

School Heads' Professional Advancement Priorities to the Instructional Quality and Job Satisfaction

Ivy Cagas De Robles

eyebeera@gmail.com

Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES

Abstract

The study investigated the School Heads' Professional Advancement Priorities to the Instructional Quality and Job Satisfaction in the Bay Sub-Office and Los Baños Sub-Office of Laguna. Specifically, this determined the level of Principals' professional advancement priorities regarding leading strategically, managing school operations and resources, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, and building connections; determine the level of teachers' instructional quality concerning content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment, diversity of learners, curriculum and planning, and assessment and reporting; determine the level of teachers' job satisfaction concerning work policies and practices, technical supervision, human relations supervision, ability utilization, and working conditions; determine the significant relationship between the level of Principals' Professional Advancement Priorities to teachers' instructional quality and job satisfaction.

The descriptive-correlational research design and 5-point Likert scale research-made questionnaire were used to assess the data gathered from 200 public elementary teachers in 20 schools from District of Bay and Los Baños, Laguna using Guildford Rule of Thumb to determine the relationship.

Principals' professional advancement priorities were all highly observable regarding the instructional quality of 200 teachers and an observable job satisfaction except a highly observable job satisfaction in ability utilization.

There was a significant relationship between principals' professional advancement priorities, teachers' instructional quality and job satisfaction, thus both hypotheses were rejected.

It was recommended that necessary departments conduct trainings to support continuous advancement of principals and teachers, perform Employee Satisfaction Index, and strengthen the Adopt-A-School program.

Keywords: Professional Advancement; Job Satisfaction; Learning environment

1. Introduction

As the result of a worldwide alarming concerns relating to advancing educational systems and making the education more effective and meaningful, the Department of Education (DepEd) of the Philippines was taking respective actions for the continuous upskilling and reskilling of school heads that will result in better school performance.

To combat the apprehensions for the deterioration of the Philippines' educational system, the Department of Education (DepEd), through the National Educators Academy of the Philippines (NEAP), issued the DepEd Professional Development (PD) Priorities for School Leaders (Department of Education, 2020).

The PD Priorities were standards drawn from the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) that constitute a quality school head. It presented a general term for high-impact leadership anticipated of school heads to guide individual professional reflections, as well as professional discussions among educational leaders and other stakeholders, and to report the establishment of professional learning and development for school heads.

Knowing the duties and responsibilities to be performed as a school head to attain the highest possible school's effectiveness, of course, it will involve teacher. In achieving good quality education, the performance of teachers in carrying out their duties must be taken into consideration as an essential requirement. Performance problems were under the spotlight of various parties; students or parents of students felt the performance of teachers. Problems that one often hears about the low quality of educational outcomes produced by educational institutions reflect the low performance produced by teachers in the process of implementing student education, both in quality and in quantity.

Looking closely to the predefined standards signifying school head's professional advancement priorities and its relationship to the instructional quality and job satisfaction of teachers, with the aim to identify specific domain to prioritize to combat the actual condition of selected public elementary schools in the District of Bay and District of Los Baños, Division of Laguna.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Specifically, the researchers sought to answer the following problems:

1. What is the level of the Professional Advancement Priorities of school heads in terms of:
 - 1.1. Leading Strategically;
 - 1.2. Managing School Operations and Resources;
 - 1.3. Focusing on Teaching and Learning;
 - 1.4. Developing Self and Others; and
 - 1.5. Building Connections?
2. What is the level of the instructional quality in terms of:
 - 2.1. Content Knowledge and Pedagogy;
 - 2.2. Learning Environment;
 - 2.3. Diversity of Learners;
 - 2.4. Curriculum and Planning; and
 - 2.5. Assessment and Reporting?
3. What is the level of teachers' job satisfaction in terms of:
 - 3.1. Work Policies and Practices;
 - 3.2. Technical Supervision;
 - 3.3. Human Relations Supervision;
 - 3.4. Ability Utilization; and
 - 3.5. Working Conditions?
4. Does the level of school heads' priorities on Professional Advancement significantly related to the teachers' instructional quality?
5. Does the level of school heads' priorities on Professional Advancement significantly related to the teachers' job satisfaction?

2. Methodology

The researcher applied the descriptive-correlational research method to assess the relationship between the level of Professional Advancement Priorities of school heads, instructions quality, and job satisfaction of teachers.

This type of research tried to explain the relationship between two or more variables without making any claims about cause and effect. It included collecting and analyzing data on at least two variables to see if there was a link between them (Bhat, 2024).

3. Results and Discussion

This chapter dealt with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data gathered to answer the sub problem relative to the main problem of this study. This part discussed the findings of the study based on the research questions.

Level of Professional Advancement Priorities of School Heads

In this study, the level of the Professional Advancement Priorities of school heads refers to Leading Strategically; Managing School Operations and Resources; Focusing on Teaching and Learning; Developing Self and Others; and Building Connections.

Table 1 *Level of Professional Advancement Priorities of School Heads in terms of Leading Strategically*

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Collaborated with school personnel in communicating the DepEd vision, mission, and core values to a wider school community.	4.64	0.51	Strongly Agree
Engaged stakeholders in improving the implementation of reviewed policies.	4.60	0.53	Strongly Agree
Designed and implemented needs-based programs in the school that support the development of learners.	4.61	0.52	Strongly Agree
Designed and applied effective strategies in utilizing learner voice, such as feelings, views and/ or opinions.	4.56	0.52	Strongly Agree
Designed supplemental monitoring and evaluation tools following standard processes.	4.57	0.53	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean = 4.59 Standard Deviation = 0.52 Verbal Interpretation = Highly observable			

Table 1 showed the level of the Professional Development Priorities of school heads in terms of Leading Strategically. Teachers strongly agreed that their school head collaborates with school personnel in communicating the DepEd vision, mission, and core values to a wider school community ($M=4.64$, $SD=0.51$). They strongly agreed that their school head designs and implements needs-based programs in the school that support the development of learners ($M=4.61$, $SD=0.52$). Additionally, teachers do strongly agree that their principal engages stakeholders in improving the implementation of reviewed policies ($M=4.60$, $SD=0.53$). Next in rank was the statement about their school head designs supplemental monitoring and evaluation tools following standard processes ($M=4.57$, $SD=0.53$). And the statement mentioning the school head who

designed and applied effective strategies in utilizing learner voice, such as feelings, views and/ or opinions ranks the least ($M=4.56$, $SD=0.52$).

The overall mean of 4.59 indicates that school heads professional advancement priority in terms of leading strategically was highly observable. This meant that the school head had commitment to a strategic course of action aligned with institutional goals towards maximizing organizational performance.

Table 2 *Level of Professional Advancement Priorities of School Heads in terms of Managing School Operations and Resources*

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Permitted school personnel in managing school data and information using technology, including ICT.	4.65	0.51	Strongly Agree
Exhibited efficient and effective practices in the management of finances consistently.	4.55	0.58	Strongly Agree
Established shared accountability in managing school facilities and equipment.	4.59	0.54	Strongly Agree
Engaged school personnel in maintaining effective management of staff.	4.57	0.53	Strongly Agree
Permitted school personnel in managing emerging opportunities and challenges to promote equality and equity.	4.60	0.53	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean = 4.59 SD = 0.54 Verbal Interpretation = Highly Observable			

Results showed that school heads permit school personnel to manage school data and information using technology, including ICT ($M=4.65$, $SD=0.51$). This followed the statement wherein school heads permit school personnel in managing emerging opportunities and challenges to promote equality and equity ($M=4.60$, $SD=0.53$). Similarly, the statement wherein school heads with the quality of establishing shared accountability in managing school facilities and equipment ranks third on the list ($M=4.59$, $SD=0.54$). It also showed that the statement about school leaders who engage school personnel in maintaining effective management of staff ($M=4.57$, $SD=0.53$). However, the statement about leaders who exhibit efficient and effective practices in the management of finances consistently ranks the least among the five behaviors ($M=4.55$, $SD=0.58$).

The overall mean of 4.59 indicated that school heads professional advancement priority in terms of managing school operations and resources was highly observable.

Table 3 *Level of Professional Advancement Priorities of School Heads in terms of Focusing on Teaching and Learning*

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Engaged school personnel such as master teachers, head teachers and department heads in providing technical assistance to teachers.	4.77	0.42	Strongly Agree
Collaborated with school personnel in effectively using validated feedback obtained from learners, parents, and other stakeholders to help teachers improve their performance.	4.72	0.47	Strongly Agree
Engaged the wider school community in	4.69	0.50	Strongly

maintaining a learner-friendly, inclusive, and healthy learning environment.			Agree
Undertook initiatives in integrating career awareness and opportunities.	4.65	0.49	Strongly Agree
Ensured that learner discipline policies developed with stakeholders were integrated into various school processes and were applied consistently at all times, by all school personnel at all levels.	4.70	0.47	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean = 4.70 SD = 0.47 Verbal Interpretation = Highly Observable			

Based on the responses gathered, the school heads were observed to carry out the behavior of engaging school personnel such as master teachers, head teachers and department heads in providing technical assistance to teachers ($M=4.77$, $SD=0.42$). Secondly, behavior concerning the school leader who collaborates with school personnel in effectively using validated feedback obtained from learners, parents, and other stakeholders to help teachers ($M=4.72$, $SD=0.47$). Next behavior in the ranking was the school head who ensures that learner discipline policies developed with stakeholders were integrated into various school processes and were always applied consistently, by all school personnel at all levels ($M=4.70$, $SD=0.47$). Then, it was followed by the observed behavior about a school leader engaged the wider school community in maintaining a learner-friendly, inclusive, and healthy learning environment ($M=4.69$, $SD=0.50$). And the statement with the least computed mean was the school head who undertook initiatives in integrating career awareness and opportunities ($M=4.65$, $SD=0.49$).

The overall mean of 4.70 indicated that school heads professional advancement priority in terms of focusing on teaching and learning was highly observable.

Table 4 Level of Professional Advancement Priorities of School Heads in terms of Developing Self and Others

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Reflected on the attainment of personal and professional development goals and objectives based on the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads.	4.50	0.53	Strongly Agree
Initiated professional reflections and promote learning opportunities with other school heads to improve practice.	4.55	0.55	Strongly Agree
Engaged actively in professional networks within and across schools to advance knowledge, skills, and practice.	4.57	0.53	Strongly Agree
Monitored and evaluated the implementation of professional development initiatives in enhancing strengths and in addressing performance gaps among school personnel.	4.56	0.53	Strongly Agree
Worked with school personnel to encourage stakeholders to support the implementation of the school rewards system.	4.56	0.56	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean = 4.55			

SD = 0.54 Verbal Interpretation = Highly Observable
--

Table 4 showed the level of the Professional Advancement Priorities of school heads in terms of Developing Self and Others.

The statement showing the highest computed mean was where a school head engages actively in professional networks within and across schools to advance knowledge, skills, and practice ($M=4.57$, $SD=0.53$). This was followed by the two statements regarding a school leader who monitored and evaluated the implementation of professional development initiatives in enhancing strengths and in addressing performance gaps among school personnel; and works with school personnel to encourage stakeholders to support the implementation of the school rewards system ($M=4.56$, $SD=0.53$). Afterwards, it showed that leaders initiated professional reflections and promoted learning opportunities with other school heads to improve practice ($M=4.55$, $SD=0.55$). Last on the list was that school heads reflect on the attainment of personal and professional development goals and objectives based on the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads. ($M=4.50$, $SD=0.53$).

The overall mean of 4.55 portrays that school heads professional advancement priority in terms of developing self and others was highly observable. This conveys that school heads reflect on their personal and professional development to enhance their practice in leading and developing people as they support their personnel's professional development and welfare.

Table 5 *Level of Professional Advancement Priorities of School Heads in terms of Building Connections*

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Supported school personnel in strengthening relationships with authorities, colleagues, parents, and other stakeholders.	4.59	0.53	Strongly Agree
Evaluated the accomplishment of school organizations, such as learner organizations, faculty clubs and parent-teacher associations.	4.57	0.52	Strongly Agree
Engaged the wider school community in promoting inclusive practices, such as gender sensitivity, physical and mental health awareness, and culture responsiveness.	4.54	0.53	Strongly Agree
Mentored school personnel in communicating effectively in speaking and in writing, as well as in the positive use of communication platforms.	4.54	0.55	Strongly Agree
Empowered the community to participate in addressing concerns on learner development, as well as school and community improvement.	4.52	0.57	Strongly Agree

Weighted Mean = 4.55 SD = 0.54 Verbal Interpretation = Highly Observable
--

The results showed that the most evident behavior of school heads was the one who supports school personnel in strengthening relationships with authorities, colleagues, parents, and other stakeholders ($M=4.59$, $SD=0.53$).

The second most evident is the one who evaluates the accomplishment of school organizations, such as learner organizations, faculty clubs and parent-teacher associations ($M=4.57$, $SD=0.53$). Next on the list were the two behaviors observed with the same mean: engages the wider school community in promoting inclusive practices, such as gender sensitivity, physical and mental health awareness, and culture

responsiveness ($M=4.54$, $SD=0.53$); and mentors school personnel in communicating effectively in speaking and in writing, as well as in the positive use of communication platforms ($M=4.54$, $SD=0.55$). Lastly was the behavior showing school heads who empower the community to participate in addressing concerns on learner development, as well as school and community improvement ($M=4.52$, $SD=0.57$).

The overall mean 4.55 conveyed that school heads professional advancement priority in terms of building connections was highly observable. This showed that the observed school heads were responsible and accountable for inculcating a deeper understanding of the vision, mission and core values, and directions of the school to relevant entities.

Level of Instructional Quality

In this study, the Level of instructional quality referred to Content Knowledge and Pedagogy; Learning Environment; Diversity of Learners; Curriculum and Planning; and Assessment and Reporting.

The level of instructional quality was revealed in the following table, which shows the statement, mean, standard deviation, and verbal interpretation.

Table 6 *Level of Instructional Quality in terms of Content Knowledge and Pedagogy*

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Applied knowledge of content within and across curriculum teaching areas.	4.65	0.50	Strongly Agree
Ensured the positive use of ICT to facilitate the teaching and learning process.	4.58	0.53	Strongly Agree
Used a range of teaching strategies that enhance learner achievement in literacy and numeracy skills.	4.64	0.49	Strongly Agree
Applied a range of teaching strategies to develop critical and creative thinking, as well as other higher-order thinking skills.	4.61	0.52	Strongly Agree
Used effective verbal and non-verbal classroom communication strategies to support learner understanding, participation, engagement, and achievement.	4.62	0.54	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean = 4.62 SD = 0.52 Verbal Interpretation = Highly Observable			

Table 6 showed the level of instructional quality in terms of Content Knowledge and Pedagogy.

The results showed that the most evident instructional quality was the statement stating that the teacher applied knowledge of content within and across curriculum teaching areas ($M=4.65$, $SD=0.50$). Teachers perceived that they used a range of teaching strategies that enhance learner achievement in literacy and numeracy skills ($M=4.64$, $SD=0.49$). They indicated that they used effective verbal and non-verbal classroom communication strategies to support learner understanding, participation, engagement, and achievement ($M=4.62$, $SD=0.54$). Furthermore, teachers applied a range of teaching strategies to develop critical and creative thinking, as well as other higher-order thinking skills ($M=4.61$, $SD=0.52$). Lastly, they also ensured the positive use of ICT to facilitate the teaching and learning process ($M=4.58$, $SD=0.53$).

Overall, the instructional quality in terms of content knowledge and pedagogy was highly observable ($M=4.62$, $SD=0.52$). This implied a positive view of the teachers' ability to apply developmentally appropriate and meaningful pedagogy grounded on content knowledge and current research.

Table 7 *Level of Instructional Quality in terms of Learning Environment*

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Established a safe and secured learning environments to enhance learning through the consistent implementation of policies, guidelines, and procedures.	4.67	0.49	Strongly Agree
Maintained learning environments that promoted fairness, respect, and care to encourage learning.	4.68	0.48	Strongly Agree
Managed classroom structure to engage learners, individually or in groups, in meaningful exploration, discovery and hands-on activities within a range of physical learning environments.	4.64	0.48	Strongly Agree
Maintained supportive learning environments that nurtured and inspired learners to participate, cooperate and collaborate in continued learning.	4.65	0.51	Strongly Agree
Applied a range of successful strategies that maintained learning environments that motivated learners to work productively by assuming responsibility for their own learning.	4.62	0.52	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean = 4.65 SD = 0.50 Verbal Interpretation = Highly Observable			

Table 7 showed the level of instructional quality in terms of Learning Environment.

The results showed that teachers were seen maintaining learning environments that promoted fairness, respect, and care to encourage learning ($M=4.68$, $SD=0.48$). They were also establishing safe and secure learning environments to enhance learning through the consistent implementation of policies, guidelines, and procedures ($M=4.67$, $SD=0.49$). Teachers were maintaining supportive learning environments that nurture and inspire learners to participate, cooperate and collaborate in continued learning ($M=4.65$, $SD=0.51$).

Furthermore, they are managing classroom structure to engage learners, individually or in groups, in meaningful exploration, discovery and hands-on activities within a range of physical learning environments ($M=4.64$, $SD=0.48$). Lastly, teachers were applying a range of successful strategies that maintain learning environments that motivate learners to work productively by assuming responsibility for their own learning ($M=4.62$, $SD=0.52$).

Overall, the instructional quality in terms of learning environment was highly observable ($M=4.65$, $SD=0.50$). It signified the role of teachers to provide learning environments that were safe, secure, fair, and supportive in order to promote learner responsibility and achievement.

Table 8 Level of Instructional Quality in terms of Diversity of Learners

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Used differentiated, developmentally appropriate learning experiences to address learners' gender, needs, strengths, interests, and experiences.	4.57	0.53	Strongly Agree
Established a learner centered culture by using teaching strategies that respond to their linguistic, cultural, socio-economic, and religious backgrounds.	4.56	0.50	Strongly Agree
Designed, adapted, and implemented teaching strategies that	4.57	0.54	Strongly

were responsive to learners with disabilities, giftedness, and talents.			Agree
Planned and delivered teaching strategies that were 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.	4.56	0.55	Strongly Agree
Adapted and used culturally appropriate teaching strategies to address the needs of learners from indigenous groups.	4.54	0.55	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean = 4.56 SD = 0.53 Verbal Interpretation = Highly Observable			

Table 8 showed the level of instructional quality in terms of Diversity of Learners.

The results presented that teachers use differentiated, developmentally appropriate learning experiences to address learners' gender, needs, strengths, interests, and experiences ($M=4.57$, $SD=0.53$). They were designing, adapting, and implementing teaching strategies that were responsive to learners with disabilities, giftedness, and talents ($M=4.57$, $SD=0.54$). Additionally, respondents revealed that they are establishing a learner centered culture by using teaching strategies that respond to their linguistic, cultural, socio-economic, and religious backgrounds ($M=4.56$, $SD=0.50$); and planning and delivering teaching strategies that were 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 ($M=4.56$, $SD=0.55$). Hence, statement wherein teachers were adapting and using culturally appropriate teaching strategies to address the needs of learners from indigenous groups ranks lowest among the others ($M=4.54$, $SD=0.55$).

Overall, the instructional quality in terms of diversity of learners was highly observable ($M=4.56$, $SD=0.53$).

Table 9 Level of Instructional Quality in terms of Curriculum and Planning

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Planned, managed, and implemented developmentally sequenced teaching and learning process to meet curriculum requirements and varied teaching contexts.	4.61	0.50	Strongly Agree
Set achievable and appropriate learning outcomes that were aligned with learning competencies.	4.66	0.49	Strongly Agree
Adapted and implemented learning programs that ensured relevance and responsiveness to the needs of all learners.	4.64	0.52	Strongly Agree
Participated in collegial discussions that used teacher and learner feedback to enrich teaching practice.	4.62	0.51	Strongly Agree
Selected, developed, organized, and used appropriate teaching and learning resources, including ICT, to address learning goals.	4.61	0.52	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean = 4.63 SD = 0.51 Verbal Interpretation = Highly Observable			

The results showed that teachers perform well in setting achievable and appropriate learning

outcomes that were aligned with learning competencies ($M=4.66$, $SD=0.49$). They did perform skillfully as well in adapting and implementing learning programs that ensure relevance and responsiveness to the needs of all learners ($M=4.64$, $SD=0.52$). Moreover, educators were found to be good at participating in collegial discussions that used teacher and learner feedback to enrich teaching practice ($M=4.62$, $SD=0.51$). Additionally, they planned, managed, and implemented developmentally sequenced teaching and learning process to meet curriculum requirements and varied teaching contexts ($M=4.61$, $SD=0.50$). Lastly, they did select, develop, organize, and use appropriate teaching and learning resources, including ICT, to address learning goals ($M=4.61$, $SD=0.52$).

Overall, educators' instructional quality in terms of curriculum and planning presented to be highly observable ($M=4.63$, $SD=0.51$). This confirmed the attainment of the fourth domain stating that teachers apply their professional knowledge to plan and design, individually or in collaboration with colleagues, well-structured and sequenced lessons.

Table 10 *Level of Instructional Quality in terms of Assessment and Reporting*

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Designed, selected, organized, and used diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies consistent with curriculum requirements.	4.72	0.45	Strongly Agree
Monitored and evaluated learner progress and achievement using learner attainment data.	4.68	0.47	Strongly Agree
Used strategies for providing timely, accurate and constructive feedback to improve learner performance.	4.69	0.47	Strongly Agree
Communicated promptly and clearly the learners' needs, progress, and achievement to key stakeholders, including parents/guardians.	4.67	0.48	Strongly Agree
Utilized assessment data to inform the modification of teaching and learning practices and programs.	4.67	0.47	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean = 4.68 SD = 0.47 Verbal Interpretation = Highly Observable			

Table 10 showed the level of instructional quality in terms of Assessment and Reporting.

The results confirmed that educators execute the designing, selecting, organizing, and using diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies consistent with curriculum requirements ($M=4.72$, $SD=0.45$). They accomplish the strand stating the use of strategies for providing timely, accurate and constructive feedback to improve learner performance ($M=69$, $SD=0.47$). Teachers were also seen monitoring and evaluating learner progress and achievement using learner attainment data ($M=4.68$, $SD=0.47$). Furthermore, educators of the two sub-offices execute the other two strands stating that they utilize assessment data to inform the modification of teaching and learning practices and programs ($M=4.67$, $SD=0.47$); and communicate promptly and clearly the learners' needs, progress, and achievement to key stakeholders, including parents/guardians ($M=4.67$, $SD=0.48$).

Overall, this showed that the instructional quality in terms of assessment and reporting was highly observable ($M=4.68$, $SD=0.47$). Presenting a positive outlook to teachers attaining the expectations mandated to them by providing learners with the necessary feedback about learning outcomes.

Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction

In this study, the level of teacher's job satisfaction refers to Work Policies and Practices; Technical Supervision; Human Relations Supervision; Ability Utilization; and Working Conditions.

The level of teachers' job satisfaction was revealed in the following table, which shows the

statements, mean, standard deviation and verbal interpretation.

Table 11 *Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction in terms of Work Policies and Practices*

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
On the policies and practices toward employees of this company.	4.13	0.93	Agree
On company policies and the way in which they were administered.	4.13	0.95	Agree
On the way employees were informed about company policies.	4.17	0.94	Agree
On the company policies that were put into practice.	4.17	0.92	Agree
On the way the company treats its employees.	4.17	0.94	Agree
Weighted Mean = 4.15 SD = 0.93 Verbal Interpretation = Observable			

Table 11 showed the level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction in terms of Work Policies and Practices.

Teachers revealed their satisfaction level with regard to the company policies that were put into practice (M=4.17, SD=0.92). Furthermore, their satisfaction level on the way employees were informed about company policies (M=4.17, SD=0.94) and on the way the company treats its employees (M=4.17, SD=0.94) appeared to be the same. On the other hand, concerning the policies and practices toward employees of the company (M=4.13, SD=0.93) and the way in which they were administered (M=4.13, SD=0.95).

Overall, the teachers' job satisfaction in terms of work policies and practices was observable (M=4.15, SD=0.93).

Table 12 *Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction in terms of Technical Supervision*

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The technical "know-how" of my supervisor.	4.15	0.93	Agree
The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.	4.16	0.94	Agree
The way my boss delegates work to others.	4.15	0.95	Agree
The way my boss provides help on hard problems.	4.17	0.94	Agree
The way my boss trains his/her employees.	4.17	0.94	Agree
Weighted Mean = 4.16 SD = 0.94 Verbal Interpretation = Observable			

Table 12 showed the level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction in terms of Technical Supervision.

Responses showed that they feel satisfied with the way their boss provides help on hard problems (M=4.17, SD=0.94); and, the way their boss trains his/her employees (M=4.17, SD=0.94). It was also in an agreeable remark that they were pleased with the competence of their supervisor in making decisions (M=4.16, SD=0.94). However, concerning the technical know-how of their supervisor (M=4.15, SD=0.93) and, they way their boss delegates work to others (M=4.15, SD=0.95) rank the least among other statements.

Overall, the level of teachers' job satisfaction in terms of technical supervision appeared to be observable (M=4.16, SD=0.94).

Table 13 *Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction in terms of Human Relations Supervision*

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The way my supervisor and I understand each other.	4.21	0.94	Strongly Agree
The way my boss handles his/her employees.	4.20	0.93	Agree
The way my boss backs up his/her employees (with top management)	4.18	0.94	Agree
The way my boss takes care of the complaints of his/her employees.	4.20	0.95	Agree
The personal relationship between my boss and his/her employees.	4.19	0.95	Agree
Weighted Mean =4.19 SD = 0.94 Verbal Interpretation = Observable			

Table 13 showed the level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction in terms of Human Relations Supervision.

Responses showed that teachers feel contented with the way their supervisors understand each other (M=4.21, SD=0.94). They also showed satisfaction with the way their boss handles his/her employees (M=4.20, SD=0.94); and the way their boss takes care of the complaints of his/her employees (M=4.20, SD=0.95). Additionally, teachers showed contentment with the personal relationship between their boss and their employees (M=4.19, SD=0.95); and, the way their boss backs up his/her employees with top management (M=4.18, 0.94).

Overall, the teachers' job satisfaction in terms of human relations supervision was observable (M=4.19, SD=0.94). Many organizations had now recognized that human resources played an important role in gaining a competitive advantage in today's highly competitive global business environment (Maicibi, 2012).

Table 14 *Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction in terms of Ability Utilization*

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
the chance to do the kind of work that I do best.	4.25	0.96	Strongly Agree
the chance to do work that is well suited to my abilities.	4.24	0.97	Strongly Agree
the chance to make use of my best abilities.	4.22	0.96	Strongly Agree
the chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.	4.23	0.96	Strongly Agree
the chance to make use of my abilities and skills.	4.23	1.00	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean = 4.23 SD = 0.97 Verbal Interpretation = Highly Observable			

Table 14 showed the level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction in terms of Ability Utilization.

Teachers showed satisfaction towards the chance given to them to do the kind of work that they do best (M=4.25, SD=0.96); and, the chance to do the work that was well suited to their abilities (M=4.24, SD=0.97). Additionally, they were also given chances to do something that made use of their abilities (M=4.23, SD=0.96); and they were given opportunity to make use of their abilities and skills (M=4.23, SD=1.00). Lastly, remarks had shown that educators were granted the chance to make use of their best

abilities ($M=4.22$, $SD=0.96$).

Overall, the level of teachers' job satisfaction in terms of ability utilization was highly observable ($M=4.23$, $SD=0.97$). This only signified that not all employees in working place are money-oriented to get job satisfaction. There were some people who were willing to accept a small amount of money to work in the desired location or in jobs that were lacking, even not challenging, it could also be because they choose it for reasons of greater freedom in their work they did during working hours.

Table 15 *Level of Teachers' Job Satisfaction in terms of Working Conditions*

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
the working conditions (heating, lighting, ventilation, etc.) on this job.	3.98	0.99	Agree
the physical surroundings where I work.	4.13	0.99	Agree
the pleasantness of the working conditions.	4.12	0.96	Agree
the physical working conditions of the job.	4.12	0.98	Agree
the working conditions.	4.15	0.98	Agree
Weighted Mean = 4.10 SD = 0.98 Verbal Interpretation = Observable			

Based on the gathered data, teachers feel satisfied with the general working conditions ($M=4.15$, $SD=0.98$). Moreover, they were seen to be content with the physical surroundings where they work ($M=4.13$, $SD=0.99$). This followed the results of the pleasantness of the working conditions ($M=4.12$, $SD=0.96$); and the physical working conditions of the job ($M=4.12$, $SD=0.98$). Finally, the results showed the least computed mean among other statements ($M=3.98$, $SD=0.99$) stating their satisfaction with regards to the working conditions (heating, lighting, ventilation, etc.) on their job.

Overall, the level of teachers' job satisfaction in terms of working conditions is observable. This meant that educators of both sub-offices showed a positive outlook on their working conditions. However, Work environments have numerous properties that may influence both physical and mental well-being.

Table 16 *Significant Relationship between School Heads' Professional Advancement Priorities and Teachers' Instructional Quality*

Professional Advancement Priorities of School Heads		Instructional Quality				
		Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	Learning Environment	Diversity of Learners	Curriculum and Planning	Assessment and Reporting
Leading Strategically	r-value	0.304813*	0.295875*	0.24399*	0.562749*	0.326795*
	p-value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200
Managing School Operations and Resources	r-value	0.297982*	0.330001*	0.291604*	0.601211*	0.349055*
	p-value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200

Focusing on Teaching and Learning	r-value	0.347323*	0.35097*	0.378317*	0.622707*	0.460718*
	p-value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200
Developing Self and Others	r-value	0.453537*	0.426336*	0.437062*	0.68392*	0.381659*
	p-value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200
Building Connections	r-value	0.480914*	0.505176*	0.472489*	0.71044*	0.496954*
	p-value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200

In this study, level of the Professional Advancement Priorities of school heads refers to Leading Strategically; Managing School Operations and Resources; Focusing on Teaching and Learning; Developing Self and Others; and Building Connections while the Level of instructional quality referred to Content Knowledge and Pedagogy; Learning Environment; Diversity of Learners; Curriculum and Planning; and Assessment and Reporting.

In this study, the table showed that there was a Significant Relationship between School Heads' Professional Advancement Priorities and instructional quality.

In terms of leading strategically, there was a low relationship with content knowledge and pedagogy ($r=0.3048$, $p=.000$), learning environment ($r=0.2958$, $p=.000$), diversity of learners ($r=0.2439$, $p=.000$), and assessment and reporting ($r=0.3267$, $p=.000$). However, a moderate relationship was found with curriculum and planning ($r=0.5627$, $p=.000$). All p values were less than the alpha value of 0.05. This meant that variables of instructional quality were partially predicted by the school heads' ability to lead strategically.

In terms of managing school operations and resources, there was a low relationship with content knowledge and pedagogy ($r=0.2979$, $p=.000$), diversity of learners ($r=0.2916$, $p=.000$), learning environment ($r=0.3300$, $p=.000$) and assessment and reporting ($r=0.3490$, $p=.000$). However, a moderate relationship existed with managing school operations and resources and curriculum and planning ($r=0.6012$, $p=.000$). All p values were less than the alpha value of 0.05. This meant that variables of instructional quality were partially predicted by the school heads' ability to manage school operations and resources.

In terms of focusing on teaching and learning, there was a low relationship with content knowledge and pedagogy ($r=0.3473$, $p=.000$), learning environment ($r=0.3509$, $p=.000$), and diversity of learners ($r=0.3783$, $p=.000$). However, a moderate relationship appeared with curriculum and planning ($r=0.6012$, $p=.000$) and assessment and reporting ($r=0.4607$, $p=.000$). All p values were less than the alpha value of 0.05. This meant that variables of instructional quality were partially predicted by the school heads' ability to focus on teaching and learning.

In terms of developing self and others, a moderate relationship was found with content knowledge and pedagogy ($r=0.4535$, $p=.000$), learning environment ($r=0.4263$, $p=.000$), diversity of learners ($r=0.4370$, $p=.000$), and curriculum and planning ($r=0.6839$, $p=.000$). On the other hand, there was a low relationship with assessment and reporting ($r=0.3816$, $p=.000$). All p values were less than the alpha value of 0.05. This meant that variables of instructional quality are partially predicted by the school heads' ability to develop self and others.

In terms of building connections, a moderate relationship was found with content and pedagogy ($r=0.4809$, $p=.000$), diversity of learners ($r=0.4724$, $p=.000$), assessment and reporting ($r=0.4969$, $p=.000$), and learning environment ($r=0.5052$, $p=.000$). However, a high relationship was obtained with curriculum and planning ($r=0.7104$, $p=.000$). All p values were less than the alpha value of 0.05. This means that variables of instructional quality are partially predicted by the school heads' ability to build connections.

Table 17 *Significant Relationship between School Heads' Professional Advancement Priorities and Teachers' Job Satisfaction*

Professional Advancement Priorities of School Heads		Teachers' Job Satisfaction				
		Work Policies and Practices	Technical Supervision	Human Relations Supervision	Ability Utilization	Working Conditions
Leading Strategically	r-value					
	p-value	0.08868*	0.07077*	0.081016*	0.259589*	0.065566*
	N	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Managing School Operations and Resources		200	200	200	200	200
	r-value					
	p-value	0.084196*	0.095615*	0.080352*	0.283465*	0.102293*
Focusing on Teaching and Learning		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200
	r-value					
	p-value	0.10769*	0.082095*	0.096036*	0.249774*	0.079259*
Developing Self and Others		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200
	r-value					
	p-value	0.104806*	0.101055*	0.093808*	0.278118*	0.092154*
Building Connections		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200
	r-value					
	p-value	0.141724*	0.117801*	0.124129*	0.30427*	0.120041*
	N	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
		200	200	200	200	200

Table 17 showed the Significant Relationship between School Heads' Professional Advancement Priorities and Teacher's Job Satisfaction.

In this study, level of the Professional Advancement Priorities of school heads refers to Leading Strategically; Managing School Operations and Resources; Focusing on Teaching and Learning; Developing Self and Others; and Building Connections while the teacher's job satisfaction referred to Work Policies and Practices; Technical Supervision; Human Relations Supervision; Ability Utilization; and Working Conditions.

In this study, the table showed that there was a Significant Relationship between School Heads' Professional Advancement Priorities and Teacher's Job Satisfaction.

In terms of leading strategically, it was found to have a negligible relationship with work policies and practices ($r=0.0886$, $p=.000$), technical supervision ($r=0.0707$, $p=.000$), human relations supervision ($r=0.0810$, $p=.000$), ability utilization ($r=0.2595$, $p=.000$), and working conditions ($r=0.0655$, $p=.000$). All p values were less than the alpha value of 0.05. This means that variables of job satisfaction are partially predicted by the school heads' advancement priorities with regards to leading strategically.

In terms of managing school operations and resources, a negligible relationship was found with work policies and practices ($r=0.0841$, $p=.000$), technical supervision ($r=0.0956$, $p=.000$), human relations

supervision ($r=0.0803$, $p=.000$), ability utilization ($r=0.2834$, $p=.000$), and working conditions ($r=0.1022$, $p=.000$). All p values were less than the alpha value of 0.05. This meant that variables of job satisfaction are partially predicted by the school heads' advancement priorities with regards to managing school operations and resources.

In terms of focusing on teaching and learning, a negligible relationship was found with work policies and practices ($r=0.1048$, $p=.000$), technical supervision ($r=0.0820$, $p=.000$), human relations supervision ($r=0.0960$, $p=.000$), ability utilization ($r=0.2497$, $p=.000$), and working conditions ($r=0.0792$, $p=.000$). All p values were less than the alpha value of 0.05. This means that variables of job satisfaction are partially predicted by the school heads' advancement priority with regards to focusing on teaching and learning.

In terms of developing self and others, a negligible relationship was found with work policies and practices ($r=0.1076$, $p=.000$), technical supervision ($r=0.1010$, $p=.000$), human relations supervision ($r=0.0938$, $p=.000$), ability utilization ($r=0.2781$, $p=.000$), and working conditions ($r=0.0921$, $p=.000$). All p values were less than the alpha value of 0.05. This means that variables of job satisfaction are partially predicted by the school heads' advancement priorities with regards to developing self and others.

In terms of building connections, a negligible relationship was found with work policies and practices ($r=0.1417$, $p=.000$), technical supervision ($r=0.1178$, $p=.000$), human relations supervision ($r=0.1241$, $p=.000$), and working conditions ($r=0.1200$, $p=.000$). On the other hand, the ability utilization appears to have a low relationship ($r=0.3042$, $p=.000$). All p values were less than the alpha value of 0.05. This meant that variables of job satisfaction are partially predicted by the school heads' advancement priorities with regards to building connections.

4. Conclusion and Recommendation

Based on the findings, the study claimed that:

There was a significant relationship between school heads' professional advancement priorities and the teachers' instructional quality; hence, hypothesis number one is rejected. This suggests that the set priorities with regards to professional advancement of school heads directly impact the quality of instruction provided by the teachers. School heads are suggested to put their focus and investments into the development they are eyeing into. They can promote a culture of collaboration and continuous enhancement by encouraging teachers to share insights, engage in peer learning, and participate in professional learning communities as well.

The study showed that there was a significant relationship between school heads' professional advancement priorities and the teachers' job satisfaction; hence, hypothesis number two is also rejected. This suggests that professional priorities set by school leaders do indeed impact the teachers' job satisfaction, which could later influence the school performance. Fostering an engaging and supportive work environment within educational settings requires an understanding of the relationship between school heads' visions for professional advancement and teachers' fulfillment with their jobs. School leaders can enhance job satisfaction, retention, and overall educational effectiveness by giving priority to activities that cater to the needs and expectations of teachers.

The study indicated that teachers were most satisfied with regards to ability utilization and least satisfied with reference to their working conditions. With reference to the results, the educators were most satisfied with ability utilization because they get the chance to do the kind of work that they do best, they do work that is well suited to their abilities, they make use of their best abilities, they do something that make use of their abilities, and make use of their abilities and skills. On the other hand, teachers showed least satisfaction with their working conditions because of the heating, lighting, and ventilation concerns; the physical surroundings

where they work, the pleasantness of the working conditions; the physical working conditions of the job; and the overall working conditions.

However, results of the study should be interpreted with caution concerning the population limited to 200 public elementary school teachers under the supervision of 20 public elementary school heads of two sub-offices only, the Bay District and Los Baños District of the Division of Laguna.

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are proposed.

1. Sub-Offices may offer periodically self-paced trainings, programs, and courses to support the continuous upskilling and reskilling of school heads with regards to the domains of Professional Advancement Priorities.
2. Districts may conduct series of trainings and courses to scale up the instructional quality of teachers with reference to the indicated development needs or weaknesses in the annual IPCRF Development Plan.
3. School heads may perform periodical and standardized Employee Satisfaction Index (ESI) to determine the extent of contentment within the workplace and execute appropriate interventions.

Reference:

Bhat, A. (2024). Descriptive Correlational: Descriptive vs Correlational Research.