

School Heads' Instructional Leadership, Administrative Support and Teachers' Efficiency

Chona O. Pez

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship among school heads' instructional leadership, administrative support, and teachers' efficiency in the Schools Division of Antique for the year 2025. The study used a descriptive-correlational research design involving 218 respondents selected from public schools. A researcher-made questionnaire was used as the main data-gathering tool, and the data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics such as mean, standard deviation, t-test, ANOVA, and Pearson product-moment correlation.

Findings revealed that school heads demonstrated a high level of instructional leadership and administrative support, while teachers exhibited a very high level of efficiency in their teaching performance. Significant positive relationships were found among instructional leadership, administrative support, and teachers' efficiency. This means that stronger instructional leadership and effective administrative support are associated with higher levels of teacher efficiency.

The study concluded that effective school leadership and strong administrative systems are essential in improving teachers' efficiency. Strengthening instructional leadership and ensuring adequate administrative support can further enhance teaching performance and overall school effectiveness.

KEYWORDS: Instructional leadership, administrative support, teachers' efficiency, school heads, school management, leadership effectiveness, teaching performance, educational leadership, Schools Division of Antique, school improvement

INTRODUCTION

Instructional leadership is an important responsibility of school heads in ensuring quality teaching and improved learner outcomes. It involves guiding teachers in instructional practices, supervising classroom instruction, supporting curriculum implementation, and fostering a strong learning-focused school environment. In the Schools Division of Antique, school heads are expected to take an active role in supporting teachers to improve the quality of instruction. Studies show that strong instructional leadership contributes to better teacher performance and improved student achievement because it provides direction, guidance, and professional support for instructional improvement (Hallinger, 2018; Robinson, 2019).

Administrative support is also a key factor in the effectiveness of teachers in schools. It refers to the assistance provided by school heads in terms of resources, communication, workload management, and overall organizational support. According to Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2017), effective administrative support increases teacher motivation, job satisfaction, and instructional effectiveness. When teachers feel well-supported by administration, they are more likely to perform their duties efficiently and effectively in the classroom (Day et al., 2016).

Teachers' efficiency refers to how well teachers manage their time, resources, and instructional tasks in order to achieve learning goals. Efficient teachers are able to deliver lessons effectively, manage classrooms properly, and complete instructional responsibilities in an organized and timely manner (OECD, 2020). Research shows that teachers' efficiency improves when school leaders provide strong instructional leadership and sufficient administrative support (Hattie, 2017).

Furthermore, instructional leadership, administrative support, and teachers' efficiency are closely connected. Strong instructional leadership helps create a focused and supportive school environment, while administrative support ensures that teachers have the necessary resources and working conditions. Together, these factors contribute to improved teacher performance and more effective schools (Bush & Glover, 2019).

Anchored on these ideas, this study focused on 218 respondents in the Schools Division of Antique for the year 2025. It aimed to examine the relationship among instructional leadership, administrative support, and teachers' efficiency, providing evidence that may serve as a basis for strengthening leadership practices and improving school management systems.

This study specifically aimed to describe the respondents' profile; assess instructional leadership in terms of supervision of instruction, curriculum implementation, and professional development support; determine administrative support in terms of resource provision, communication, and workload management; and evaluate teachers' efficiency in terms of classroom management, instructional delivery, and time utilization. It also examined differences among groups and tested relationships among the three variables to support leadership enhancement programs.

METHODOLOGY

This study used a descriptive-correlational research design to determine the relationship among school heads' instructional leadership, administrative support, and teachers' efficiency among 218 respondents in the Schools Division of Antique for the year 2025. The descriptive part described the levels of each variable, while the correlational part examined the relationships among them.

The respondents were 218 teachers and school personnel from public elementary and secondary schools in the division. They were selected through random sampling to ensure fair representation across schools and districts. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were included based on their availability and willingness.

A researcher-made questionnaire was used as the main data-gathering instrument. It contained three sections: instructional leadership, administrative support, and teachers' efficiency. The instrument was validated by experts in education and research methodology and was pilot-tested to ensure reliability. Ethical standards such as informed consent, confidentiality, anonymity, and voluntary participation were strictly observed.

Data were analyzed using frequency count and percentage for respondent profiles, while mean and standard deviation were used to determine levels of each variable. T-test and ANOVA were used to determine differences among groups, and Pearson product-moment correlation was used to test relationships among variables at a 0.05 level of significance.

RESULTS

The results showed that school heads' instructional leadership was rated high, with an overall mean of 4.27 (SD = 0.54). This indicates that school heads actively supervised instruction, supported curriculum

implementation, and promoted teachers' professional development

Administrative support was also rated high, with an overall mean of 4.22 (SD = 0.56). This suggests that school heads provided adequate resources, maintained effective communication, and managed teachers' workload in a supportive manner.

Teachers' efficiency was rated very high, with an overall mean of 4.30 (SD = 0.52). This indicates that teachers demonstrated strong performance in classroom management, lesson delivery, and time utilization. Inferential analysis showed no significant differences in instructional leadership, administrative support, and teachers' efficiency when grouped according to age, sex, and length of service.

Furthermore, significant positive relationships were found among the variables. Instructional leadership was significantly related to administrative support ($r = 0.72$) and teachers' efficiency ($r = 0.68$). Administrative support also showed a strong relationship with teachers' efficiency ($r = 0.75$). This means that better leadership and support are associated with higher teacher efficiency.

FINDINGS

The findings revealed that school heads demonstrated a high level of instructional leadership, showing active involvement in supervising instruction and supporting teachers' professional growth.

Administrative support was also rated high, indicating that school heads provided adequate resources, communication, and workload management to support teaching and learning.

Teachers' efficiency was found to be very high, showing strong ability in managing classrooms, delivering lessons effectively, and utilizing time properly.

No significant differences were found when respondents were grouped according to age, sex, and length of service, indicating consistent perceptions across groups.

Significant positive relationships were also found among instructional leadership, administrative support, and teachers' efficiency, showing that stronger leadership and support contribute to better teacher performance.

SUMMARY

This study examined the relationship among school heads' instructional leadership, administrative support, and teachers' efficiency among 218 respondents in the Schools Division of Antique for the year 2025. The study found that instructional leadership and administrative support were rated high, while teachers' efficiency was rated very high. Significant positive relationships were found among all variables, and no significant differences were observed across demographic profiles.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that school heads' instructional leadership and administrative support play an important role in improving teachers' efficiency. When school leaders actively guide instruction and provide strong administrative support, teachers are more likely to perform efficiently in their teaching tasks. The relationships among the variables show that effective leadership and support systems are essential for improving school performance.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that school heads continue strengthening instructional leadership through regular supervision, mentoring, and curriculum support. Schools should also enhance administrative support by

improving communication systems, ensuring timely provision of resources, and managing teacher workload effectively. Teachers are encouraged to maintain and further improve their efficiency through continuous professional development. The Schools Division of Antique may also provide leadership training programs for school heads to strengthen their effectiveness. Future researchers may explore additional variables such as school climate, teacher motivation, and student outcomes to further enrich the findings.

REFERENCES

1. Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2019). *School leadership and management*. Routledge.
2. Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). *The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies*. Routledge.
3. Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1), 5–24.
4. Hattie, J. (2017). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge.
5. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2017). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 37(1–2), 5–22.
6. OECD. (2020). *School leadership for learning: Insights from TALIS 2018*. OECD Publishing.
7. Robinson, V. (2019). *Reduce change to increase improvement*. Corwin Press.
8. Sebastian, J., Allensworth, E., & Huang, H. (2016). The role of teacher leadership in how principals influence classroom instruction and student learning. *American Journal of Education*, 123(1), 1–36.
9. Spillane, J. P. (2018). *Distributed leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
10. Tschannen-Moran, M. (2017). *Trust matters: Leadership for successful schools*. Jossey-Bass.
11. UNESCO. (2017). *A guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education*. UNESCO Publishing.
12. Wang, M. T., & Degol, J. L. (2016). School climate: A review of the construct, measurement, and impact on student outcomes. *Educational Psychology Review*, 28(2), 315–352.