), with teachers aged 30–50 rating leadership lower than younger and older colleagues, likely due to higher

expectations and critical evaluation. Teaching position also influenced perceptions ( $F = 2.691, p = 0.047$ ), with Master Teachers and Teacher I rating school heads more favorably than Teacher III. School size was significant as well ( $F = 5.780, p = 0.003$ ), with mega schools reporting higher leadership perceptions due to stronger support systems and coordination structures.

*Table 6a. Comparison test results in the levels of instructional leadership of the school heads as perceived by the teachers when grouped according to their profile*

Grouping Variables	F- or t-value	Probability	Stat. Inference
Age	6.377	0.000	Significant
Sex	0.237	0.627	Not significant
Civil status	1.684	0.187	Not significant
Educational attainment	0.118	0.976	Not significant
Position	2.691	0.047	Significant
School size	5.780	0.003	Significant

\*tested at 0.05 level of significance

*Table 6b. Post Hoc Analysis of Significant Differences in Instructional Leadership*

Age Group	Mean	SD	Significant Difference
30 or below	4.67	0.65	Higher than 31–40 and 41–50
31–40	4.4	0.62	No significant difference
41–50	4.37	0.84	No significant difference
51 or above	4.94	0.16	Higher than 31–40 and 41–50
Position	Mean	SD	Significant Difference
Teacher I	4.67	0.72	Higher than Teacher III
Teacher II	4.46	0.6	No significant difference
Teacher III	4.43	0.7	No significant difference
Master Teacher	4.77	0.55	Higher than Teacher III
School Size	Mean	SD	Significant Difference
Medium	4.72	0.46	Higher than Large
Large	4.4	0.74	No significant difference
Mega	4.66	0.56	Higher than Large

**Difference in the Levels of Administrative Support Provided by the School Heads when grouped according to their Teachers' Profile**

Tables 6c and 6d reveal significant differences in teachers' perceptions of administrative support based on age and school size at the 0.05 level. Age showed a significant effect ( $F = 5.859$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ), with mid-career teachers (31–50) rating support lower than younger and older groups, likely due to higher workload demands

and expectations. School size was also significant ( $F = 9.555$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), with teachers in large schools reporting lower support than those in medium and mega schools, reflecting resource and workload constraints. Findings suggest the need for more responsive and differentiated administrative practices.

*Table 6c. Comparison test results in the levels of administrative support provided by the school heads as perceived by the teachers when grouped according to their profile*

Grouping Variables	F- or t-value	Probability	Stat. Inference
Age	5.859	0.001	Significant
Sex	0.208	0.649	Not significant
Civil status	1.452	0.236	Not significant
Educational attainment	0.219	0.928	Not significant
Position	2.175	0.091	Not significant
School size	9.555	0.000	Significant

\*tested at 0.05 level of significance

*Table 6d. Post Hoc Analysis of Significant Differences in Administrative Support*

Age Group	Mean	SD	Significant Difference
30 or below	4.71	0.6	Higher than 31–40 and 41–50
31–40	4.49	0.58	No significant difference
41–50	4.39	0.85	No significant difference
51 or above	4.94	0.18	Higher than 31–40 and 41–50
School Size	Mean	SD	Significant Difference
Medium	4.79	0.37	Higher than Large
Large	4.43	0.72	No significant difference
Mega	4.77	0.45	Higher than Large

## Relationship between the Learners' Achievements and the Levels of

### Instructional Leadership and Administrative Support of the School Heads

#### Classroom Awards

Table 7a shows no significant relationship between learners' conduct and attendance awards and both instructional leadership ( $r = 0.103$ ,  $p = 0.086$ ) and administrative support ( $r = 0.087$ ,  $p = 0.147$ ), as both p-values exceed 0.05. This indicates that school heads' leadership practices do not directly influence these learner outcomes. Instead, external factors such as family background, peer influence, and motivation may play stronger roles (Kim & Park, 2021). Leadership may still have indirect effects through classroom climate (Sebastian et al., 2020). Overall, adolescent developmental factors also shape behavior and attendance outcomes.

*Table 7a. Correlation test results between the learner's achievements in terms of classroom awards and the levels of instructional leadership and administrative support provided by the school heads*

Variables	r-value	Probability	Stat. Inference
<b>Learners' Classroom awards</b>			
Level of instructional leadership	0.103	0.086	Not significant
Level of administrative support	0.087	0.147	Not significant

*\*tested at 0.05 level of significance*

#### Academic Excellence

Table 7a shows no significant relationship between learners' conduct and attendance awards and both instructional leadership ( $r = 0.103$ ,  $p = 0.086$ ) and administrative support ( $r = 0.087$ ,  $p = 0.147$ ), as both p-values exceed 0.05. This indicates that school heads' leadership practices do not directly influence these learner outcomes. Instead, external factors such as family background, peer influence, and motivation may play stronger roles (Kim & Park, 2021). Leadership may still have indirect effects through classroom climate (Sebastian et al., 2020). Overall, adolescent developmental factors also shape behavior and attendance outcomes.

*Table 7b. Correlation test results between the learner's achievements in terms of Academic Excellence Awards and the levels of instructional leadership and administrative support provided by the school heads*

Variables	r-value	Probability	Stat. Inference
<b>Learners' Academic Excellence Awards</b>			
Level of instructional	0.244	0.000	Significant

leadership			
Level of administrative support	0.176	0.003	Significant

*\*tested at 0.05 level of significance*

#### Special Recognition

Table 7c reveals a significant positive relationship between administrative support and learners' special recognition awards ( $r = 0.127$ ,  $p = 0.034$ ), indicating that stronger administrative support is associated with higher learner achievements. This suggests that school heads' provision of resources, stakeholder collaboration, and logistical support enhances learners' participation in competitions from district to higher levels. Studies support that administrative backing strengthens extracurricular programs and student engagement (Caparros, 2023; Boy et al., 2022). Overall, administrative support serves as a key factor in promoting holistic learner development.

*Table 7c. Correlation test results between the learner's achievements in terms of Special Recognition and the levels of instructional leadership and administrative support provided by the school heads*

Variables	r-value	Probability	Stat. Inference
<b>Learners' Special Recognition Awards</b>			
Level of instructional leadership	0.064	0.287	Not significant
Level of administrative support	0.127	0.034	Significant

*\*tested at 0.05 level of significance*

## Conclusions

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that the school heads of the participating schools in the 1<sup>st</sup> Congressional District of Cagayan exhibit high levels of instructional leadership practices and administrative support as perceived by teachers and themselves as evidenced by commendable school performance indicators such as high promotion rates, minimal failures, low dropout rates and improved class size management. However, learners' achievements -conduct, attendance, academic excellence and special recognitions remain relatively limited. The results also showed that instructional leadership and administrative support are positively correlated with learners' academic achievements. Specifically, administrative support was also found to significantly influence the attainment of special recognitions awards but no significant correlation between conduct and attendance-based awards was observed. Meanwhile, a significant difference was observed in teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership when grouped by age and position.

Overall, the results confirm that strong instructional leadership and administrative support from school heads lead to higher achievements of learners and overall school performance emphasizing their vital role in shaping educational outcomes.

## Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, it is recommended that school heads and teachers strengthen collaborative efforts in monitoring learner behavior and attendance, in close coordination with guidance personnel and parents, to reduce tardiness, absences, referrals, and dropout cases. School heads should further enhance support for differentiated, data-driven instruction to assist struggling learners while sustaining high achievers, and maximize collaboration with Master Teachers and subject coordinators to improve classroom practices. Continuous professional development through graduate studies and trainings should also be sustained. In addition, adequate funding for advanced trainings and competitions should be allocated, while stronger partnerships with parents and the community should be established to improve learner welfare and resilience.

## DECLARATION OF NO CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author hereby declares that she does not have any personal conflict or interest in the submission of this article. This paper is her original work.

## REFERENCES

1. **AITSL, Robinson, E. Al., Waters, E. Al., Andrews, E. Al., Gumus, E. Al., Hallinger, E. Al., Hallinger, E. Al., Murphy, E. Al., ACER, & Hallinger. (2022).** Instructional leadership – leading the teaching and learning. In Education Improvement Research Centre [Spotlight paper]. <https://schoolreviews.education.qld.gov.au/res/Document/s/spotlight-paper-instructional-leadership.pdf>
2. **Ames, W., & Angioloni, S. (2022).** Drivers of school performance over time: Evidence from public schools in the United States. [Journal Name, Volume(Issue)], pages. <https://doi.org/xx.xxx/yyyyy>
3. **ANGUILLA'S FIRST EVER NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM a SUCCESS! (2024, March 18).** The Anguillian Newspaper - the Weekly Independent Paper of Anguilla. <https://theanguillian.com/2024/02/anguillas-first-ever-national-symposium-a-success/>
4. **Aureada, J. J. U., & Department of Education – City Schools Division, Tayabas City, Philippines. (2021).** The instructional leadership practices of school heads. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 2(2), 75–89. <https://iari.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/ijemds.v2.2.142.pdf> Aydin, H. (2023).
5. **Bernal, P., Mittag, N., & Qureshi, J. A. (2016).** Estimating effects of school quality using multiple proxies. *Labour Economics*, 39, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2016.01.005>
6. **Brolund, J. (2016).** The relationship between instructional leadership and teacher collaboration in Swedish schools. *Educational Management Journal*, 12(3), 45–62.
7. **Campbell, C., Evans, J., & Maloney, C. (2019).** The effective instructional leader: Practices that improve student outcomes. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 15(1), 22–39.
8. **Department of Education. (2017).** DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2017/08/11/do-42-s-2017/>
9. **Department of Education. (2020).** DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH). [https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO\\_s2020\\_024-.pdf](https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024-.pdf)
10. **Department of Education. (2016).** DepEd Order No. 36, s. 2016: Policy guidelines on awards and recognition for K to 12 basic education program.
11. **Department of Education. (2020).** DepEd Order No. 40, s. 2012: Child Protection Policy.
12. **UNESCO. (2019).** Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education – All means all. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373721>
13. **UNESCO. (2020).** UNESCO & DepEd Philippines launch the Global Education Monitoring Report. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/unesco-and-deped-launch-2020-global-education-monitoring-report-philippines>
14. **D’Innocenzo, L., Mathieu, J. E., & Kukenberger, M. R. (2016).** A meta-analysis of different forms of shared leadership–team performance relations. *Journal of Management*, 42(7), 1964–1991. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314525205>
15. **Ertürk, R. (2021).** The relationship between school administrators’ supportive behaviors and teachers’ job satisfaction and subjective well-being. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 8(4), 184–195. <https://doi.org/10.33200/ijcer.956667>
16. **Feng, C., Gao, Y., Liu, A., & Zhang, Y. (2025).** Do part-time administrative positions of teachers affect student achievements? *International Journal of Educational Development*, 116, 103298. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2025.103298>
17. **Fevre, M. L. (2021).** Exploring leadership impact on school productivity: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of School Administration*, 29(2), 101–115.
18. **Glasman, N. S. (1984).** Student achievement and the school principal. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 6(3), 283–296. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737006003283>
19. **Hallinger, P. (2005).** Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 221–239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500244793>
20. **Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985).** Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–247. <https://doi.org/10.1086/461445>
21. **Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1986).** The social context of effective schools. *American Journal of Education*, 94(3), 328–355. <https://doi.org/10.1086/443847>
22. **Heneghan, J. (2024, June 22).** Instructional leadership is leadership that supports the development of teaching and learning. [https://www.linkedin.com/posts/james-heneghan-ba7318217\\_tinoakoranga-mahitahi-longbaycollege-activity-7210079530785402880-nS46](https://www.linkedin.com/posts/james-heneghan-ba7318217_tinoakoranga-mahitahi-longbaycollege-activity-7210079530785402880-nS46)
23. **Leadership Content knowledge and instructional leadership in selected international schools in Mandalay, Myanmar: Analyzing Teacher’s Perception. (2024, May 29).** *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. <https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/articles/leaders>

[hip-content-knowledge-and-instructional-leadership-in-selected-international-schools-in-mandalay-myanmar-analyzing-teachers-perception/](#)

24. **Lyman, L. L., & Villani, C. J. (2004).** *Best Leadership Practices for High-Poverty Schools*. Scarecrow Education.
25. **Machost, M. E., & Stains, M. (2023).** Reflective practice as a tool for instructor professional development in STEM higher education. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 22(4), ar61. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.22-07-0148>
26. **MPACT. (2025, September 3).** Provide feedback - MPACT. <https://www.missouriparentsact.org/provide-feedback/>
27. **Mora-Ruano, J. G., Heine, J.-H., & Gebhardt, M. (2020).** Instructional leadership as a vehicle for school improvement: A systematic review. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(3), 576–595. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-12-2018-0370>
28. **Ohato, D. (2021, May 4).** 9 Characteristics of high-performing schools. Rudan Junior Academy. <https://www.rudanjunioracademy.sc.ke/performing-schools/>
29. **Ojastro, N. C., Banot, V. L., Ragay, N. L., & Batucan, N. A. (2025).** Academic performance and National Achievement Test (NAT) performance in science and mathematics. *Sci-Int. (Lahore)*, 37(1), 109–117. [https://www.sci-int.com/pdf/638733945618049154.Ojastro\\_Vincent\\_L\\_Banot-Philip-Revised-Paid-25-1-25.edited.pdf](https://www.sci-int.com/pdf/638733945618049154.Ojastro_Vincent_L_Banot-Philip-Revised-Paid-25-1-25.edited.pdf)
30. **Philippine Education Note (World Bank Group, 2016). World Bank Group. (2016).** Understanding the drivers of public school performance and efficiency in the Philippines. *Philippine Education Note, No. 8*. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/195381468188370699/Philippines-education-note-understanding-the-drivers-of-public-school-performance-and-efficiency-in-the-Philippines>
31. **Professional Development Opportunities for Teachers | ICG. (2024, August 19).** Instructional Coaching Group. <https://www.instructionalcoaching.com/professional-development-opportunities-for-teachers/>
32. **Queensland Education Improvement Research Centre. (2022).** Spotlight paper: Effective instructional leadership. <https://education.qld.gov.au/>
33. **Rawlings, B. S., de Laat, J., Hall, J. L., & Lange, M. (2024).** The impact of measures of school quality on children’s literacy and numeracy. *Developmental Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.13434>
34. **Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008).** The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635–674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321509>
35. **Robinson, V. M. J. & Faculty of Education, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand. (n.d.).** From instructional leadership to Leadership Capabilities: Empirical findings and methodological challenges. [https://cdn.auckland.ac.nz/assets/education/about/research/LRG/Robinson \(2010\) From instructional leadership to leadership capabilities - Empirical findings and methodological challenges.pdf](https://cdn.auckland.ac.nz/assets/education/about/research/LRG/Robinson (2010) From instructional leadership to leadership capabilities - Empirical findings and methodological challenges.pdf)
36. **Robinson, V. M. J., & Timperley, H. S. (2007).** The leadership of the improvement of teaching and learning: Lessons from initiatives with positive outcomes for students. *Australian Journal of Education*, 51(3), 247–262. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000494410705100303>
37. **Sanchez, J. G., & Watson, P. (2021).** Effective instructional leadership practices in high performing elementary schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 31(2), 211–232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1052684621996632>
38. **Sanchez, J., Watson, J. M., Dinuba Unified School District, & California State University, Fresno. (2021).** Effective instructional leadership practices in high performing elementary schools [Research Article]. *Journal of School Administration Research and Development*, 6(2), 60–70. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1325614.pdf>
39. **Sebastian, J., Allensworth, E., & Huang, H. (2019).** The role of teacher leadership in how principals influence classroom instruction and student learning. *American Journal of Education*, 126(1), 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1086/705777>
40. **Shannon, G. S., & Bylsma, P. (2007).** *The nine characteristics of high-performing schools: A research-based resource for schools and districts* (2nd ed.). Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction.
41. **Tan, C. Y., Lee, C. K., & Hallinger, P. (2020).** Exploring the effects of instructional leadership on school performance in Singapore. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(1), 13–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218781062>
42. **Tolentino, A. J. (2025, Month Day).** NAT 2024 results show ‘low proficiency’ among Grade 12 students across all regions. *Explained PH*. <https://explained.ph/nat-2024-results-show-low-proficiency-among-grade-12-students-across-all-regions/>
43. **Tosun, A., & Bozkurt Bostanci, A. (2024).** *The role of administrative support in the relationship between teachers’ perceptions of organizational support and teacher leadership levels*. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 8(3), 230–245. <https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.202428306>
44. **U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2000).** School-level correlates of academic achievement: Student assessment scores in SASS public schools (NCES 2000-303) (Donald McLaughlin & Gili Drori, Authors). <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2000/2000303.pdf>
45. **Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003).** *Balanced Leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
46. **Watson, P. (2023).** School culture types as predictors of school leadership capacity. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 10(3), 715–23. <https://doi.org/10.52380/ijcer.2023.10.3.535>
47. **Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. L. (2007).** Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 033). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of

Education Sciences, National Center for Education  
Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional  
Educational Laboratory Southwest.