

School Administrators' Instructional Leadership Competence in Relation to Teachers' Instructional Performance

Joel C. Flores

Student
Medina College
Philippines

Abstract:

This study examined the relationship between school administrators' instructional leadership competence and teachers' instructional performance in Naawan District, Misamis Oriental. Guided by the descriptive-correlational design, the research involved 19 administrators and 205 teachers from 19 public schools to determine how leadership proficiency in supervision, curriculum coordination, and protection of instructional time influences teachers' performance in planning, delivery, and assessment. Standardized instruments—the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (Hallinger, 2011) and the DepEd Classroom Observation Tool (2017)—were employed to gather data, which were analyzed using descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation. Findings revealed that administrators demonstrated *very high* instructional leadership competence, particularly in supervision and evaluation, curriculum coordination, and safeguarding instructional time, while teachers displayed *excellent* instructional performance. A significant positive correlation was found between the two variables, indicating that higher instructional leadership competence among administrators is associated with improved teacher performance. The results affirm the critical role of instructional leadership in fostering effective teaching practices and enhancing student learning outcomes. It is recommended that administrators further strengthen mentorship, curriculum alignment, and time management strategies through continuous professional development to sustain teaching excellence and educational quality in the district.

Keywords: instructional leadership, teacher performance, supervision, curriculum coordination, instructional time.

INTRODUCTION

Education is always on the lookout to improve academic achievement, and in realizing this, school principals are now tasked not just to work as managers but as effective instructional leaders. Instructional leadership is presently most crucial in determining the quality of teaching and learning in schools. Beyond that of an administrator, instructional leadership is concerned with guiding, mentoring, and collaborating with teachers on improving their instructional practices and classroom pedagogy. Effective instructional leadership also translates to there being a professional learning culture that has collaboration, innovation, and reflective practice supported in order to enhance student achievement. Additionally, high instructional leadership ability administrators impact the motivation, commitment, and instructional performance of the teachers, in turn impacting the learners' academic growth. With this in mind, this study sought to investigate the instructional leadership capacity of school administrators and the instructional performance of teachers in Naawan District, Naawan, Misamis Oriental, with the aim of gaining insights into how leadership practices are accountable for the overall teaching quality and learning.

School administrators' instructional leadership ability contains a variety of skills, such as establishing clear instructional aims, giving teachers opportunities for professional growth, monitoring and assessing instructional practice, and developing a positive school culture that involves cooperation. This is crucial in

ensuring the right training is imparted to teachers to address the diversified needs of their learners. Instructional performance among teachers, on the other hand, refers to the ability of teachers to deliver quality teaching pedagogies, classroom management, monitoring of students' progress, and responsiveness to new educational demands. Achievement at high levels of instructional performance is directly proportional to students' achievement and thus illustrates the importance of targeting teachers to perform best in their roles. Research has established the impact of leadership styles on the performance of teachers towards a better learning environment, and demonstrating that active, knowledgeable, and positive leadership significantly increases teachers' effectiveness (Abedemi & Bilikis, 2023). Instructional leadership has also been discovered to have direct effects on teacher performance since headmasters and school administrators who issue clear instructions and professional assistance play a significant role in teacher effectiveness (Wahab et al., 2020). Moreover, research indicates that instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators relate directly to teacher competencies, and it highlights the leadership role in enhancing classroom performance (Villa & Tulod, 2021). Similarly, it has been emphasized that even as teachers are ready to become practical, technical, and dynamic in delivering lessons utilizing contextualized content, school administrators' technical competence in providing technical support and direction plays an important part in maximizing teachers' instructional capacity (Balaca, 2023). In addition, instructional leadership straddling principalship and organizational management has become a school performance determinant, echoing administrators' key role in facilitating teachers' effectiveness (Sebastian et al., 2018). As such, studying this topic is helpful in maximizing Naawan District's school administrators' instructional leadership and teachers' performance. The connection between instructional leadership skills of school administrators and instructional performance of teachers is a significant educational research issue, as it directly influences students' learning accomplishment and school effectiveness.

While earlier studies have recognized the relevance of instructional leadership to teacher performance and student achievement, much of the earlier research has been conducted in broader or other forms of educational settings. There remains a shortage of studies that examine how school leaders' instructional leadership competencies affect teachers' daily instructional practices in the Philippine setting, particularly in the Naawan District. This is significant because instructional leadership routines are often shaped by cultural, institutional, and contextual factors, which may vary across regions and school environments. This is why this research aims to address the lack of information by investigating how the instructional leadership capacity of school leaders relates directly to the instructional performance of teachers in Naawan District. Along with identifying the correlation, the research also aims to uncover areas for improvement and development, and provide useful implications on how to augment leadership practices and teaching performance towards further improving student achievement. This research is grounded on the belief that effective instructional leadership is needed to advance teaching efficiency and, in turn, improve student performance. It primarily seeks to explore the relationship between the instructional leadership capability of school administrators and the instructional performance of teachers in the Naawan District.

This study aimed to determine the relationship between school administrators' instructional leadership competence and teachers' instructional performance. Specifically, the study tries to determine the level of administrators' proficiency in instructional supervision and assessment, coordination of curriculum, and safeguarding instructional time since these are significant areas of leadership with immediate impacts on teaching practice. Moreover, it strives to identify the extent to which instructional performance of teachers is and to establish if there is a significant relationship between instructional performance and leadership competence. The purpose of this study is to present empirical evidence that can be employed as a basis for enhancing leadership practices, enhancing teacher effectiveness, and improving the general quality of education in the district.

METHODS

Research Design

The research employed a descriptive-correlational design, a non-experimental research approach used to describe variables and explore the relationships between them without manipulation. Creswell (2014) explained that a correlational design establishes the extent to which two or more variables are associated,

while the descriptive aspect provides an overview of the attributes of the studied population. In this research, the descriptive section established the school administrators' instructional leadership capacity and teachers' instructional practice at varying levels, and the correlational section examined the statistical relationship between the variables. The design aimed to create patterns, trends, and relationships, and not causation. The variables were measured in their natural occurrence without manipulation by the researcher

Research Setting

The study was conducted in Naawan District, Misamis Oriental, which comprises 15 elementary and 4 secondary public schools with 19 school administrators managing both instructional and administrative functions. With a population of about 22,444 and a mix of urban and rural schools, the district provides a representative setting for examining diverse educational contexts. Its 224 teachers (85 elementary and 139 secondary) play a crucial role in shaping the community's learning culture under the guidance of their administrators. Given the district's limited resources, varying teacher competencies, and diverse needs, it offers a realistic view of the challenges faced by many Philippine public schools. This research explored how administrators' instructional leadership—through supervision, curriculum coordination, and time management—affects teachers' instructional performance, offering insights and strategies to strengthen educational quality and equity both in Naawan and similar districts nationwide.

Research Respondents

The respondents of this study were the school administrators and teachers from the Naawan District in Misamis Oriental, which consists of 15 elementary and 4 secondary public schools with 19 school administrators overseeing both instructional and administrative duties. The district, located in a fourth-class municipality with a population of about 22,444, represents a blend of urban and rural educational contexts, providing a well-rounded perspective of school leadership and teacher performance. A total of 224 teachers—85 elementary and 139 secondary—comprised the instructional force, working closely with their administrators to shape the district's learning environment. Given its diverse needs, resource limitations, and varying competencies among educators, Naawan District serves as an ideal setting to examine how instructional leadership influences teachers' planning, teaching, and assessment performance. The respondents' insights offer valuable evidence on how effective leadership, supervision, and curriculum coordination contribute to achieving quality and equitable education within and beyond the district.

Research Instrument

Two standardized instruments were utilized to gather data for this study. The first was the Instructional Leadership Competence Survey, adapted from Hallinger's Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) Version 2.2 (2011), which measured administrators' practices in supervising and assessing instruction, coordinating the curriculum, and protecting instructional time. The second was the Teacher Performance Evaluation Instrument, adapted from the Department of Education's Classroom Observation Tool (COT) (2017), developed through the Research Center for Teacher Quality (RCTQ) and Jocson et al. (2017), assessing teacher performance in lesson planning, classroom delivery, management, and assessment. Both instruments were pilot-tested to ensure validity and reliability, providing accurate and consistent data on administrators' instructional leadership and teachers' instructional performance in the Naawan District.

Validity of Instrument

Prior to distribution, the Instructional Leadership Competence Survey and Teacher Performance Evaluation Tool underwent a thorough validation process to ensure that they accurately measured the intended constructs. A panel of experienced school leaders, education professors, and research experts evaluated the instruments for content validity, assessing the clarity, relevance, and appropriateness of each item. Their feedback was incorporated to refine the language and align the tools with the study's objectives. A pilot test involving teachers and administrators outside the study group was also conducted to determine reliability and internal consistency. Ambiguous items were revised, and statistical analysis using Cronbach's alpha confirmed that all subscales were dependable. These procedures ensured that the instruments were valid, reliable, and appropriate for generating credible and consistent data.

Data-Gathering Procedure

The data collection of this study began with the acquisition of the proper permissions from the Department of Education and the District of Naawan school administrators in Naawan, Misamis Oriental, to operate ethically and get permission to conduct the research. Having acquired the permission, 19 school administrators and 224 teachers in the district were selected and approached to be part of the study. Informed consent questionnaires were distributed, and confidentiality of responses was guaranteed. Data were subsequently gathered through two instruments of research: the Instructional Leadership Competence Survey for administrators and the Teacher Performance Evaluation Tool for teachers. The questionnaires were taken through an online instrument (Google Forms), with 15 administrators and 205 teachers responding. After the respondents completed their questionnaires, the gathered data were kept, organized, and stored in SPSS for analysis. This organized and ethical procedure ensured a thorough, accurate, and study-based collection of data, eventually providing reliable and valid results.

Ethical Considerations

This study strictly observed ethical research standards to ensure integrity and protect participants' rights and welfare. The purpose, procedures, and goals of the research were clearly explained to all respondents, who voluntarily participated after signing an informed consent form and were assured of their right to withdraw at any time without consequence. Anonymity and confidentiality were maintained by omitting personal identifiers and securely storing all data, accessible only to the researcher for academic purposes. Participants received no material incentives, and care was taken to prevent any physical, psychological, or professional harm. Honesty and transparency guided the entire research process—from data collection to reporting—and all records were properly disposed of after completion. Through adherence to these principles and compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (RA 10173), the study upheld respect, dignity, and ethical responsibility toward all participants.

Data Analysis

The study employed both descriptive and inferential statistical methods to analyze the data gathered from the respondents. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize and present the data through frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation, providing a clear overview of the factors influencing the Science performance of Grade VI pupils. To examine relationships between variables, the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) was utilized to determine the strength and direction of the association between the identified factors and pupils' Science performance. A 0.05 level of significance served as the criterion for deciding whether to accept or reject the null hypothesis, ensuring that findings were statistically valid and reliable.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1.1 - Level of School Administrators' Instructional Leadership Competence in terms of Supervision and Evaluation of Instruction

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. The school administrator conducts regular classroom observations and constructive technical assistance.	0.44	4.73
2. The school administrator encourages the use of innovative teaching methods and technologies.	0.46	4.69
3. The school administrator promotes a student-centered approach to teaching and learning.	0.29	4.91
4. The school administrator ensures curriculum alignment with educational standards.	0.46	4.67
5. The school administrator offers mentoring or coaching programs for teachers.	0.15	4.98

6. The school administrator reviews teacher’s lesson plan and learning materials when evaluating classroom instruction.	0.62	4.37
7. The school administrator points out specific strengths and weaknesses in teachers’ instructional practices.	0.70	4.36

Average Mean **4.672 Very High**

Scale: 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High” 3.41 - 4.20 “High”; 2.61 – 3.40 “Moderate”; 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”; 1.00 – 1.80 “Very Low”

Table 1.1 reports the level of instructional leadership ability of school administrators in supervision and instruction evaluation. The calculated overall mean of 4.67, which was labeled as Very High, revealed that school administrators always exhibited effective leadership practices in directing, monitoring, and supporting instructional functions. This, therefore, meant that administrators were indeed actively involved in improving teaching quality through effective supervision and instruction evaluation, which most likely led to improving teachers' instructional performance and student learning achievements.

Of the indicators that were explored, the highest rated was the school administrator offering mentoring or coaching initiatives to the teachers, with a mean of 4.98 reflected that coaching and mentoring were being employed as a fundamental strategy for enhancing teacher competence. Similarly, promoting student-centered teaching (4.91) and conducting regular classroom observation and technical assistance (4.73) were also highly ranked, suggesting that administrators cared about ensuring teaching practice had value and impact. Conversely, the lowest-rated activity was the administrator's ability to review lesson plans and learning materials (4.37) and to recognize specific strengths and weaknesses in teachers' practice (4.36). Although still highly rated, these were inferred areas that may need additional strengthening to enable teachers to receive more specific, constructive, and personalized feedback in supervision and evaluation.

The findings of the current study also indicated that school leaders exhibited highly competent supervision and instructional evaluation, especially in mentoring teachers, fostering student-centered instruction, and instilling innovative instructional practices. This is consistent with other research highlighting that effective instructional leadership strategies greatly boost teacher competencies by stressing frequent supervision and guidance to enhance instruction quality (Villa & Tulod, 2021). Equally, instructional supervision in the 21st century has been highlighted to extend beyond compliance checks to encompass coaching, mentoring, and incorporating cutting-edge approaches (Basilio & Bueno, 2021). Whereas the literature highlighted the dynamic and changing role of supervision to accommodate contemporary educational needs, the current research verified that administrators were already using these techniques effectively, hence strengthening teacher performance and aligning even closer with modern expectations.

Table 1.2 - Level of School Administrators’ Instructional Leadership Competence in terms of Curriculum Coordination

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. The school administrator monitors the classroom curriculum to see that it covers the school’s curricular activities.	0.56	4.68
2. The school administrator assesses the overlap between the school’s curricular objectives and the schools achievement test.	0.83	4.22
3. The school administrator participates actively in the review of curricular materials.	0.90	4.42
4. The school administrator is knowledgeable about recent trends and innovations in education.	0.75	4.33
5. The school administrator provides guidance on instructional strategies to achieve curriculum objectives.	0.75	4.33
6. The school administrator supports teachers in addressing challenges in curriculum delivery	0.49	4.4

7. The school administrator encourages collaborative planning among teachers to improve curriculum alignment. 0.45 4.72

Average Mean 4.449 Very High

Scale: 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High” 3.41 - 4.20 “High”; 2.61 – 3.40 “Moderate”; 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”; 1.00 – 1.80 “Very Low”

Table 1.2 reported the instructional leadership competence of school administrators in curriculum coordination. The calculated overall mean of 4.45 was interpreted verbally as very high, which reflected that administrators uniformly exhibited strong competence in guaranteeing curriculum alignment, implementation, and support for the teachers. This reflected that administrators had been actively involved in managing curriculum-related tasks, shaping instructional practices, and promoting collaboration among the teachers. The assumption was that the high competence enhanced effective teaching and learning procedures, and it also guaranteed the accomplishment of the school's curricular objectives through efficiency.

On scrutiny of the indicators, findings showed that teachers highly rated the item of encouraging collective planning to enhance curriculum alignment with a mean of 4.72, which meant that administrators highly focused on collective effort towards enhancing curriculum delivery. Close monitoring of what occurs in the classroom so that it encompasses curricular activities rated very highly at 4.68, showing administrators' close monitoring of teaching materials. The lowest mean was measured in assessing overlap between curricular goals and achievement tests at 4.22, though still very high, indicating that this aspect needed more systematic measurement to establish greater overlap between objectives and outcomes. Overall, the findings suggested that administrators exhibited proficiency in all of the indicators, though greater focus on assessment and evaluation could further increase curriculum coordination.

The result of the current study indicated that school administrators exhibited a highly competent performance in curriculum coordination, which is consistent with the outcome of prior research highlighting the critical role of instructional leadership in reinforcing pedagogical practices and promoting congruence of curricular goals with student outcomes (Banua et al., 2022). Also, other studies emphasized the value of principals' skills in monitoring the curriculum, innovation, and planning collaboratively, which are aligned with administrators' good performance in leading the implementation of the curriculum and teachers in handling instruction problems (Keykha et al., 2022). But whereas the literature had been emphasizing constant development and improvement of leadership skills to cope with changing educational needs, the current study revealed that administrators were already functioning at a very high level, indicating that in the local context the emphasis may be shifting from building essential competence to maintaining excellence and incorporating innovative practice.

Table 1.3 - Level of School Administrators' Instructional Leadership Competence in terms of Protect Instructional Time

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. The school administrator limits the interruptions of instructional time.	0.41	4.78
2. The school administrator ensures that the tardy and truant students will be addressed properly.	0.43	4.75
3. The school administrator encourages teachers to use instructional time in teaching and practicing new concepts.	0.75	4.33
4. The school administrator ensures meetings and training sessions for teachers do not encroach on instructional time.	0.46	4.67
5. The administrator supports teachers in maintaining class discipline to minimize time lost to behavioral issues.	0.50	4.50
6. The administrator regularly evaluates the use of instructional time and identifies areas for improvement.	0.62	4.49

7. The administrator gathers feedback from teachers on factors affecting instructional time. 0.44 4.72

Average Mean 4.606

Scale: 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High” 3.41 - 4.20 “High”; 2.61 – 3.40 “Moderate”; 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”; 1.00 – 1.80 “Very Low”

Table 1.3 showed that the total mean of 4.61 was the level of school administrators' instructional leadership ability in the area of safeguarding instructional time and was very high. This implied that the school administrators always carried out activities that safeguarded and optimized instructional time. The findings showed that the administrators put a great deal of emphasis on avoiding interruptions, sustaining class discipline, and supporting teachers in optimizing time for instruction, which consequently resulted in effective teaching and improved learning outcomes.

Looking into the actions, the highest mean score was realized in eliminating disruptions of instructional time (4.78), followed closely by dealing with tardy and absent students (4.75) and gathering teachers' responses about factors that disrupt instructional time (4.72). These were indicative of administrators being very engaged in reducing distraction and time-on-task among pupils. On the contrary, the lowest average was obtained for supporting teachers in utilizing instructional time to teach and practice new ideas (4.33). This indicated that although administrators strongly defended instructional time, a slightly lower amount was devoted to reinforcing teaching quality strategies directly during instructional time. However, all of the indicators were in the very high range, underscoring the administrators' unwavering dedication to fostering a climate supportive of quality teaching.

The literature highlighted that instructional leadership has a positive effect on teacher efficacy as long as administrators are supportive of classroom practices and establish conditions that optimize learning opportunities (Ma & Marion, 2019) and underscored difficulties in school leaders' efforts to weigh managerial responsibilities with the preservation of instructional time (Hayes & Irby, 2019). In the same way, the current study established that administrators always manifested highly high competence in protecting instructional time, like reducing interruptions, correcting tardiness among students, and enforcing discipline, which reinforced the positive impact of leadership on teacher performance. Nonetheless, whereas previous research indicated challenges in preparing school principals to successfully handle instructional leadership duties (Hayes & Irby, 2019), the results of this current study contradicted this by revealing that administrators were already effective in defending instructional time and thus indicated a high capability to leverage leadership preparation to real-world application (Ma & Marion, 2019).

Table 1.4 - Summary of the Level of School Administrators’ Instructional Leadership Competence

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
Supervision and Evaluation of Instruction	4.672	Very High
Curriculum Coordination	4.449	Very High
Protect Instructional Time	4.606	Very High
Average Mean	4.575	Very High

Scale: 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High” 3.41 - 4.20 “High”; 2.61 – 3.40 “Moderate”; 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”; 1.00 – 1.80 “Very Low”

Table 1.4 indicated that the overall mean of 4.575 was translated as Very High. This indicated that school administrators consistently evidenced strong instructional leadership ability. Their ability to monitor, guide, and inspire teachers was reflected by consistently high ratings, which meant that they maintained practices and strategies that worked to enhance the quality of instruction positively. The very high overall mean also indicated that the administrators established an effective instructional climate which played a huge part in enhancing instructional performance among the teachers.

Of all the predictors, the monitoring and supervision of teaching had the largest mean of 4.672, which was interpreted to mean Very High. This suggested that administrators were placing great emphasis on monitoring classroom teaching and assessing the effectiveness of teachers so that quality education was being offered. Protecting instructional time ranked second with a mean of 4.606, and also interpreted as Very High, indicating that administrators placed significant priority on the protection of teaching hours, as well as eradicating disturbances to learning within classrooms. Coordination of curriculum ranked highest with a mean of 4.449, also interpreted as Very High, showing efforts of administrators in aligning teaching activities to curricular objectives, but slightly below the rest of the indicators. These findings suggested that although all aspects were rated very high, administrators were most competent in supervision and evaluation with curriculum coordination being an aspect that could still be improved further to enhance overall instructional leadership capability.

The outcomes of the current study corroborated with the findings of earlier studies, which stressed that school leaders exhibited strong instructional leadership competencies that played a critical role in professional growth, especially in aspects of supervision, curriculum, and instructional assistance (Gamata, 2021). In the same vein, it was stressed that school administrators in elementary schools had high instructional leadership capacity, which improved teaching effectiveness and school performance (Basañes, 2020). In contrast, the current study also found administrators to consistently demonstrate extremely high competence in supervision, curriculum coordination, and safeguarding of instructional time, consistent with the findings of previous studies. While previous literature primarily emphasized professional development and capacity-building as a result, the current study emphasized more on the global competence of administrators across particular instructional leadership domains.

Table 2 - Level of Teachers' Teaching Performance

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. The teachers applied knowledge of content within and across curriculum teaching areas.	0.47	4.67
2. The teachers use a range of teaching strategies that enhance learner achievement in literacy and numeracy skills.	0.44	4.73
3. The teachers ensure the positive use of ICT to facilitate the teaching and learning process.	0.49	4.60
4. The teachers use the verbal and non-verbal classroom communication strategies to support learners' understanding, participation, engagement and achievement.	0.88	4.40
5. The teachers maintain supportive learning environments that nurture and inspire learners to participate, cooperate and collaborate in continued learning.	0.40	4.80
6. The teachers apply a range of successful strategies that maintain learning environments that motivate learners to work productively by assuming responsibility for their own learning.	0.60	4.67
7. The teachers design, adapt and implement teaching strategies that are responsive to learners with disabilities, giftedness and talents.	0.49	4.60
8. The teachers plan and deliver teaching strategies that are responsive to the special educational needs of learners in difficult circumstances, including: geographic isolation; chronic illness; displacement due to armed conflict; urban resettlement or disasters; child abuse and child labor practices.	0.47	4.67
9. The teachers know how to assess the performance in the classroom	0.71	4.40
10. The teachers can adapt teaching based upon what learners currently understand or do not understand.	0.73	4.00
11. The teachers give timely and constructive feedback on assignments and assessments.	0.62	4.13

12. The teachers are familiar with learner understandings and misconception.	0.49	4.60
13. The teachers know how to organize and maintain classroom management.	0.44	4.73
14. The teachers can assess learners' performance in multiple ways.	0.72	4.53
15. The teachers demonstrate professionalism and respect in their interactions with students.	0.60	4.67

Average Mean **4.538 Excellent**

Scale: 4.21 – 5.00 “Excellent” 3.41 - 4.20 “Very Good”; 2.61 – 3.40 “Good”; 1.81 – 2.60 “Fair”; 1.00 – 1.80 “Poor”

Table 2 revealed that the total average mean score of 4.54 was translated to Excellent. This meant that teachers exhibited high instruction performance consistently in various areas of instruction. Such findings indicated that teachers used content knowledge effectively, employed suitable strategies, controlled classrooms, and monitored learning in a manner that facilitated learner achievement. The results revealed that the practice by the teachers aligned with the anticipated professional benchmarks and made contributions that were favorable to learners' growth and participation.

From the specific indicators, the greatest mean of 4.80 was registered under keeping supporting learning environments, which suggests that teachers developed classrooms that encouraged participation, cooperation, and collaboration among students. This was complemented by applying diverse teaching strategies to literacy and numeracy (M=4.73) and organizing classroom management (M=4.73), which reflected the teachers' competency in applying strategies that promoted student success and ensured order. Conversely, the lowest mean score of 4.00 was in accommodating instruction to learners' existing knowledge, reflecting that teachers needed to improve in differentiating instruction based on the progress of individual students. Likewise, providing prompt feedback (M=4.13) and monitoring learner performance through multiple forms (M=4.53) were areas in which teachers already scored well but could be further improved to optimize learners' outcomes. Generally, the analysis suggested that although teachers had excelled, there was still a need for ongoing support and training in order to maintain strengths and plug gaps identified.

The results of the current study indicated that teachers' performance in teaching was considered excellent, especially in using different strategies, incorporating ICT, ensuring supportive learning environments, and portraying professionalism. This is consistent with the literature, which stressed that teacher performance is shaped importantly by content mastery, strategies for teaching, and classroom management, demonstrating consistency in how these competencies contribute to learner outcomes (Sumanga, Batuigas, Leyson, Fernandez, & Napil, 2022). Similarly, the importance of professional commitment, pedagogical competence, and adaptability in addressing students' needs resonates with the study's results, indicating teachers' ability to adapt strategies for diverse learners and provide constructive feedback (Kanya, Fathoni, & Ramdani, 2021). Nonetheless, while the literature highlighted extrinsic factors like motivation and administrative backing as key to teaching performance, the current study focused on teachers displayed competencies in class, thus providing a more skill-centered view of performance than it did on extrinsic influences.

Table 3 - Test of Significant Relationship between School Administrators' Instructional Leadership and Teachers' Teaching Performance

Test Variables	Correlation Coefficient	P value	Decision
School Administrators' Instructional Leadership and Teachers' Teaching Performance	0.585	0.022	reject the H ₀

Note: If $p \leq 0.05$, with a significant relationship

Table 3 displayed the test of significant relationship between instructional leadership of school administrators and teaching performance of teachers. The finding indicated a gross correlation coefficient value of 0.585 with p-value equaling 0.022. As the calculated value of probability was less than the level of significance that is 0.05, the null hypothesis was rejected. This meant there existed a significant positive relationship between instructional leadership of school administrators and teaching performance of teachers. That is, administrators with higher instructional leadership proficiency levels were related to improved teaching performance among instructors, emphasizing the significant role of leadership in the provision of effective instruction.

Concerning indicators, the findings indicated that administrators who offered clear instructional supervision, curriculum coordination, and effective utilization of instructional time had a positive impact on teachers' teaching performance. The significant link indicated that instructional outputs and classroom practices of teachers were improved if administrators exhibited effective leadership in instructing, supporting, and overseeing instructional processes. The said finding highlighted the importance of ongoing development of leadership skills to maintain and continue to enhance the quality of teaching performance.

The outcomes of the current research were consistent with prior findings, underlining that instructional leadership of headmasters positively impacted teacher performance, highlighting the importance of proper supervision and guidance in improving teaching practices (Wahab et al., 2020). Similarly, it was highlighted that administrators' instructional leadership skills significantly improved teachers' performance and efficacy, particularly in fostering confidence and competence in instructional delivery (Daing & Mustapha, 2023). On the other hand, while the prior literature had placed important focus on the overall leadership themes and their explicit role in teacher effectiveness, the present study significantly focused on the significant relational link between the instructional leadership of administrators and teaching performance, upholding the wide-ranging view that leadership ability acts as an impetus for instruction achievement.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

The research found that the school leaders exhibited a high degree of instructional leadership proficiency, specifically in instruction supervision and instruction evaluation, curriculum coordination, and safeguarding instructional time, while teachers all performed extremely well in all aspects of teaching practice. The strong positive association between teachers' instructional performance and administrators' instructional leadership supported the fact that high leadership ability among administrators is crucial in improving the quality of instruction delivered by teachers. These results stressed the interdependence of effective leadership and instructional excellence, pointing out that when administrators make consistent guidance, support, and instructional monitoring available, educators are better able to maximize their capacities, ultimately translating to enhanced student learning.

Recommendations

School administrators are encouraged to strengthen their instructional leadership skills in supervision, curriculum coordination, and protecting instructional time through continuous training, mentoring, and reflection. Teachers should actively engage in professional development, embrace mentoring and innovation, and collaborate with administrators to enhance instructional quality and student outcomes. Policymakers are urged to design and implement policies and programs that build administrators' instructional leadership capacities through sustained training and evaluation. Schools and districts should institutionalize capacity-building initiatives and promote a culture of collaboration and shared accountability for instructional improvement. Lastly, future researchers are encouraged to explore additional variables influencing the link between instructional leadership and teacher performance, such as motivation, school culture, and student achievement, and to conduct comparative studies across different educational settings.

REFERENCES:

1. Abidemi, A., & Bilikis, L. A. (2023). Leadership strategies for enhancing teacher performance and student learning. ResearchGate.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387965569_LEADERSHIP-STRATEGIES-FOR-ENHANCING-TEACHER-PERFORMANCE-AND-STUDENT-LEARNING

2. Wahab, J. A., Mansor, A. Z., Hussin, M., & Kumarasamy, S. (2020). Headmasters' instructional leadership and its relationship with teachers performance. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(11), 97-102.
3. Sebastian, J., Allensworth, E., Wiedermann, W., Hochbein, C., & Cunningham, M. (2019). Principal leadership and school performance: An examination of instructional leadership and organizational management. *Leadership and policy in schools*, 18(4), 591-613.
4. Balaca, D. B. (2020). Supervisory competence and instructional leadership of DepEd secondary school heads: Its relation to teachers' performance. *ePHI Journal of Education Research*. <http://ephijer.com/index.php/er/article/view/103>
5. Banua, E. I., Iglesia, N. S., & Muarip, V. C. (2022). School administrators' instructional leadership: Basis for pedagogical enhancement. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(7), 2131–2145. <https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6ns7.11770>
6. Basañes, R. A. (2020). Instructional leadership capacity of elementary school administrators. *Global Journal of Business and Social Science Review*, 8(2), 113–123. [https://doi.org/10.35609/gjbssr.2020.8.2\(5\)](https://doi.org/10.35609/gjbssr.2020.8.2(5))
7. Basilio, M. B., & Bueno, D. C. (2021). Instructional supervision and assessment in the 21st century and beyond. *Online Submission*, 4, 1–8.
8. Gamata, J. A. (2021). Basic education school administrators' instructional leadership capabilities for professional development. *Puissant*, 2, 185–196.
9. Hayes, S. D., & Irby, B. J. (2019). Challenges in preparing aspiring principals for instructional leadership: Voices from the field. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 23(2), 131–151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2018.1562102>
10. Daing, C. A., & Mustapha, L. C. (2023). School administrators' instructional leadership skills and teachers' performance and efficacy in senior high schools in the national capital region, Philippines. *International Journal of Educational Policy Research and Review*, 11(1), 1.
11. Kanya, N., Fathoni, A. B., & Ramdani, Z. (2021). Factors affecting teacher performance. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 10(4), 1462–1470. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i4.21693>
12. Keykha, A., Rahmani, P., & Ezati, M. (2022). Identifying the competencies of school principals for effective leadership in schools. *School Administration*, 10(3), 110–132. <https://doi.org/10.34785/J010.2022.034>
13. Ma, X., & Marion, R. (2019). Exploring how instructional leadership affects teacher efficacy: A multilevel analysis. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(1), 188–207. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219888742>
14. Sumanga, C., Batuigas, F., Leyson, F., Fernandez, L., & Napil, J. (2022). Factors affecting teaching performance of junior high school teachers of Madridejos National High School. *Asia Research Network Journal of Education*, 2(1), 40–47. <https://so05.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/arnje/article/view/257352>
15. Villa, F. T., & Tulod, R. C. (2021). Correlating instructional leadership practices of school administrators with teachers' competencies. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S1), 83–99. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5ns1.1318>