

School Heads' Instructional Leadership Behavior Of Public And Private Educational Institutions

Dominique John O. Soriano, LPT^a, Corazon S. Fajardo, PhD^b

^a*dominiquejohn.soriano@deped.gov.ph*

^b*csfajardo@yahoo.com*

*Mabini Colleges, Inc., Governor Panotes Avenue,
Daet, Camarines Norte, 4600, Philippines*

Abstract

This study explored the instructional leadership behaviors of school heads in public and private educational institutions in the Sta. Elena District during the 2024–2025 school year. It aimed to address the following problems such as identify school profiles in terms of sector and classification, designation of school heads and their years of service; evaluate instructional leadership behaviors across the eight domains of Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH); test for the significant difference between the instructional leadership behavior of the school heads in private and public institutions when grouped according to school profile; find out the challenges in instructional leadership behavior; and develop an intervention plan to enhance the school heads' leadership practices. A descriptive-inferential research design was employed on a total population sample of 270 respondents (257 teachers and 13 school heads) using validated survey instruments; data were tested using frequency count, percentage, weighted mean, and ANOVA. Key findings revealed that 1) public schools dominated the district (61.54%) mostly medium schools (53.85%), with most leaders being principals (84.62%) having limited tenure (53.85% with 1–5 years), 2) strengths in instructional leadership behavior were noted in career awareness and learning environments, 3) leadership behaviors are significantly different across school classifications and leadership designations, but not with sector classification or years of service, 4) challenges persisted in pedagogical support and performance feedback with administrative burdens, technological adaptation, and financial constraints as prevalent issues, and 5) the proposed intervention program targeted instructional excellence, organizational efficiency, teacher support, and community engagement.

It concludes that 1) most principals in public medium schools with low tenure, 2) showed strengths in career awareness and inclusive learning environments, 3) while leadership behaviors varied by school classification and designation with significant difference, 4) challenges remained in pedagogical support, feedback, administration, technology, and finances, and 5) the proposed intervention aimed to enhance instructional excellence, efficiency, teacher support, and community engagement.

It is recommended to 1) enhance leadership training for new principals, 2) expand career and inclusive education initiatives, 3) tailor support based on school profiles, 4) strengthen pedagogical and operational systems, and 5) implement a comprehensive intervention for instructional excellence and community engagement for the school heads in both public and private secondary schools.

Keywords: Instructional leadership behavior, school heads, leadership challenges, intervention plan, school classification

1. Introduction

Instructional leadership plays a central role in effective school management, involving the actions and strategies of school leaders to enhance teaching, learning, and academic performance. Maldrine and Kiplangat

(2020) emphasized that strong leaders focus on activities directly affecting student learning, such as setting a clear vision, maintaining high academic expectations, and nurturing a culture of continuous improvement. School heads are more than administrators; they act as instructional leaders, shaping educational outcomes through visionary leadership.

Expanding on this, Hallinger et al. (2020) highlighted the importance of involving stakeholders in shaping a shared vision aligned with school goals. This collaborative approach fosters unity and ownership among teachers, students, and the community, strengthening the school's direction (Sebastian et al., 2019). Instructional leaders also support teachers through regular classroom observations, feedback, and professional development opportunities, all aimed at enhancing instructional effectiveness and student achievement.

Equally important is the school's context, which provides the foundation for understanding leadership dynamics. Factors such as school classification, head designation, staff size, and student population shape the roles of instructional leaders (Hallinger et al., 2020). Kwan (2020) noted that these structural differences significantly influence how leadership is practiced, whether in public, private, or specialized institutions.

However, school heads also face growing challenges. Limited resources and increasing student needs require balancing instructional leadership with administrative responsibilities (Hayes & Irby, 2019). Adapting to evolving educational trends and technologies demands resilience and skill (Goldring et al., 2020). In the Philippines, legal frameworks such as DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017, mandate teacher supervision and competency standards, guiding leaders in fostering teacher growth and classroom effectiveness.

Supporting this, other policies including RA 10533 (2013), DepEd Order No. 01, s. 2003, and DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024, focus on improving instruction, governance, and school-based management. These ensure leaders uphold transparency, accountability, and instructional quality across institutions. Within this framework, Kilag and Sasan (2023) emphasized that instructional leaders foster trust, communication, and collaboration, which are vital in developing teacher capacity and maintaining strong teacher-administrator relationships.

Finally, Kilag et al. (2023) and Anub (2020) noted that instructional leadership drives school effectiveness, despite challenges like change resistance and limited resources. Through shared vision and empowerment, principals lead school improvement and professional growth. Chavez and Rubi (2021) demonstrated how leadership styles in Bicol influence productivity through strategic initiatives and benchmarking. Despite extensive literature, local studies on instructional behaviors in public and private settings remain scarce. Hence, this study aims to address that gap and help strengthen leadership development programs in both sectors.

1.1. Objective of the Study

This study aimed to determine the instructional leadership behavior of school heads in public and private educational institutions in Sta. Elena District for the school year 2024–2025. Specifically, it sought to identify the school profile in terms of sector classification, school classification, designation of school heads, and number of years in service. It also examined the instructional leadership behaviors of school heads with regard to school-based review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards, teaching standards and pedagogies, teacher performance feedback, learner achievement and performance indicators, learning assessment, learning environment, career awareness and opportunities, and learner discipline. Furthermore, the study investigated whether there is a significant difference in the instructional leadership behavior of school heads in public and private institutions when grouped according to their school profile. It also explored the challenges encountered by school heads in exercising instructional leadership and sought to develop an intervention plan to improve their leadership behavior in both public and private educational settings.

2. Methodology

The study utilized a descriptive-inferential research design under the quantitative method, which was appropriate for addressing the research questions and aligned with the use of a structured survey questionnaire. The descriptive phase focused on examining the school profile—including sector classification, school classification, designation of school heads, and years in service—while also identifying instructional leadership behaviors related to curriculum implementation, pedagogies, teacher feedback, learner achievement, assessment, environment, career awareness, and discipline, as well as the challenges faced by school heads in both public and private institutions. The inferential phase involved testing the significant differences in instructional leadership behavior when grouped according to school profile. This design allowed for a detailed analysis of existing conditions and patterns while enabling inferences about variations in experiences and leadership practices, as supported by Siedlecki (2020), who emphasized the value of such methods in gathering factual data and deriving analytical interpretations.

2.1. Population, Sample Size, and Sampling Technique

The study was conducted in the Santa Elena District, Camarines Norte, involving five private schools and eight public high schools. Using total enumeration, the study involved all five private school heads and eight public school heads, along with 257 secondary school teachers, resulting in a total of 270 respondents. This allowed for a comprehensive understanding of instructional leadership behaviors within the district, avoiding the need for sampling (Novosel, 2023). The respondents included school heads designated as principals, head teachers, or officers-in-charge, all with at least one year of instructional leadership experience, and teachers with at least one year of secondary-level teaching experience, regardless of specialization or demographic characteristics. Schools were selected based on the observed variability in instructional leadership behaviors, as reflected by differences in school performance, challenges, and operational contexts. School profile—whether public or private, small or large, or offering varied curricula—was the primary factor in understanding leadership practices across different institutional types.

2.2. Data Gathering Procedures

Data for the study were collected using survey questionnaires aligned with the indicators from the statement of the problem. The researcher first secured permission from the Schools Division Superintendent of Camarines Norte and then sent request letters to the school heads of all public and private secondary schools, along with their respective Public Schools District Supervisors (PSDS). With approval granted, the researcher personally visited the schools and, with the help of guidance counselors or research coordinators, administered the questionnaires. Respondents were oriented on the study's purpose and were assured of their rights, including the freedom to withdraw at any time or skip sensitive questions. Their participation was voluntary, and all responses were treated with strict confidentiality. Names were not required, and physical contact was avoided during distribution. The questionnaires were later retrieved by the researcher with the same assistance, and the data were tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted with support from research advisers and statisticians. The instrument used in the study was adapted from the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) and included additional indicators based on a review of related literature. It was validated by three Education Program Specialists and pilot-tested in both a public and a private school within a nearby district in Camarines Norte to ensure reliability (Dovetail Editorial Team, 2023). The final questionnaire had three parts: Part I gathered school profile data (sector, classification, designation of the school head, and years of service); Part II assessed instructional leadership behaviors across eight domains with ten items each; and Part III addressed fifteen indicators related to the challenges faced by school heads. Both school heads and teachers completed all parts of the instrument.

2.3. Statistical Treatment of Data

The data gathered from the survey were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software to ensure accuracy and efficiency in data processing, with the guidance of a statistician. A combination of statistical tools—frequency count and percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, and Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)—was applied to address the specific research questions.

To answer research question 1, frequency count and percentage were used to describe the profile of schools in terms of sector classification, school classification, designation of school heads, and number of years in service. These descriptive statistics provided a foundational understanding of the institutional characteristics of both public and private schools involved in the study.

For research question 2, weighted mean and standard deviation were employed to assess the instructional leadership behaviors of school heads across eight key domains. These domains included school-based review and contextualization of learning standards, teaching standards and pedagogies, teacher performance feedback, learner achievement and performance indicators, learning assessment, learning environment, career awareness and opportunities, and learner discipline. Responses were interpreted using a four-point Likert scale to measure levels of agreement in leadership practices.

To address research question 3, Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was utilized to determine whether significant differences existed in the instructional leadership behaviors of school heads when grouped according to school profile. When MANOVA results indicated significant differences, follow-up tests such as univariate ANOVA and post hoc analysis were conducted to identify specific areas where group differences occurred.

For research question 4, the challenges encountered by school heads in performing their instructional leadership roles were analyzed using weighted mean, also interpreted through a four-point Likert scale. This allowed the study to identify which challenges were commonly, occasionally, rarely, or not at all experienced by the respondents. Overall, the combination of descriptive and inferential statistics provided a comprehensive approach to interpreting the data. This framework enabled the study to draw well-supported conclusions regarding instructional leadership behaviors and the contextual factors influencing them in both public and private secondary schools in Sta. Elena District.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Profile of the School

The data in Table 1 show that public schools comprised 61.54% of institutions in the district, indicating a dominant presence due to affordability, accessibility, and government support, consistent with national trends promoting free education (Pierce and Claybourn, 2023). This suggests that public school heads face greater responsibilities in managing large student populations and ensuring compliance with mandated standards despite limited resources. Conversely, private schools accounted for only 38.46%, reflecting financial barriers that limit access and a need for strategic leadership to maintain enrollment and academic quality. Private school heads, while enjoying decision-making flexibility, must focus on financial sustainability and innovation in learning, echoing Lapuz and Pecajas (2022), who emphasized the challenge of sustaining competitive private education in a predominantly public system.

Table 1. Profile of the School in terms of Sector Classification

Sector	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Public	8	61.54
Private	5	38.46
Total	13	100.00

The findings reveal that medium-sized schools are the most common in the district, comprising 53.85%, suggesting that most institutions manage a moderate student population with a balanced student-to-teacher ratio conducive to effective instruction. Large schools follow at 23.08%, indicating that some institutions handle greater student numbers, requiring structured leadership to ensure instructional quality and resource management. In contrast, small schools account for only 15.38%, and very large schools just 7.69%, reflecting limited representation, possibly due to enrollment capacity or location. Medium schools may benefit from manageable class sizes, while large and very large schools face challenges in supervision and engagement. Small schools, though offering close-knit learning, may struggle with limited resources. These results support the studies of The Wing Institute at Morningside Academy (2023) and Gamala and Marpa (2022), both of which emphasize that school size impacts leadership demands, requiring heads to tailor strategies based on institutional capacity and context.

Table 2. Profile of the School in terms of School Classification

School Classification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Small	2	15.38
Medium	7	53.85
Large	3	23.08
Very Large	1	7.69
Total	13	100.00

The findings show that Principals lead the majority of schools in the district, accounting for 84.62% of leadership roles, highlighting the district's preference for formally appointed school heads with full administrative and instructional authority. This suggests that most schools benefit from structured leadership, where Principals manage both supervision and decision-making. In contrast, Officers-in-Charge and Head Teachers each represent only 7.69%, indicating limited use of transitional or mid-level leadership roles. While the dominance of Principals ensures continuity and accountability, the lack of diverse leadership structures may pose challenges during leadership transitions or in schools needing additional support. Schools led by OICs or Head Teachers may require targeted leadership development to strengthen their instructional oversight. These findings are consistent with the National Center for Education Statistics (2023) and Dellomas and Deri (2022), who emphasized that Principals are important in implementing effective school programs and outperform other designations in terms of instructional leadership and administrative capacity.

Table 3. Profile of the School in terms of Designation of School Heads

Designation of School Heads	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Principal	11	84.62
Officer-In-Charged	1	7.69
Head Teacher	1	7.69
Total	13	100.00

The findings reveal that 53.85% of school heads in the district have only 1–5 years of service, indicating that a majority are relatively new in their roles. This trend may reflect a high turnover rate or a preference for appointing newer leaders, which can bring fresh perspectives but may also require additional training to enhance leadership effectiveness. Meanwhile, school heads with 6–10 years of experience provide a balance between adaptability and practical knowledge, contributing to moderate leadership stability. In contrast, only one school head (7.69%) has served for 11–15 years, suggesting low long-term leadership retention, which could limit mentorship and the transfer of institutional knowledge. These results imply that while newer school heads introduce innovation, experienced leaders offer continuity, stronger support systems, and deeper understanding of school dynamics. However, extended tenures may also pose challenges in embracing change.

These findings align with Grand Canyon University (2023) and Rahmat (2022), who highlight the influence of leadership tenure on school improvement, decision-making, and the need for targeted development among novice administrators.

Table 4. The Profile of the School in Number of Years in Service of the School Heads

Number of years of service	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1-5 year	7	53.85
6-10 years	5	38.46
11-15 years	1	7.69
Total	13	100.00

3.2. Instructional Leadership Behavior of the School Heads in Private and Public Educational Institutions

Table 5 presents leadership behavior in the domain of School-based Review, Contextualization, and Implementation of Learning Standards. The highest-rated behavior was “Engage in collaborative efforts with educators to refine and apply learning standards,” with a weighted mean of 3.68, reflecting a strong emphasis on collaboration in curriculum development. This indicates that school heads value working closely with teachers to ensure curricular relevance and instructional alignment—an approach that fosters shared responsibility, improves teaching practices, and supports continuous school improvement. These findings are consistent with Montillano and Yango (2024), who underscore the role of collaborative leadership in enhancing instructional quality through localized curriculum contextualization. Conversely, the lowest-rated behavior was “Recognize and reward teachers who excel in implementing learning standards,” with a mean of 3.17, suggesting limited prioritization of teacher recognition. This could impact teacher motivation and long-term engagement in curriculum initiatives. As Nataño (2023) emphasized, recognizing teacher contributions is critical to sustaining reform efforts, and leadership-driven motivation remains essential for reinforcing commitment to instructional excellence.

Table 5. Instructional Leadership Behavior of the School Head in Private and Public Education Institutions along School-based Review, Contextualization, and Implementation of Learning Standards

The school head...	Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1.	promote exemplary practices in the review, contextualization, and implementation of learning standards to support teacher effectiveness.	3.63	VMA
2.	encourage the adoption of best practices for reviewing and implementing learning standards to make the curriculum relevant for students.	3.22	MA
3.	facilitate the sharing of successful strategies for contextualizing learning standards among teachers to enhance curriculum relevance.	3.51	VMA
4.	support teachers in applying exemplary practices in the review and adaptation of learning standards for improved student engagement.	3.63	VMA
5.	develop systems for teachers to share their experiences in contextualizing learning standards, ensuring curriculum alignment with student needs.	3.57	VMA
6.	recognize and reward teachers who excel in implementing learning standards that make the curriculum relevant for diverse learners.	3.17	MA
7.	organize professional development sessions focused on best practices for reviewing and contextualizing learning standards.	3.61	VMA
8.	incorporate exemplary methods in the curriculum design process to ensure learning standards meet the needs of all learners.	3.60	VMA
9.	monitor and assess the effectiveness of learning standards implementation to identify and share exemplary practices.	3.64	VMA
10.	engage in collaborative efforts with educators to refine and apply learning standards, making the curriculum more relevant and effective.	3.68	VMA
Overall Weighted Mean		3.53	VMA

Rating Scale:	Descriptive Interpretation:
3.26 – 4.00	Very Much Agree (VMA)
2.51 – 3.25	Much Agree (MA)
1.76 – 2.50	Agree (A)
1.00 – 1.75	Disagree (D)

In pedagogical domains, Table 6 in the findings reveals that the highest-rated instructional leadership behavior was “Sharing best practices in providing technical support to enhance teachers’ instructional methods,” with a weighted mean of 3.64, reflecting a strong emphasis on collaboration and professional growth. This indicates that school heads actively promote knowledge-sharing to improve instructional quality and support teacher development. By facilitating the exchange of best practices, school leaders help build a culture of continuous learning and instructional improvement. These findings are consistent with Leithwood et al. (2020), who emphasized that effective school leadership fosters teaching excellence through structured collaboration and trust-building. On the other hand, “Ensuring continuous technical support for teachers” received the lowest rating, with a weighted mean of 3.21, suggesting that sustained assistance beyond initial training is less emphasized. While knowledge-sharing is present, the limited availability of ongoing support may hinder teachers from effectively applying and maintaining new strategies. Without structured technical guidance, teachers may struggle with consistency in instructional implementation. Bümen and Holmqvist (2022) support this observation, stating that continuous technical support is essential for empowering teachers to adapt to curricular demands and maintain instructional quality over time.

Table 6. Instructional Leadership Behavior of the School Heads in Private and Public Education Institutions in the Teaching Standards and Pedagogies

The school head...	Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1.	offer technical assistance to help teachers develop exemplary practices aligned with teaching standards and pedagogies.	3.58	VMA
2.	share best practices in providing technical support that enhances teachers' instructional methods across various learning areas.	3.64	VMA
3.	facilitate professional development sessions focused on exemplary practices consistent with established teaching standards.	3.61	VMA
4.	provide teachers with resources and tools that exemplify best practices in teaching and learning across different subjects.	3.22	MA
5.	guide teachers in implementing pedagogies that align with best practices and enhance student learning outcomes.	3.23	MA
6.	promote collaboration among teachers to share and adopt best practices in instructional methods and pedagogical approaches.	3.59	VMA
7.	ensure continuous technical support for teachers to maintain and improve their instructional practices in line with teaching standards.	3.21	MA
8.	develop mentoring programs that pair experienced educators with new teachers to promote the development of exemplary teaching practices.	3.57	VMA
9.	implement feedback mechanisms that provide teachers with constructive insights to refine their practices according to teaching standards and pedagogical advancements.	3.56	VMA
10.	encourage teachers to engage in reflective practices and continuous learning to stay updated with best practices and innovative teaching methods.	3.59	VMA
Overall Weighted Mean		3.48	VMA

Rating Scale:	Descriptive Interpretation:
3.26 – 4.00	Very Much Agree (VMA)
2.51 – 3.25	Much Agree (MA)
1.76 – 2.50	Agree (A)
1.00 – 1.75	Disagree (D)

Along teacher performance feedback domain, the findings indicate that the highest-rated instructional leadership behavior was “Providing training for teachers on interpreting and using feedback from various sources,” with a weighted mean of 3.65, showing that school heads prioritize equipping educators with the skills to effectively analyze and apply stakeholder feedback. This highlights a commitment to fostering continuous improvement and data-informed teaching practices. Structured training helps teachers adjust their methods based on input from students, parents, and peers, leading to enhanced instructional quality. These findings support Weber (2021), who emphasized that effective feedback improves instruction when paired with proper training and motivation strategies. Conversely, the lowest-rated behavior was “Recognizing and rewarding teachers who effectively use stakeholder feedback,” with a weighted mean of 3.23, suggesting that while training is emphasized, formal recognition is lacking. This gap may reduce teacher motivation and limit the impact of feedback-driven improvements. Recognition reinforces teacher commitment by validating their efforts and encouraging reflective practice. Ndubuisi et al. (2021) support this view, noting that underutilized feedback systems often stem from limited engagement and the absence of consistent acknowledgment, highlighting the need for balanced leadership strategies that integrate both skill-building and recognition.

Table 7. Instructional Leadership Behavior of the School Heads in Private and Public Educational Institutions in the Teacher Performance Feedback

The school head...	Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1.	utilize validated feedback from learners to guide teachers in enhancing their instructional strategies.	3.60	VMA
2.	incorporate feedback from parents into professional development plans to support teachers' growth and performance improvement.	3.61	VMA
3.	implement systems for gathering and analyzing stakeholder feedback to provide teachers with actionable insights.	3.57	VMA
4.	facilitate regular feedback sessions where teachers can review and discuss input from students, parents, and other stakeholders.	3.24	VMA
5.	develop structured approaches to integrate stakeholder feedback into teachers' performance evaluations and improvement plans.	3.54	VMA
6.	promote a culture of continuous improvement by encouraging teachers to seek and respond to feedback from the school community.	3.59	VMA
7.	provide training for teachers on interpreting and using feedback from various sources to refine their teaching practices.	3.65	VMA
8.	create feedback loops that ensure timely and relevant feedback from stakeholders is communicated to teachers for immediate application.	3.62	VMA
9.	recognize and reward teachers who effectively use stakeholder feedback to make significant improvements in their teaching performance.	3.23	VMA
10.	support teachers in setting goals and action plans based on validated feedback from learners, parents, and other stakeholders to drive their professional growth.	3.61	VMA
Overall Weighted Mean		3.53	VMA
Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation: 3.26 – 4.00 Very Much Agree (VMA) 2.51 – 3.25 Much Agree (MA) 1.76 – 2.50 Agree (A) 1.00 – 1.75 Disagree (D)			

In Table 8, along learner achievement and other performance indicators, the findings show that the highest-rated instructional leadership behavior was “Facilitating collaborative sessions where school heads can discuss challenges and solutions related to learner achievement and accountability,” with a weighted mean of 3.67. This indicates that school heads prioritize collective problem-solving and peer learning to enhance student outcomes and promote accountability. Collaborative leadership fosters the sharing of best practices and the development of strategies that strengthen instructional performance. These results are supported by Leithwood et al. (2020), who emphasized that collaboration and trust among educational leaders improve teaching quality

and student achievement. In contrast, the lowest-rated item was “Mentoring school heads on aligning school improvement plans with district and national performance standards,” with a mean of 3.22, suggesting that structured mentorship programs are less emphasized. While collaboration exists, the lack of mentorship may hinder consistent alignment with broader educational goals. Unlike collaboration, which promotes internal teamwork, mentorship provides targeted guidance on meeting external standards. Without it, school heads may face challenges in aligning school-level initiatives with district or national benchmarks. These findings are consistent with Ngole and Mkulu (2021), who noted that school improvement efforts may fall short without clear mentorship that ensures coherence with overarching educational policies.

Table 8. Instructional Leadership Behavior of the School Heads in Private and Public Education Institutions along Learner Achievement and Other Performance Indicators

The school head...	Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1.	guide fellow school heads in developing strategies to sustain high levels of learner achievement.	3.58	VMA
2.	share best practices and successful initiatives for meeting and exceeding performance indicators with other school leaders.	3.44	VMA
3.	provide mentorship on data analysis techniques to help school heads monitor and improve student performance.	3.55	VMA
4.	facilitate collaborative sessions where school heads can discuss challenges and solutions related to learner achievement and accountability.	3.67	VMA
5.	encourage a culture of continuous improvement among school heads by setting goals and tracking progress in key performance areas.	3.59	VMA
6.	support fellow school heads in creating and implementing action plans that address gaps in learner achievement and performance indicators.	3.34	VMA
7.	offer advice on effective leadership practices that promote accountability and drive school improvement.	3.54	VMA
8.	assist school heads in building networks and partnerships to share resources and strategies for enhancing student outcomes.	3.57	VMA
9.	mentor school heads on aligning school improvement plans with district and national performance standards.	3.22	MA
10.	promote accountability by regularly reviewing and reflecting on performance data with fellow school heads to identify areas for development.	3.57	VMA
Overall Weighted Mean		3.51	VMA
Rating Scale:	Descriptive Interpretation:		
3.26 – 4.00	Very Much Agree (VMA)		
2.51 – 3.25	Much Agree (MA)		
1.76 – 2.50	Agree (A)		
1.00 – 1.75	Disagree (D)		

In Table 9 about the learner assessment domain, the findings indicate that the highest-rated instructional leadership behavior was “Encouraging the use of assessment results to set actionable goals and accountability measures for continuous school improvement,” with a weighted mean of 3.71, highlighting the strong emphasis school heads place on data-driven decision-making. This reflects a commitment to using assessment outcomes to refine instructional strategies and address learning gaps. By promoting accountability through assessment, school heads foster a responsive learning environment aligned with student needs. These findings are consistent with Kilag et al. (2020), who emphasized that effective school leadership guides assessment practices to inform teaching and curriculum adjustments. In contrast, the lowest-rated item was “Facilitating training sessions for teachers on interpreting and utilizing assessment data,” with a mean of 3.20, indicating that while assessment use is encouraged, structured teacher support in analyzing data remains limited. This suggests a gap between promoting assessment and equipping teachers with the tools to apply it effectively. Gamala and Marpa (2022) support the importance of structured training in improving assessment practices, while this study further highlights the lack of technological integration as a limiting factor. Without sufficient

training and access to digital tools, teachers may struggle to interpret assessment data effectively and implement timely instructional changes, reducing the impact of assessments on student learning.

Table 9. Instructional Leadership Behavior of the School Heads in Private and Public Education Institutions along Learner Assessment

The school head...	Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1.	develop and implement innovative assessment tools that align with curriculum requirements to enhance learning outcomes.	3.64	VMA
2.	lead workshops on the effective use of diverse assessment strategies to improve student performance and accountability.	3.63	VMA
3.	promote the integration of technology in learning assessments to provide real-time feedback and track student progress.	3.44	VMA
4.	facilitate training sessions for teachers on interpreting and utilizing assessment data to inform instruction and improve learning outcomes.	3.20	MA
5.	introduce best practices for formative and summative assessments that drive curriculum-aligned teaching and learning.	3.47	VMA
6.	guide the development of assessment frameworks that support differentiated instruction and address diverse student needs.	3.69	VMA
7.	advocate for the use of comprehensive assessment results to refine curriculum and teaching methodologies for better student achievement.	3.65	VMA
8.	support the creation of collaborative assessment design teams to ensure assessments are meaningful, fair, and aligned with learning goals.	3.38	VMA
9.	monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of assessment tools and strategies, making necessary adjustments to achieve higher learning outcomes.	3.64	VMA
10.	encourage the use of assessment results to set actionable goals and accountability measures for continuous school improvement.	3.71	VMA
Overall Weighted Mean		3.55	VMA
Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation: 3.26 – 4.00 Very Much Agree (VMA) 2.51 – 3.25 Much Agree (MA) 1.76 – 2.50 Agree (A) 1.00 – 1.75 Disagree (D)			

From Table 10, the instructional leadership of school heads in the Learner Environment domain reveals that the highest-rated behavior was “Engaging parents and community members in initiatives that support a learner-friendly and inclusive school environment,” with a weighted mean of 3.71. This indicates a strong emphasis on external collaboration to promote inclusivity within schools. The data suggest that school heads are proactive in involving families and community stakeholders in shaping supportive and welcoming environments for learners. These efforts help foster a sense of belonging and improve student engagement, aligning with Chakma (2022), who asserts that inclusive school policies and active community involvement significantly contribute to student well-being and academic success.

In contrast, the lowest-rated behavior was “Providing training for teachers on inclusive teaching practices,” which received a weighted mean of 3.24. This finding implies that while institutional support for inclusivity is evident, direct capacity-building for teachers is relatively insufficient. The data highlight a critical gap between policy-level advocacy for inclusivity and the practical implementation of inclusive strategies in classrooms. Teachers who are not adequately trained may face difficulties addressing the needs of diverse learners, which could hinder the realization of inclusive education goals. Unlike broad school policies, effective teacher training plays a direct and essential role in influencing day-to-day classroom interactions and outcomes.

Moreover, Toth (2020) reinforces this concern by pointing out that many school leaders struggle to provide adequate training and support for teachers in inclusive education. He stresses that sustainable inclusivity depends not only on leadership directives but also on continuous professional development and teacher readiness. Ultimately, achieving a truly inclusive learner environment requires both strong institutional

leadership and consistent investment in teacher competencies, coupled with active student participation and community collaboration.

Table 10. Instructional Leadership Behavior of the School Heads in Private and Public Education Institutions along Learner Environment

The school head...	Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1.	engage parents and community members in initiatives that support a learner-friendly and inclusive school environment.	3.71	VMA
2.	facilitate workshops for staff and community members on creating and maintaining a healthy learning atmosphere for all students.	3.56	VMA
3.	develop partnerships with local organizations to provide resources and programs that enhance student well-being and inclusivity.	3.60	VMA
4.	encourage student-led projects that promote inclusivity, respect, and a positive school culture.	3.37	VMA
5.	organize community events that celebrate diversity and promote a sense of belonging among students and families.	3.55	VMA
6.	implement school-wide health and wellness programs that involve students, staff, and the wider community.	3.61	VMA
7.	provide training for teachers on inclusive teaching practices and strategies to support diverse learners.	3.24	MA
8.	create communication channels for parents and community members to share ideas and feedback on improving the school environment.	3.61	VMA
9.	lead initiatives to enhance the physical school environment, ensuring it is safe, welcoming, and conducive to learning.	3.66	VMA
10.	advocate for policies and practices that support mental health, inclusivity, and the overall well-being of all students.	3.67	VMA
Overall Weighted Mean		3.56	VMA
Rating Scale:			
Descriptive Interpretation:			
3.26 – 4.00	Very Much Agree (VMA)		
2.51 – 3.25	Much Agree (MA)		
1.76 – 2.50	Agree (A)		
1.00 – 1.75	Disagree (D)		

Table 11 presents data on the Career Awareness and Opportunities domain as it relates to the instructional leadership behavior of school heads. The highest-rated behavior was “Encouraging student participation in extracurricular activities that build skills relevant to their future careers,” which earned a weighted mean of 3.67. This reflects a strong emphasis on promoting student engagement in activities that foster both personal and professional development. It suggests that school heads actively recognize the role of extracurricular programs in preparing students for future career demands by cultivating critical soft skills such as communication, collaboration, and problem-solving. These findings align with the work of Pambudi and Harjanto (2020), who stress the importance of embedding career-oriented activities into school programming as a strategic approach to enhance students’ employability and life preparedness.

In contrast, the lowest-rated behavior within this domain was “Facilitating mentorship programs where professionals guide students in their career development,” which received a mean score of 3.19. This indicates that while general support for career development exists, there is limited emphasis on providing students with structured mentorship opportunities. The lack of direct engagement with industry professionals may hinder students’ exposure to real-world experiences and career pathways. Without guided mentorship, students may struggle to make informed decisions regarding their future careers, potentially missing out on valuable insights that could shape their goals and aspirations. This gap underscores the difference between generalized career support and personalized career development facilitated through one-on-one or group mentorship models.

Supporting these observations, Himmetoglu et al. (2020) emphasize the critical role of structured mentorship in equipping students with the knowledge, motivation, and confidence necessary to navigate complex career landscapes. According to their findings, mentorship programs not only bridge the gap between school and the workplace but also contribute to more informed and confident career choices. Therefore, while

school heads demonstrate commendable efforts in promoting career awareness through extracurricular engagement, there remains a need to expand mentorship opportunities to further enrich students' career readiness and practical understanding of their future professional environments.

Table 11. Instructional Leadership Behavior of the School Heads in Private and Public Education Institutions in the Career Awareness and Opportunities

Indicators		Weighted Mean	Interpretation
The school head...			
1.	develop a comprehensive career awareness program integrated into the school curriculum.	3.66	VMA
2.	collaborate with local businesses and organizations to provide students with real-world career experiences and internships.	3.63	VMA
3.	organize career fairs and workshops that expose students to various career paths and opportunities.	3.20	MA
4.	incorporate career exploration activities into classroom lessons across different subjects.	3.65	VMA
5.	facilitate mentorship programs where professionals guide students in their career development.	3.19	MA
6.	implement project-based learning that connects academic content with real-world career applications.	3.60	VMA
7.	provide professional development for teachers on how to integrate career awareness into their teaching practices.	3.38	VMA
8.	establish partnerships with higher education institutions to offer dual enrollment and career-focused courses.	3.59	VMA
9.	create a career resource center that offers students access to information on various professions and career planning tools.	3.61	VMA
10.	encourage student participation in extracurricular activities that build skills relevant to their future careers.	3.67	VMA
Overall Weighted Mean		3.52	VMA
Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:			
3.26 – 4.00 Very Much Agree (VMA)			
2.51 – 3.25 Much Agree (MA)			
1.76 – 2.50 Agree (A)			
1.00 – 1.75 Disagree (D)			

In the Learner Discipline domain, findings reveal that the highest-rated instructional leadership behavior was “Promoting restorative practices as a key component of the school’s discipline approach to foster a positive school climate,” with a weighted mean of 3.77. This indicates that school heads place a strong emphasis on rehabilitative, relationship-centered discipline strategies rather than punitive measures. Such an approach highlights a commitment to fostering accountability, conflict resolution, and personal growth among students. By encouraging mutual respect and involving various stakeholders in developing consistent and fair discipline policies, school leaders contribute to a more inclusive and supportive school culture. These results are consistent with Grauer (2022), who emphasized that fostering strong student-educator relationships and engaging in collaborative discipline processes improve student accountability and enhance the overall effectiveness of school policies.

Conversely, the lowest-rated indicator was “Leading initiatives to integrate social-emotional learning into discipline policies,” with a weighted mean of 3.23. This suggests that while restorative practices are being implemented, there is limited emphasis on explicitly incorporating emotional intelligence and self-regulation skills into disciplinary frameworks. The underdevelopment of this component may hinder the holistic development of students, as discipline policies that lack a social-emotional foundation may not fully address the root causes of behavioral issues. Sichon and Guhao Jr. (2020) underscore the significance of integrating social-emotional learning into discipline systems, asserting that such integration not only enhances empathy and emotional awareness among students but also contributes to a more responsive and compassionate learning environment. This finding points to a need for school leaders to more actively bridge the gap between behavioral expectations and emotional development.

Table 12. Instructional Leadership Behavior of the School Heads in Private and Public Education Institutions in the Learner Discipline

The school head...	Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1.	collaborate with teachers, parents, and students to create comprehensive learner discipline policies that promote student growth.	3.70	VMA
2.	facilitate regular meetings with stakeholders to review and update discipline policies, ensuring they align with school improvement goals.	3.67	VMA
3.	provide training for staff on the implementation of effective and equitable discipline strategies.	3.62	VMA
4.	establish clear communication channels to ensure all stakeholders understand the discipline policies and their roles in enforcing them.	3.66	VMA
5.	promote restorative practices as a key component of the school's discipline approach to promote a positive school climate.	3.77	VMA
6.	monitor and evaluate the impact of discipline policies on student behavior and academic performance, making adjustments as needed.	3.63	VMA
7.	engage the wider school community in discussions about the importance of consistent and fair discipline practices.	3.25	MA
8.	lead initiatives to integrate social-emotional learning into discipline policies to support holistic student development.	3.23	MA
9.	advocate for resources and support services to help students with behavioral challenges succeed in the school environment.	3.66	VMA
10.	recognize and reward positive student behavior as part of a balanced approach to discipline that encourages personal responsibility and growth.	3.64	VMA
Overall Weighted Mean		3.58	VMA
Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:			
3.26 – 4.00	Very Much Agree (VMA)		
2.51 – 3.25	Much Agree (MA)		
1.76 – 2.50	Agree (A)		
1.00 – 1.75	Disagree (D)		

3.3. Significant Difference Between the Instructional Leadership Behavior of the School Heads in Private and Public Institutions

The univariate ANOVA results reveal significant differences between public and private school heads across all eight domains of instructional leadership behavior. The most pronounced disparities were found in the School-Based Review, Teaching Standards and Pedagogies, and Learning Environment domains. These findings suggest that private school heads typically have more autonomy and flexibility in curriculum implementation, pedagogical support, and instructional innovation, while public school heads often work within more standardized and regulated frameworks. Pairwise comparisons further confirm these differences, particularly in the alignment of assessments with curriculum goals. However, smaller gaps in the Learner Discipline and Career Awareness domains indicate that both public and private school leaders share common values in managing student behavior and promoting career readiness, despite differences in institutional contexts.

These results underscore the importance of developing differentiated leadership training programs that address the distinct needs and challenges of each sector. Public school heads may benefit from training that focuses on adaptive leadership and effective resource management within the constraints of standardized policies, while private school leaders could improve their skills in strategic planning and policy alignment. Kilag et al. (2024) support these findings, highlighting that differences in autonomy and administrative structures significantly influence leadership styles. This reinforces the need for context-specific professional development to ensure that instructional leaders can effectively navigate their respective environments and enhance overall educational outcomes.

Table 13. Test for Significant Differences between the Sector Profile and the Leadership Instructional Behavior

Leadership Instructional Behavior	MANOVA				Univariate (ANOVA)			Pairwise Comparison	
	<i>Wilk's Lambda</i>	<i>F (8,256)</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>Partial Eta Squared (η^2)</i>	<i>F (1,263)</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>Partial Eta Squared (η^2)</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>p-value</i>
School-Based Review	0.929	2.428*	.015	.071	14.749*	.000	.053	Private & Public	.000
Teaching Standards and Pedagogies					13.411*	.000	.049	Private & Public	.000
Teacher Performance Feedback					9.23*	.003	.034	Private & Public	.003
Learner Achievement and Other Performance Indicators					8.256*	.004	.030	Private & Public	.004
Learning Assessment					9.883*	.002	.036	Private & Public	.002
Learning Environment					12.156*	.001	.044	Private & Public	.001
Career Awareness and Opportunities					8.515*	.004	.031	Private & Public	.004
Learner Discipline					4.938*	.027	.018	Private & Public	.027

*Significant @.05 level.

In examining the significant differences between school categories and instructional leadership behavior, the univariate ANOVA results indicate noteworthy distinctions in leadership practices across various school sizes. Specifically, differences were observed in domains such as School-Based Review, Learner Achievement and Other Performance Indicators, and Learning Assessment. These areas, which are integral to evaluating student progress and academic outcomes, showed that larger schools tend to have more advanced and structured leadership behaviors. The Post Hoc LSD test further clarified these differences, showing that large schools outperform medium-sized ones in implementing leadership strategies that directly impact student achievement and assessment. Very large schools also exhibited superior leadership practices, particularly in aligning instructional goals with performance indicators and assessment methods. These disparities suggest that larger schools benefit from more robust leadership systems, which enable them to handle the complexities of curriculum management, student achievement tracking, and standardized assessments.

However, the analysis revealed no significant differences between school sizes in the Teacher Performance Feedback and Learner Discipline domains. This consistency across school sizes suggests that, despite variations in school scale, leadership practices related to providing feedback to teachers and managing student behavior remain largely uniform. School heads in both large and medium-sized schools appear to prioritize similar strategies in these areas, likely because effective teacher feedback and discipline management are essential to all educational environments, regardless of size. These consistent practices imply that the foundational elements of instructional leadership, such as fostering teacher development and maintaining positive behavior, are integral to the leadership approach, irrespective of the institution's scale. As a result, the uniformity in these two domains suggests that leadership training programs could be universally applied in these areas without needing major adjustments based on school size.

The findings also imply that while larger schools may benefit from more structured leadership systems due to their inherent complexity, medium-sized schools face unique challenges that need specialized attention. Medium schools, being more flexible in their structure, often lack the extensive resources available to larger institutions. This resource constraint can make it difficult to implement the same level of leadership practices seen in larger schools, particularly in domains that require significant investments, such as learner achievement tracking and learning assessments. Moreover, while discipline practices are universally applied, the gaps in achievement and assessment highlight the need for tailored instructional strategies that are responsive to the specific needs of medium-sized schools. School heads in both medium and very large schools could benefit from professional development programs that focus on addressing the distinct challenges of their respective school sizes. Pierce and Claybourn (2023) support these conclusions, suggesting that leadership structures should be adapted to the specific needs of a school's size. Their research emphasizes that instructional leadership is more effective in larger schools due to the availability of better resources, making it clear that professional development programs should be designed with these contextual factors in mind to maximize their effectiveness across different school settings.

Table 14. Test for Significant Difference between the School Category and the Leadership Instructional Behavior

Leadership Instructional Behavior	MANOVA				Univariate (ANOVA)			Post Hoc (LSD)		
	<i>Wilk's Lambda</i>	<i>F (8,256)</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>Partial Eta Squared (η^2)</i>	<i>F (2,263)</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>Partial Eta Squared (η^2)</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>p-value</i>
School-Based Review	0.662	7.139*	.000	.184	5.504*	.005	.040	Large & Medium	-.3067*	.000
								Large & Very Large	.1923*	.023
								Large & Medium	-.2106*	.019
Teaching Standards and Pedagogies					2.361	.096	.018	Medium & Very Large	.1854*	.009
Teacher Performance Feedback					.296	.744	.002			
Learner Achievement and Other Performance Indicators					8.32*	.000	.058	Medium & Very Large	.3570*	.000
Learning Assessment					6.123*	.003	.044	Large & Medium	-.3194*	.000
								Large and Very Large	-.2883*	.002
Learning Environment					2.051	.131	.015	Large & Medium	-.1920*	.025
								Very Large & medium	.1589*	.018
Career Awareness and Opportunities					2.046	.131	.015	Large & Medium	.2119*	.017
Learner Discipline					.694	.500	.005			

*Significant @.05 level.

In the next table, the univariate ANOVA results reveal significant differences in instructional leadership behaviors based on the designation of school heads, particularly in School-Based Review, Teaching Standards and Pedagogies, Teacher Performance Feedback, Learning Assessment, Learning Environment, and Career Awareness and Opportunities. The Post Hoc LSD test shows that Head Teachers and Officers-in-Charge differ notably in several domains, with Officers-in-Charge showing lower scores, especially in instructional supervision and school climate. Additionally, Principals demonstrated stronger leadership in providing structured performance feedback compared to Head Teachers. These findings suggest that Principals, with formal appointments and broader authority, tend to implement more consistent instructional leadership practices than those in temporary or mid-level roles. The lack of significant differences in Learner Achievement and Performance Indicators implies that school heads across all designations exert similar efforts in influencing student outcomes. However, the disparities in other domains highlight the challenges faced by HTs and OICs, particularly due to limited training, authority, or resources. These results imply the need for targeted training and mentorship programs tailored to HTs and OICs to strengthen their instructional leadership capacities. Structured interventions, supported by policy alignment and experienced mentorship, can help bridge the gap and prepare them for more advanced leadership roles. This is supported by Ngole and Mkulu (2021), who emphasized that school leadership effectiveness improves significantly when administrators, especially those in acting or informal roles, receive structured, role-specific guidance and support.

Table 15. Test for Significant Difference between the Designation of the School Heads and the Leadership Instructional Behavior

Leadership Instructional Behavior	MANOVA			Univariate (ANOVA)			Post Hoc (LSD)		
	<i>Wilk's Lambda</i>	<i>F (16,512)</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>Partial Eta Squared (η^2)</i>	<i>F (2,263)</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>Partial Eta Squared (η^2)</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i> <i>p-value</i>
School-Based Review	0.860	2.499*	.001	.070	6.357*	.002	.046	HT & OIC	-.460* .023
Teaching Standards and Pedagogies					7.723*	.001	.055	HT & OIC	-.548* .021
Teacher Performance Feedback					7.875*	.000	.057	HT & OIC HT & Principal	-.542* -.1587* .023 .047
Learner Achievement and Other Performance Indicators					1.699	.185	.013		
Learning Assessment					5.948*	.003	.043	HT & OIC	-.4800* .032
Learning Environment					7.815*	.001	.056	HT & OIC	-.5220* .021
Career Awareness and Opportunities					5.988*	.003	.044	HT & OIC	-.5000* .033
Learner Discipline					5.114*	.007	.037		

*Significant @.05 level.

In Table 16, the univariate ANOVA results reveal significant differences in instructional leadership behaviors based on years of service, with all domains exhibiting highly significant p-values and moderate to strong effect sizes. The greatest contrasts occur between school heads with 1–5 years versus 6–10 years of experience, especially in Teaching Standards and Pedagogies, Teacher Performance Feedback, and Learning Environment. This suggests that more experienced leaders demonstrate stronger guidance in instruction,

assessment use, and climate management. Improvements with tenure also appear in Learning Assessment and Career Awareness, indicating veteran heads are better at aligning instruction with career readiness and refining student monitoring.

These findings imply that leadership effectiveness grows with experience, highlighting the importance of structured training and mentoring for novice administrators. Early-career heads would benefit from targeted development in instructional supervision, assessment strategies, and discipline practices. Formal mentoring by seasoned leaders can bridge the experience gap and promote consistent leadership across schools. Apsorn et al. (2019) note that new administrators often falter without practical guidance, whereas experienced leaders leverage institutional knowledge and exposure to apply strategies more effectively.

Table 16. Test for Significant Difference between the Number of Years in Service and the Leadership Instructional Behavior

Leadership Instructional Behavior	MANOVA				Univariate (ANOVA)			Pairwise Comparison	
	<i>Wilk's Lambda</i>	<i>F</i> (16,512)	<i>p-value</i>	<i>Partial Eta Squared</i> (η^2)	<i>F</i> (1,263)	<i>p-value</i>	<i>Partial Eta Squared</i> (η^2)	<i>Group</i>	<i>p-value</i>
	.698	13.824*	.000	.302				1-5 years & 6-10 years	
School-Based Review					66.479*	.000	.202	1-5 years & 6-10 years	.000
Teaching Standards and Pedagogies					75.061*	.000	.222	1-5 years & 6-10 years	.000
Teacher Performance Feedback					69.427*	.000	.209	1-5 years & 6-10 years	.000
Learner Achievement and Other Performance Indicators					30.061*	.000	.103	1-5 years & 6-10 years	.000
Learning Assessment					56.221*	.000	.176	1-5 years & 6-10 years	.000
Learning Environment					69.243*	.000	.208	1-5 years & 6-10 years	.000
Career Awareness and Opportunities					49.048*	.000	.157	1-5 years & 6-10 years	.000
Learner Discipline					40.416	.000	.133	1-5 years & 6-10 years	.000

*Significant @.05 level.

Along the challenges encountered in instructional leadership behavior of school heads in public and private institutions in Table 17, the findings show that the most significant challenge identified by school heads was “Adapting to technological advancements,” with the highest weighted mean of 3.69, indicating that integrating digital tools into instructional and administrative practices remains a pressing concern. This suggests that school leaders face difficulties in keeping pace with evolving technology, likely due to limited training, resistance to change, or inadequate infrastructure. Balancing innovation with established practices also poses a leadership challenge. These results are supported by Carino and Antonio (2020), who found that technological integration is a common struggle for school heads, often due to a lack of time and professional development opportunities. In contrast, “Establishing communication channels” received the lowest mean at 3.19, implying that while still important, communication is seen as a less urgent concern. This may reflect the existence of established systems and digital platforms that already support regular interaction among stakeholders. These findings align with Toth (2020), who noted that effective leadership can mitigate administrative burdens through distributed leadership and strategic collaborations, emphasizing that while technology demands attention, communication and funding may already be sufficiently managed through shared responsibilities and partnerships.

Table 17. Challenges Encountered in Instructional Leadership Behavior of School Heads in Public and Private Institutions

The school head...	Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1.	balancing administrative tasks with instructional leadership responsibilities.	3.54	AE
2.	meeting the diverse needs of teachers and students.	3.57	AE
3.	implementing changes in educational policies and curriculum requirements.	3.55	AE
4.	directing budget constraints and financial limitations affecting educational resources.	3.44	AE
5.	overseeing staff development and ensuring continuous professional growth.	3.53	AE
6.	addressing the disparity in teacher workload, managing burnout, and ensuring mental health and well-being.	3.21	SE
7.	establishing effective communication channels and resolving conflicts within the school community.	3.19	AE
8.	adapting to technological advancements in teaching practices and managing the transition to remote or hybrid learning models.	3.69	AE
9.	encouraging innovative teaching methodologies and personalized learning experiences.	3.59	AE
10.	promoting a positive school culture, maintaining morale, and supporting holistic development.	3.58	AE
11.	Adhering to compliance and regulatory standards.	3.56	AE
12.	encouraging inclusive and diverse educational practices.	3.61	AE
13.	implementing effective assessment strategies and adapting instructional strategies for diverse learning styles.	3.53	AE
14.	promoting parental involvement and engagement.	3.58	AE
15.	providing resources and support for special education programs and dealing with socio-economic challenges affecting student learning.	3.23	SE
Overall Weighted Mean		3.49	AE
Rating Scale:	Descriptive Interpretation:		
3.26 – 4.00	Always Encountered (AE)		
2.51 – 3.25	Sometimes Encountered (SE)		
1.76 – 2.50	Less Encountered (LE)		
1.00 – 1.75	Not Encountered at All (NEaA)		

3.4. Developed Intervention Plan to Improve the Instructional Leadership Behavior of the school heads in public and private educational institutions

The development of an intervention plan titled “BUILD: Behavior-Understanding and Instructional Leadership Development” focuses on improving instructional leadership among school heads in public and private institutions by addressing key challenges identified in the study. These include enhancing the

implementation of learning standards, promoting teacher development, improving learning environments, and strengthening student achievement. The study underscores the need for school leaders to adapt to technological advancements, balance instructional and administrative responsibilities, and foster inclusive, innovative, and supportive learning environments. By providing structured training and mentorship, the intervention aims to equip school heads with practical strategies for instructional supervision, curriculum adaptation, and stakeholder collaboration. Related literature emphasizes that a successful intervention must also prioritize digital integration, mental health support, and professional growth to meet the dynamic demands of education today.

The proposed program incorporates focused areas such as embracing technology, promoting equity, encouraging innovative teaching, improving communication, and addressing resource gaps. It supports ongoing professional development and collaboration through leadership workshops, peer mentoring, and strategic partnerships. The plan also calls for resource optimization training and improved community engagement to build inclusive school cultures. Combining these targeted strategies, the intervention seeks to holistically strengthen the instructional leadership behaviors of school heads, ensuring that they are well-prepared to lead both instructionally and administratively. This comprehensive approach aspires to drive sustainable improvements in teaching quality, student performance, and school-wide success across various educational contexts.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

The study concludes that instructional leadership in Sta. Elena District is primarily led by principals from public, medium-sized schools, most of whom have limited experience in the role. While school heads demonstrate strengths in promoting career awareness and maintaining positive learning environments, areas such as Teaching Standards and Pedagogies remain underdeveloped, indicating a need for further instructional support. Leadership behaviors vary significantly with school profile characteristics, though years of experience and sector classification show minimal impact. Key challenges include balancing administrative and instructional duties, adapting to technological changes, and managing financial limitations. The proposed intervention program aims to address these gaps through targeted professional development, mentorship, strategic resource management, and stakeholder collaboration to enhance instructional leadership across diverse school settings.

Based on the findings, it is recommended that district supervisors and school administrators implement focused professional development programs to enhance competencies in instruction, feedback, and discipline. Mentoring systems involving experienced school heads should be established to guide less experienced leaders, particularly in assessment and performance monitoring. Educational leaders should pursue equitable resource allocation through partnerships with public and private stakeholders. Training should be provided to help school heads navigate technological demands and hybrid learning. Strengthening community involvement and parental engagement is also advised to support inclusive school environments. Finally, future research should investigate additional factors influencing instructional leadership, including school culture, policy contexts, and socio-economic conditions, to guide the development of more tailored leadership interventions.

Acknowledgment

The researcher extends her heartfelt gratitude to everyone who provided invaluable support, technical assistance, and encouragement, making the completion of this study possible. She acknowledges Dr. Sonia S. Carbonell, Dean of the Graduate School, for her invaluable advice, administrative guidance, and continuous encouragement.

The researcher expresses profound gratitude and sincere appreciation to all individuals who have significantly contributed to the successful completion of this thesis. Heartfelt thanks are extended to Dr. Corazon S. Fajardo, the Thesis Adviser, for her unwavering dedication, inspirational guidance, and steadfast commitment throughout the development of this study. Her invaluable insights and mentorship deeply shaped the research. Deep appreciation is also given to Dr. Jennifer S. Rubio, the Statistician, for her expert data analysis, ensuring both accuracy and clarity, and for patiently addressing all inquiries related to the research findings.

The researcher is equally grateful to all professors in the Graduate School, whose shared knowledge, dedication, and perseverance served as a constant source of inspiration. Sincere appreciation is given to the members of the thesis panel—Dr. Erlinda J. Porcincula, Dr. Jennifer S. Rubio, and Dr. Daryl I. Quinito—for their patience, understanding, insightful recommendations, and valuable contributions to the refinement of this study. Gratitude is also extended to the Private and Public-School Heads of Sta. Elena District, Camarines Norte, for their generous cooperation and support during the conduct of surveys and interviews. Their willingness to share essential data was crucial to the success of this research. The same gratitude goes to the Private and Public School Teachers of the district, whose participation and cooperation made a significant impact on the research.

Appreciation is also given to Ninang Annie Calvario, Amor Velasquez, and Lanie Sayson for their assistance during every enrollment period. To the researcher's co-teachers at Rizal National School, thank you for your kind support, understanding, and for providing a positive work environment that helped sustain the researcher's progress.

Most of all, the researcher is eternally grateful to his beloved family: Parents Dominic and Librada "Levy," Siblings Ruel+, Rodel, Randel, Efren, Domingo+, and Raquel, Rodelyn, Cherry, and Criselda, nephews Mc Kevin, Ron-Ron, John Carlo, John Wayne, and Troy, nieces Janica, Nicole, Bembem, Denden, and Chloe, and to his loving fiancée, Jane Mirasol Oropesa. Their unconditional love, motivation, prayers, and unwavering belief in the researcher's abilities served as the strongest pillar of support throughout this endeavor.

Lastly, above all, the researcher acknowledges with deep gratitude the Almighty Father for His protection, wisdom, guidance, and endless blessings that accompanied every step of this academic journey.

References

- ABS-CBN News. (2023, August 28). *DepEd: 22.8 million students enroll for SY 2023–2024*. <https://news.abs-cbn.com/news/08/28/23/deped-228-million-students-enroll-for-sy-2023-2024>
- Acosta, A. L. (2021). *School leadership: Managing public school in the Philippines*. <https://www.barnesandnoble.com/w/school-leadership-maem-allan-everiza-acosta/1121216411>
- Allensworth, E. M., & Hart, H. (2018). *How do principals influence student achievement?* University of Chicago Consortium on School Research. <https://consortium.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/2018-10/Leadership%20Snapshot-Mar2018-Consortium.pdf>
- Anub, C. D. (2020). Instructional leadership practices, teachers' satisfaction and school performance indicators. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices*, 2(4), 50–64. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jweep.2020.2.4.6>
- Aureada, J. J. U. (2021). The instructional leadership practices of school heads. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 1(1), 75–89. <https://doi.org/10.53378/346106>
- Bümen, N. T., & Holmqvist, M. (2022). Teachers' sense-making and adapting of the national curriculum: A multiple case study in Turkish and Swedish contexts. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2022.2121178>
- Carino, J., & Antonio, A. (2020). *Transforming Philippine education: Addressing systemic inequalities through leadership and policy innovation*. De La Salle University Publishing House. <https://www.dlsu.edu.ph/research/publishing-house/book-publications/>
- Chakma, D. (2022). *Educational supervision: Nature, characteristics, objectives and function of educational supervision*. <https://onlinenotebank.wordpress.com/2022/12/03/educational-supervision-nature-characteristics-objectives-and-function-of-educational-supervision/>
- Chavez, R. C., & Rubi, R. B. (2021). Leaders' initiatives affecting the level of productivity in educational leadership. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Perspectives*, 8(1). <https://research.lpubatangas.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/APJEAS-2021.8.1.13.pdf>
- Childhope Philippines. (2021). *The current education issues in the Philippines — and how Childhope rises to the challenge*. <https://childhope.org.ph/education-issues-in-the-philippines/>
- Department of Education. (2020). *Policy guidelines on the implementation of learning delivery modalities for the formal education (DepEd*

- Order No. 007, s. 2020). <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2020/07/21/do-007-s-2020-policy-guidelines-on-the-implementation-of-learning-delivery-modalities-for-the-formal-education>
- Department of Education. (2003). *Promulgating the implementing rules and regulations (IRR) of Republic Act No. 9155 (DepEd Order No. 01, s. 2003)*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2003/01/06/do-1-s-2003-promulgating-the-implementing-rules-and-regulations-irr-of-republic-act-no-9155-otherwise-known-as-the-governance-of-basic-education-act-of-2001/>
- Department of Education. (2017). *National adoption and implementation of the Philippine professional standards for teachers (DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017)*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2017/08/11/do-42-s-2017-national-adoption-and-mplementation-of-the-philippine-professional-standards-for-teachers/>
- Gamala, J. J., & Marpa, E. P. (2022). School environment and school heads' managerial skills: Looking into their relationships to school's performance. *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences*, 4(2), 218–235. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijoneses.285>
- Goldring, E., Grissom, J., Neumerski, C. M., Blissett, R., Murphy, J., & Porter, A. (2020). Increasing principals' time on instructional leadership: Exploring the SAM process. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(1), 19–37. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-07-2018-0131>
- Grand Canyon University. (2023). *Becoming a principal: Daily duties and how to become one*. <https://www.gcu.edu/blog/teaching-school-administrators/becoming-principal-daily-duties-how-become-one>
- Grauer, S. R. (2022). *Small versus large schools: The truth about equity, cost, and diversity of programming in small and large schools*. <https://magazine.communityworksinstitute.org/small-versus-large-schools-the-truth-about-equity-cost-and-diversity-of-programming-in-small-and-large-schools/>
- Hallinger, P., Gümüş, S., & Bellibaş, M. Ş. (2020). 'Are principals instructional leaders yet?' A science map of the knowledge base on instructional leadership, 1940–2018. *Scientometrics*, 122(3), 1629–1650. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03360-5>
- Hayes, S. D., & Irby, B. J. (2020). 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>
- Himmetoğlu, B., Ayduğ, D., & Bayrak, C. (2020). Education 4.0: Defining the teacher, the student, and the school manager aspects of the revolution. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 21(Special Issue-IODL), 12–28. <https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.770896>
- Kartini, D., Kristiawan, M., Fitria, H., Negeri, S., & Sugihan, M. (2020). The influence of principal's leadership, academic supervision, and professional competence toward teachers' performance. *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies*, 20(1), 156–164. <http://ijpsat.ijshst-journals.org/>
- Kilag, L., Salvo, M., & Ibarra, D. (2024). Assessing the impact of principal's instructional leadership, school level, and effectiveness in educational institutions. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy*, 22(1), 78–95. <https://doi.org/10.47134/ijsl.v1i5.44>
- Kilag, O. K. T., & Sasan, J. M. (2023). Unpacking the role of instructional leadership in teacher professional development. *Advanced Qualitative Research*, 1(1), 63–73. <https://doi.org/10.31098/aqr.v1i1.1380>
- Kilag, O. K. T., Abendan, C. F. K., Uy, F. T., Calledo, M. F. S., Diano Jr, F. M., & Morales Jr, N. M. (2023). Assessing the impact of principal's instructional leadership, school level, and effectiveness in educational institutions. *Science and Education*, 4(5), 902–917. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/assessing-the-impact-of-principal-s-instructional-leadership-school-level-and-effectiveness-in-educational-institutions>
- Kwan, P. (2020). Is transformational leadership theory passé? Revisiting the integrative effect of instructional leadership and transformational leadership on student outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(2), 321–349. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X19861137>
- Lapuz, M. C. L., & Pecajas, E. S. (2022). School heads' authority, accountability, and empowerment as functions of school performance. *International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences*, 9(3), 69–83. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6701039>
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
- Maldrine, T., & Kiplangat, H. K. (2020). Relationship between supervision and job satisfaction among public secondary school teachers in Nakuru West sub-county, Kenya. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 7(11). <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v7i11.3339>
- Montillano, A. C., & Yango, A. (2024). Create and craft: Understanding the lived experience of education program supervisors in leading the implementation of contextualized learning resources. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 59, 81–90. <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v59i1.11336>
- Motseke, M. (2020). Managing ill-discipline among learners in disadvantaged schools. *Africa Education Review*, 17(3), 22–36. <https://journals.co.za/doi/abs/10.1080/18146627.2019.1588747>
- Nataño, N. M. (2023). Perspectives on curriculum contextualization and localization as integral to promoting indigenous knowledge. *International Journal of Academic and Practical Research*, 2(3), 67–76. <http://actonlineedu.org/ijaapr/>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2023). *Characteristics of public and private school principals*. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cl5>
- Ndubuisi, A. G., Jacob, O. N., & Constance, O. E. U. (2021). Challenges of instructional supervision in Nigerian educational system and the way forward. *Academia Globe: Inderscience Research*, 2(4), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.4314/njeap.v14i1.9>
- Ngole, D. M., & Mkulu, D. G. (2021). The role of school heads' supervision in improving quality of teaching and learning: A case of public secondary school in Ilemela district, Mwanza, Tanzania. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 6(1), 59–73. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels>
- Novosel, L. M. (2023). Understanding the evidence: Population, sample, and sample size. *Urologic Nursing*, 43(3).

- <https://doi.org/10.7257/2168-4626.2023.43.3.142>
- Pambudi, N. A., & Harjanto, B. (2020). Vocational education in Indonesia: History, development, opportunities, and challenges. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 115, 105092. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105092>
- Pierce, E., & Claybourn, C. (2023, August 29). *Private school vs. public school*. U.S. News & World Report. <https://www.usnews.com/education/k12/articles/private-school-vs-public-school>
- Rahmat, B. (2022). Principal challenges in implementing instructional supervision during the transition to new normal. *Jurnal Kepemimpinan dan Pengurusan Sekolah*, 7(3). <https://doi.org/10.34125/kp.v7i3.794>
- Republic Act No. 10533. (2013). *An act enhancing the Philippine basic education system by strengthening its curriculum and increasing the number of years for basic education*. https://legacy.senate.gov.ph/republic_acts/ra%2010533.pdf
- Republic Act No. 9155. (2001). *Implementing rules and regulations of Republic Act No. 9155 (Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001)*. <https://wydrr.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/irr-of-ra-no-9155.pdf>
- Robinson, V., & Gray, E. (2019). What difference does school leadership make to student outcomes? *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 49(2), 171–187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03036758.2019.1582075>
- Sebastian, J. (2019). The role of school leadership in student achievement and teacher development. *Journal of Educational Management*, 17(4), 245–261. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEM-05-2019-0193>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2018.1513151>
- Sichon, D. J. S., & Guhao Jr, E. S. (2020). Implementing an effective student discipline: School heads' perspective. *International Journal for Scientific and Technology Research*, 9(3), 3168–3191. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Implementing-An-Effective-Student-Discipline%3A-Sichon/cb758a508f8f6c86774e027cb46bc593bf4a5af2>
- Siedlecki, S. L. (2020). Understanding descriptive research designs and methods. *Clinical Nurse Specialist*, 34(1), 8–12. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NUR.0000000000000493>
- The Wing Institute at Morningside Academy. (2023). *Does school size affect student performance?* <https://www.winginstitute.org/does-school-size-effect>
- Toth, M. D. (2020). *Strengthening instructional leadership: 6 strategies to promote a culture of continuous improvement, close COVID gaps, and increase principal retention*. <https://www.learningsciences.com/blog/https-www-learningsciences-com-blog-strengthening-instructional-leadership-6-strategies/>
- Villar, R. B., Yazon, A. D., Tan, C. S., Buenvinida, L. P., & Bando, M. M. (2021). School heads' leadership practices in the new normal, administrative disposition, and readiness of the public schools in Laguna. *International Journal of Theory and Application in Elementary and Secondary School Education*, 3(2), 156–170. <https://doi.org/10.31098/ijtaese.v3i2.683>
- Weber, S. (2021). *Schools need an instructional leader*. <https://teachbetter.com/blog/schools-need-an-instructional-leader/>
- Younas, A., & Porr, C. (2023). A step-by-step approach to developing scales for survey research. *Nurse Researcher*, 31(3). <https://doi.org/10.7748/nr.2018.e1585>