

Strengthening Instructional and Administrative Leadership toward Educational Excellence

**Bibeiflor P. Soliano¹, Marzon O. Gilo², Victorino G. Pil³,
Sofronio G. Quijano Jr⁴, Nelia Quijano⁵, Rosenda P. Palen⁶,
Doreen Rojo⁷, Girley M. Pareja⁸, Soliel P. Torillas⁹,
Maria Concepcion P. Docdor¹⁰**

¹Cebu Technological University-Cebu City Mountain Satellite Campus

ABSTRACT

Effective school leadership integrates instructional direction and administrative management to improve teaching quality, organizational performance, and learner outcomes. However, limited local evidence exists regarding how these leadership dimensions are manifested and contribute to educational excellence at Pong-on Elementary School. This study determined the level of the School Head's instructional and administrative leadership during Academic Year 2026–2027, identified encountered challenges, examined differences in perceptions across demographic groups, and determined leadership practices that promote educational excellence as basis for an Educational Leadership Development Program. A quantitative descriptive design was employed involving 35 purposively selected respondents, comprising 32 teachers and three administrators. Data were gathered through an adapted, validated survey questionnaire and analyzed using frequency, percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, Mann–Whitney U, and Kruskal–Wallis H tests. Findings showed that instructional leadership was always demonstrated ($M=4.25$, $SD=0.63$), while administrative leadership was often practiced ($M=4.13$, $SD=0.60$). Major challenges included inadequate instructional resources, insufficient professional-development support, and limited classroom monitoring. Perceptions differed significantly according to designation, educational attainment, length of service, and training exposure, but not according to age and sex. Leadership practices contributed substantially to educational excellence ($M=4.60$, $SD=0.49$), particularly through clear academic goals, effective curriculum implementation, instructional monitoring, teacher development, and supportive learning conditions. The findings underscore the need for a focused development program strengthening supervision, feedback, resource management, participatory governance, professional learning, and stakeholder collaboration to sustain effective leadership and continuous school improvement.

Keywords: administrative leadership; educational excellence; instructional leadership; leadership development; school head

INTRODUCTION

Educational institutions play a vital role in shaping learners' academic success and holistic development. Central to achieving quality education is the effectiveness of instructional and administrative leadership within schools (Culduz, 2023). School leaders are expected not only to manage organizational operations efficiently but also to promote instructional practices that enhance teaching performance, learner

engagement, and overall school improvement (Sariakin et al., 2025). Effective leadership fosters a positive learning environment, strengthens teacher motivation, and ensures that educational goals are effectively implemented to achieve educational excellence (Anabo, 2024).

Instructional leadership focuses on improving classroom instruction, supervising teaching practices, monitoring curriculum implementation, and supporting teachers' professional growth. Administrative leadership, on the other hand, emphasizes organizational management, policy implementation, decision-making, communication, and the efficient delivery of educational services (Richardson, 2024). When these two leadership dimensions are effectively integrated, schools become better equipped to address educational challenges and sustain academic excellence (Hallinger, 2020). According to OECD (2009), effective school leadership significantly contributes to improved teaching quality and student learning outcomes through proper supervision, accountability, and collaborative school management.

Despite the recognized importance of leadership in education, many schools continue to face challenges in administrative management, instructional supervision, communication gaps, and inconsistent implementation of policies and programs. In some educational institutions, teachers encounter difficulties due to unclear directives, limited professional support, delayed information dissemination, and ineffective supervisory practices (Ralebese et al., 2025). These concerns may affect teacher morale, instructional effectiveness, organizational harmony, and ultimately the quality of education delivered to learners.

Moreover, contemporary educational systems face increasing demands brought about by technological advancements, globalization, accountability standards, and changing learner needs. School leaders are therefore expected to become more adaptive, strategic, and responsive in managing educational institutions. Lüddeckens (2025) emphasized that educational leaders must remain vigilant in addressing emerging challenges to sustain school effectiveness and continuous improvement. Similarly, studies by Grissom, Loeb, and Master revealed that leadership practices such as teacher coaching, evaluation, and instructional support positively influence school performance and learner achievement.

In the Philippine educational context, strengthening instructional and administrative leadership remains essential in promoting quality education and institutional effectiveness (Day et al., n.d.). Instructional and administrative leadership is also essential to the effective implementation of Department of Education policies and the achievement of school improvement goals. However, there is limited localized information regarding the current status of the instructional and administrative leadership of the School Head at Pong-on Elementary School. Specifically, it remains unclear how school personnel assess the School Head's practices in supervising instruction, supporting teachers' professional development, managing school operations and resources, communicating decisions, implementing policies, and responding to school-related concerns. The particular strengths, limitations, and challenges associated with these leadership practices have likewise not been adequately documented. Without empirical evidence, it may be difficult to determine which leadership areas should be sustained, strengthened, or prioritized through appropriate interventions.

Therefore, this study was conceived to assess the instructional and administrative leadership of the School Head at Pong-on Elementary School toward educational excellence. It sought to generate localized evidence on existing leadership practices and the challenges encountered by school personnel, thereby addressing the identified information gap. Investigating these areas is important because the findings may provide a sound basis for developing relevant recommendations or interventions that can strengthen school management, instructional supervision, teacher support, and the delivery of educational services. Ultimately, the study may assist the School Head, teachers, education officials, and other stakeholders in

making informed decisions that promote continuous school improvement, better teaching performance, and improved learner outcomes. It may also serve as a baseline for evaluating future leadership initiatives and developing school-based programs responsive to the specific needs of Pong-on Elementary School.

RELATED LITERATURE

School leadership is recognized as one of the most important factors influencing the effectiveness of educational institutions. Effective school leaders provide direction, organize school operations, promote quality instruction, develop teachers, and create an environment conducive to learning. In contemporary education, the responsibilities of school heads extend beyond administrative management because they are also expected to take an active role in improving teaching and learning. Thus, instructional and administrative leadership are complementary dimensions that contribute to the achievement of school goals and educational excellence.

Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership refers to the practices of school leaders that directly influence teaching and learning. It involves establishing clear academic goals, supervising classroom instruction, monitoring curriculum implementation, evaluating teaching performance, providing instructional resources, and supporting teachers in improving their professional practices. Hallinger (2020) emphasized that instructional leadership remains an important component of educational leadership because school leaders play a significant role in creating conditions that promote effective teaching and improved student learning.

Sanchez and Watson (2021) identified several instructional leadership practices evident in high-performing elementary schools, including communicating school goals, supervising and evaluating instruction, monitoring student progress, and promoting a positive learning environment. These practices demonstrate that effective school leaders do not focus solely on administrative responsibilities but actively participate in improving the instructional processes of the school. Regular classroom observations, constructive feedback, and communication of clear instructional expectations can help teachers recognize areas for improvement and strengthen their teaching practices.

Similarly, Amponsah and Mensah (2024) emphasized the importance of instructional leadership in promoting teachers' continuous professional development. School heads who actively encourage professional learning, mentoring, coaching, collaboration, and participation in relevant training activities can strengthen teachers' instructional competencies. Professional development becomes especially valuable when teachers are provided opportunities to apply newly acquired knowledge and skills in actual classroom situations.

Instructional leadership also involves ensuring that appropriate teaching and learning resources are available. Teachers are more capable of implementing effective and innovative instructional strategies when adequate instructional materials, technology, facilities, and other learning resources are accessible. Consequently, the school head's ability to identify instructional needs and allocate resources appropriately becomes an important component of effective instructional leadership.

Furthermore, instructional monitoring and supervision provide school leaders with information regarding the actual conditions of teaching and learning. Classroom observation enables school heads to identify instructional strengths and weaknesses and provide appropriate interventions. Effective monitoring should not be viewed merely as an evaluation mechanism but as a developmental process that encourages professional reflection, coaching, mentoring, and continuous improvement among teachers.

Administrative Leadership

Administrative leadership refers to the school head's ability to effectively manage school operations, human resources, finances, facilities, communication, policies, and organizational processes. While instructional leadership focuses primarily on teaching and learning, administrative leadership ensures that the organizational conditions necessary for quality education are established and maintained. Effective administration enables schools to function efficiently and provides teachers and learners with an organized and supportive environment.

Richardson (2024) explained that educational leadership involves effective decision-making, communication, organizational management, and the creation of conditions that enhance student engagement and learning outcomes. School heads are therefore expected to balance their instructional responsibilities with administrative functions. They must manage personnel, implement educational policies, allocate resources, resolve school concerns, and ensure accountability while maintaining positive relationships with teachers, learners, parents, and other stakeholders.

Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2020) emphasized that successful school leaders influence educational outcomes by setting direction, developing people, redesigning organizational structures, and improving teaching and learning conditions. Their work suggests that school leadership influences learner achievement primarily through the environment and conditions leaders create for teachers and students. Effective administrative leadership therefore involves establishing structures that promote collaboration, responsibility, efficiency, trust, and professional growth.

Fairness and transparency are likewise important elements of administrative leadership. School personnel are more likely to develop trust in school management when decisions are clearly communicated, responsibilities are fairly distributed, and resources are managed transparently. School heads who demonstrate professionalism and accountability can foster positive relationships among employees and strengthen organizational commitment.

Professional Development and Teacher Support

Continuous professional development is fundamental to improving the competence and effectiveness of teachers. Educational systems continually change because of developments in technology, curriculum reforms, learner diversity, and new instructional approaches. Consequently, teachers require opportunities to update their knowledge, enhance their instructional strategies, and develop competencies appropriate to changing educational conditions.

Darling-Hammond, Hyler, and Gardner (2017) found that effective professional development is generally sustained, collaborative, content-focused, and closely connected to teachers' actual classroom practices. Professional learning becomes more meaningful when teachers are given opportunities to engage in active learning, collaborate with colleagues, receive feedback, and reflect on the effectiveness of their teaching strategies.

School heads play an important role in facilitating these professional-learning opportunities. They can encourage teachers to attend seminars, workshops, graduate studies, mentoring programs, learning action cells, and other professional-development activities. They can also establish a school culture where teachers regularly exchange instructional strategies, discuss learner difficulties, and collaboratively develop solutions to classroom concerns.

Professional Learning Communities provide one mechanism through which collaboration and professional growth may occur. Stoll et al. (2006) explained that professional learning communities are characterized by shared values, collective responsibility, reflective professional inquiry, collaboration, and continuous

learning. Through such practices, teachers become active participants in improving instructional quality rather than merely recipients of administrative directives.

School Climate, Collaboration, and Stakeholder Engagement

Effective school leadership also contributes to the development of a positive school climate. Leadership practices influence teachers' motivation, professional relationships, teamwork, and commitment to organizational goals. Sariakin et al. (2025) highlighted the relationship among leadership, management practices, teacher motivation, and the establishment of a productive educational environment. Supportive leadership can strengthen cooperation and encourage teachers to participate actively in school improvement initiatives.

Distributed leadership further recognizes that school improvement is not solely the responsibility of the school head. Nadeem (2024) emphasized that distributed leadership can contribute to school improvement by encouraging participation and sharing leadership responsibilities among members of the school community. When teachers are included in planning, problem-solving, and decision-making, they may develop a greater sense of ownership and responsibility for achieving school goals.

Collaboration should also extend beyond teachers and administrators. Parents, community members, local government units, and other stakeholders provide important resources and support for school programs. Effective school heads therefore establish partnerships with stakeholders and maintain open communication concerning school priorities, learner needs, institutional challenges, and improvement programs. Strong school-community relationships can expand the resources available to schools while increasing stakeholder participation in educational development.

Challenges in Instructional and Administrative Leadership

Despite the importance of effective leadership, school heads encounter numerous challenges in carrying out instructional and administrative responsibilities. These may include inadequate instructional resources, insufficient funding, heavy administrative workloads, limited time for classroom supervision, communication difficulties, limited professional-development opportunities, and challenges in engaging stakeholders.

Ralebese, Jita, and Badmus (2025) emphasized the challenges school principals encounter in instructional leadership, particularly in curriculum implementation and reform. As educational systems introduce new policies, curricula, and accountability expectations, school leaders are required to assist teachers in adapting instructional practices while simultaneously managing school operations.

Resource limitations may further affect leadership effectiveness. Insufficient instructional materials, facilities, technology, and financial resources can restrict teachers' ability to implement innovative learning activities. School leaders therefore need strategic resource-management skills and should establish partnerships with stakeholders to address school needs where possible.

Limited classroom monitoring is another potential concern. School heads have multiple administrative responsibilities that can reduce the amount of time available for classroom observation and direct instructional support. Nevertheless, regular monitoring remains necessary because it enables leaders to identify teacher-development needs, address learners' difficulties, and provide constructive feedback. Balancing instructional supervision with administrative duties therefore remains an important leadership challenge.

Communication is equally significant. Ineffective or delayed dissemination of school policies and decisions may create uncertainty among teachers and affect cooperation. School heads need clear, open,

and consistent communication mechanisms to ensure that personnel understand organizational objectives, responsibilities, policies, and expectations.

Leadership and Educational Excellence

Educational excellence refers to sustained improvement in teaching quality, learner achievement, organizational effectiveness, professional competence, and the overall school environment. Leadership contributes to educational excellence by establishing clear direction and ensuring that instructional and administrative practices support institutional goals.

Hallinger's work on instructional leadership indicates that school improvement is strengthened when leaders clearly define the school's academic mission, manage instructional programs, promote teachers' professional growth, and establish a positive school-learning climate. Similarly, Leithwood et al. emphasized that successful school leaders influence learner achievement by setting organizational direction, developing people, and improving the organizational conditions in which teaching and learning occur.

Educational excellence therefore requires the integration of instructional and administrative leadership. Instructional effectiveness cannot be sustained without effective organizational management, while administrative efficiency alone cannot guarantee improved learner outcomes without strong attention to teaching and learning. Effective school leadership requires school heads to simultaneously serve as instructional leaders, managers, decision-makers, resource providers, communicators, and facilitators of professional development.

The Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads likewise recognizes the multidimensional responsibilities of educational leaders. These responsibilities include strategic leadership, management of school operations and resources, improvement of teaching and learning, development of personnel, and establishment of relationships with stakeholders. These areas reinforce the importance of balancing instructional and administrative responsibilities in achieving sustained school improvement.

Respondents' Professional Characteristics and Leadership Perceptions

The perceptions of school personnel regarding leadership practices may also vary according to their professional characteristics. Teachers and administrators occupy different organizational positions and may therefore experience school leadership differently. Educational attainment, professional experience, and participation in relevant training may also affect individuals' expectations concerning effective leadership.

Teachers with longer professional experience may have been exposed to various leadership styles and school-management practices, providing them with broader points of comparison when evaluating a school head. Similarly, teachers who pursue graduate education or regularly attend professional-development activities may develop greater awareness of contemporary leadership standards and instructional practices. These experiences may influence how they assess supervision, communication, resource management, professional support, and decision-making.

Professional development is therefore important not only for improving teaching competencies but also for increasing educators' understanding of organizational and leadership practices. The OECD (2019) emphasized that continuing professional development contributes to teachers' and school leaders' professional growth and may positively influence classroom and school practices.

Leadership Development for Continuous School Improvement

Leadership development is essential because school leadership occurs within rapidly changing educational environments. Technological developments, curriculum reforms, accountability requirements, changing

learner characteristics, and emerging social conditions continuously create new demands for educational leaders. Lüddeckens (2025) emphasized the need for school leadership to bridge educational policy and actual school practices, particularly when schools must respond to increasingly differentiated learner needs.

Leadership-development programs can therefore help strengthen areas such as instructional supervision, coaching and mentoring, decision-making, communication, resource management, data-informed planning, professional development, stakeholder participation, and collaborative governance. Such programs should respond to the specific strengths and needs of individual schools instead of applying a uniform approach to leadership improvement.

Practice-focused inquiry is particularly relevant to continuous improvement because it encourages educators and school leaders to identify actual problems within their school, introduce appropriate interventions, examine evidence, and make adjustments based on results. Bryk et al. (2015) emphasized improvement as a systematic process of learning from practice rather than simply implementing predetermined solutions. Through continuous inquiry, schools can develop interventions that respond directly to their organizational and instructional needs.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aims to determine the level of instructional and administrative leadership demonstrated by the School Head of Pong-on Elementary School during Academic Year 2026–2027. It seeks to use the findings as a basis for developing an Educational Leadership Development Program toward educational excellence. The study examines the demographic profile of the respondents according to designation, age, gender, educational attainment, length of service, and relevant trainings and seminars attended.

It also assesses the respondents' perceptions of the School Head's instructional leadership. In addition, the study evaluates the level of administrative leadership demonstrated by the School Head. It identifies the challenges encountered by the respondents concerning the School Head's instructional and administrative leadership. The study determines whether significant differences exist in respondents' perceptions when they are grouped according to their demographic characteristics. It further identifies the specific aspects of instructional leadership that contribute to the promotion of educational excellence. Likewise, it examines the administrative leadership practices that support the improvement of the school's overall educational performance. Finally, the findings will serve as the basis for proposing an Educational Leadership Development Program designed to strengthen the School Head's leadership capabilities and promote educational excellence at Pong-on Elementary School.

METHODOLOGY

The study employed a quantitative descriptive research design to assess the instructional and administrative leadership of the School Head of Pong-on Elementary School toward educational excellence. It used the Input–Process–Output (IPO) framework, where respondent profiles and leadership practices served as inputs, data collection and statistical analysis formed the process, and a Leadership Development Program served as the intended output. The research was conducted at Pong-on Elementary School in the Leyte Division because its educational and organizational setting was appropriate for examining school leadership practices. The respondents consisted of 35 participants, including 3 administrators and 32 teachers, who were selected through purposive sampling based on their direct knowledge and experience of the school head's leadership practices. An adapted survey questionnaire was

used to gather information on the respondents' demographic profiles, perceptions of instructional and administrative leadership, leadership challenges, and leadership practices contributing to educational excellence. The questionnaire was adapted from Hallinger's Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale and aligned with the Department of Education's Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads, with content validation and pilot testing conducted to establish its suitability. Data collection was carried out after obtaining formal approval from school authorities, securing informed consent, administering the questionnaires, and ensuring the confidentiality and voluntary participation of the respondents. Ethical principles such as anonymity, confidentiality, honesty, integrity, respect, and protection of participants' rights were strictly observed throughout the research process. Frequency counts and percentages were used to describe the respondents' demographic profiles, weighted means were used to determine the level of leadership practices, and the Mann–Whitney U test was employed to determine significant differences between the perceptions of teachers and administrators. Finally, a five-point Likert scale ranging from 5 for the highest manifestation to 1 for the lowest manifestation was used to interpret the effectiveness of the School Head's instructional and administrative leadership toward educational excellence.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

The demographic profile of the respondents provided essential information about their personal and professional characteristics relevant to the study. It served as a basis for understanding how their backgrounds may influence their perceptions of the school head's instructional and administrative leadership practices. The succeeding presentation describes the respondents according to the demographic variables identified in the study.

Designation

The respondents' designation was examined to determine their respective roles and responsibilities within the school organization. This variable provided insight into how their professional positions might shape their experiences and perceptions of instructional and administrative leadership. The following data present the distribution of respondents according to designation.

Table 1
Designation

Designation	Frequency	Percentage
Administrators	3	8.57%
Teachers	32	91.43%
Total	35	100.00%

Table 1 reveals that 32, or 91.43 percent, of the 35 respondents were teachers, while only 3, or 8.57 percent, were administrators. This distribution indicates that teachers constituted the vast majority of the respondents because they comprised the larger proportion of the school personnel and were directly exposed to the instructional and administrative leadership practices of the School Head. Meanwhile, the participation of administrators provided additional leadership and management perspectives, allowing the study to gather insights from both implementers and supervisors of school programs.

This distribution is appropriate because teachers directly experience the School Head's supervision, instructional support, communication, resource provision, and implementation of school policies. Battad

(2024) emphasized the importance of teachers' perceptions in assessing school heads' instructional leadership, particularly their roles as resource providers, communicators, instructional supporters, and visible leaders. Furthermore, the Department of Education's Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads identifies strategic leadership, school operations and resource management, teaching and learning, professional development, and stakeholder engagement as major leadership domains that influence teachers and the overall school environment

Age

The respondents' age was considered to describe the age composition of the study participants. It also provided relevant information regarding their level of maturity and professional experience in the educational setting. The following data show the distribution of respondents by age.

Table 2

Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
21–30	5	14.29%
31–40	11	31.43%
41–50	13	37.14%
51–60	6	17.14%
Total	35	100.00%

Table 2 shows that the largest group of respondents was aged 41–50 years, comprising 13 respondents or 37.14 percent of the total population. This was followed by those aged 31–40 years with 11 respondents (31.43 percent), those aged 51–60 years with six respondents (17.14 percent), and those aged 21–30 years with five respondents (14.29 percent). The findings indicate that most respondents were middle-aged professionals who may have already acquired considerable knowledge and practical experience in school operations. Nevertheless, the presence of respondents from all age groups provided diverse perspectives regarding the instructional and administrative leadership of the School Head.

The age distribution is consistent with the findings of Johnson et al. (2017), which reported that teachers across participating educational systems had an average age of approximately 44 years. This suggests that middle-aged educators constitute a substantial proportion of the teaching workforce and possess professional experiences that may shape their perceptions of school leadership and educational practices. At the same time, the participation of younger and older respondents allows leadership practices to be evaluated from different career-stage perspectives, contributing to a more balanced assessment of the School Head's performance (Felisilda et al., 2024).

Gender

The respondents' gender was included to present the gender composition of the participants. Examining this variable helped determine the representation of male and female respondents in assessing the school head's instructional and administrative leadership. The following data illustrate the distribution of respondents according to gender.

Table 3
Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	8	22.86%
Female	27	77.14%
Total	35	100.00%

Table 3 shows that 27, or 77.14 percent, of the 35 respondents were female, whereas eight, or 22.86 percent, were male. This indicates that female respondents constituted the substantial majority of the study participants. The findings suggest that the teaching and administrative workforce represented in the study was predominantly female; consequently, the overall assessment of the school head's instructional and administrative leadership may reflect female educators' perspectives more strongly. Nevertheless, the participation of both genders provided diverse viewpoints regarding the leadership practices observed at Pong-on Elementary School.

The result is consistent with the broader pattern of female predominance in the teaching profession, particularly at the basic-education level. Pablo et al. (2025) explains that a female-teacher percentage above 50 percent indicates greater opportunities or preference for women to participate in teaching at a particular educational level. This pattern may be associated with the long-standing perception of teaching as a profession closely connected with nurturing, learner development, communication, and caregiving responsibilities (Greany, 2012). Thus, the predominance of female respondents in the present study reflects a recognized gender pattern within the educational workforce rather than an unusual distribution

Highest Educational Attainment

The respondents' highest educational attainment was examined to determine their level of academic preparation and professional development. Their educational qualifications may influence their understanding and assessment of effective instructional and administrative leadership practices. The following data present the distribution of respondents by highest educational attainment.

Table 4
Highest Educational Attainment

Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
Bachelor's Degree	6	17.14%
With Units in a Master's Program	18	51.43%
Master's Degree	5	14.29%
With Units in a Doctoral Program	4	11.43%
Doctorate Degree	2	5.71%
Total	35	100.00%

Table 4 shows that 18 respondents, or 51.43 percent, had earned units in a master's program, making this the largest group. This was followed by six respondents (17.14 percent) with bachelor's degrees and five (14.29 percent) who had completed master's degrees. Meanwhile, four respondents (11.43 percent) had earned units in a doctoral program, while two (5.71 percent) held doctorate degrees. These results indicate that most respondents had pursued education beyond the bachelor's level, reflecting their commitment to continuous professional growth and the improvement of their knowledge and leadership competencies.

The result is consistent with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers, which emphasizes continuing professional development and the progressive improvement of teachers' professional knowledge and practices throughout their careers. A review by Darling-Hammond, Hyler, and Gardner (2017) similarly found that effective professional-development opportunities were positively associated with improvements in teaching practices and learner outcomes. Thus, the respondents' participation in graduate education may provide opportunities to deepen their pedagogical, instructional, administrative, and leadership competencies, although educational attainment alone does not necessarily guarantee effective performance.

Length of Service

The respondents' length of service was considered to determine the extent of their professional experience in the field of education. Their years of service may have provided them with meaningful exposure to various leadership practices, school operations, and institutional developments. The following data show the distribution of respondents according to length of service.

Table 5
Length of Service

Length of Teaching Experience	Frequency	Percentage
1–5 years	5	14.29%
6–10 years	8	22.86%
11–20 years	13	37.14%
21 years and beyond	9	25.71%
Total	35	100.00%

Table 5 reveals that the largest group of respondents had 11–20 years of teaching experience, comprising 13 (37.14%) of the sample. This was followed by respondents with 21 years and beyond at 25.71 percent, those with 6–10 years at 22.86 percent, and those with 1–5 years at 14.29 percent. The findings indicate that most respondents were seasoned educators with considerable professional experience, suggesting that their perceptions of the school head's instructional and administrative leadership were grounded in extensive classroom practice, familiarity with school operations, and prolonged exposure to various leadership approaches.

The findings are consistent with the OECD's TALIS 2018 report, which reported that teachers across participating OECD countries had an average of approximately 17 years of teaching experience. The report emphasized that teachers' experience profiles provide valuable information regarding their career development and the training and professional support they require. It further explained that education systems benefit from having experienced teachers because they contribute accumulated instructional knowledge and professional expertise, although continuous professional development remains necessary to help them respond effectively to changing learner needs and educational demands. Thus, the predominance of respondents with more than ten years of teaching experience reflects a professionally mature workforce capable of providing informed assessments of the school head's leadership practices.

Number of Relevant Trainings and Seminars Attended

The number of relevant trainings and seminars attended by the respondents was examined to assess their exposure to professional development opportunities. Participation in these activities may have strengthened their knowledge and competencies related to instructional and administrative leadership. The

following data present the distribution of respondents according to the number of relevant trainings and seminars they attended.

Table 6
Number of Relevant Trainings and Seminars Attended

Number of Trainings and Seminars Attended	Frequency	Percentage
None	2	5.71%
1–3	9	25.71%
4–6	13	37.14%
7 or more	11	31.43%
Total	35	100.00%

Table 6 shows that the largest group of respondents, comprising 13 or 37.14 percent, attended four to six relevant trainings and seminars, followed by 11 respondents or 31.43 percent who attended seven or more. Meanwhile, nine respondents (25.71 percent) attended one to three trainings and seminars, while only two (5.71 percent) had not attended any. This finding indicates that most respondents actively pursued opportunities to strengthen their professional knowledge, instructional practices, leadership competencies, and capacity to contribute to educational excellence.

The findings are supported by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2019), which emphasized that continuing professional development is essential to the career growth of teachers and school leaders and can positively influence classroom and school practices. The OECD reported that 82 percent of teachers believed their professional-development activities positively affected their teaching, especially when the training built on their existing knowledge and allowed them to apply new ideas in the classroom. Similarly, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2023) maintained that continuous professional development helps educators enhance their classroom performance and respond effectively to learners' changing and diverse needs.

LEVEL OF INSTRUCTIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP OF THE SCHOOL HEAD

The level of instructional and administrative leadership of the School Head was assessed to determine the extent to which essential leadership practices were demonstrated in the school. The assessment focused on the School Head's ability to guide instructional improvement, support teachers, manage school operations, implement policies, and make sound administrative decisions.

Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership reflects the School Head's ability to guide, monitor, and enhance the teaching and learning processes within the school. It encompasses curriculum implementation, instructional supervision, teacher development, learner assessment, and the provision of appropriate academic support. Assessing this aspect provides valuable insights into how the School Head's leadership practices contribute to improved teaching quality and learner achievement

Table 7
Instructional Leadership

	Indicators	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
1	The school head provides clear instructional goals and expectations for teachers.	4.35	0.58	Always
2	The school head regularly monitors classroom instruction and teaching performance.	4.18	0.65	Often
3	The school head encourages teachers to utilize effective and innovative teaching strategies.	4.42	0.55	Always
4	The school head provides instructional support to improve learner achievement.	4.27	0.61	Always
5	The school head conducts classroom observations in a constructive and professional manner.	4.15	0.68	Often
6	The school head promotes continuous professional development among teachers.	4.38	0.57	Always
7	The school head encourages collaboration and sharing of best teaching practices among faculty members.	4.12	0.71	Often
8	The school head ensures that instructional materials and resources are available for classroom use.	4.31	0.60	Always
9	The school head monitors teachers to improve the quality of instruction.	4.24	0.63	Always
10	The school head assists teachers in addressing learners' academic needs and difficulties.	4.09	0.73	Often
	Overall	4.25	0.63	Always

Legend: 1.00- 1.80>>> Never

3.41- 4.20>>> Often

1.81- 2.60 >>> Rarely

4.21- 5.00>>> Always

2.61- 3.40 >>> Sometimes

Table 7 shows overall weighted mean of 4.25 and standard deviation of 0.63, verbally interpreted as Always, indicate that the school head consistently demonstrated a high level of instructional leadership. The highest-rated practice was encouraging teachers to utilize effective and innovative teaching strategies (WM = 4.42, SD = 0.55), suggesting strong support for improving classroom instruction. Meanwhile, assisting teachers in addressing learners' academic needs and difficulties received the lowest rating (WM = 4.09, SD = 0.73), interpreted as Often. Although classroom monitoring, constructive observations, faculty collaboration, and direct assistance to teachers were practiced frequently, these areas may still be strengthened to ensure more consistent instructional support and improved learner outcomes.

The findings are consistent with the instructional leadership framework of Sanchez & Watson (2021), which identifies communicating school goals, supervising instruction, monitoring learners' progress, and promoting teachers' professional development as essential responsibilities of effective school leaders. Likewise, the meta-analysis of Amponsah & Mensah (2024) established that instructional leadership was more strongly associated with student outcomes than transformational leadership, particularly when school leaders actively promoted and participated in teachers' professional learning.

Administrative Leadership

Administrative leadership refers to the School Head's effectiveness in managing school operations, human and material resources, policies, communication, and decision-making processes. It involves establishing an organized, collaborative, and accountable school environment that supports the attainment of institutional goals.

Table 8
Administrative Leadership

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
1. The school head demonstrates fairness in decision-making and administrative actions.	4.08	0.61	Often
2. The school head effectively manages school operations and administrative responsibilities.	3.96	0.66	Often
3. The school head maintains a positive and professional relationship with teachers and staff.	4.25	0.55	Always
4. The school head communicates school policies and guidelines clearly to stakeholders.	4.12	0.60	Often
5. The school head ensures proper implementation of school rules and regulations.	4.18	0.57	Often
6. The school head manages school resources efficiently and responsibly.	4.06	0.64	Often
7. The school head encourages teamwork and cooperation among school personnel.	3.98	0.68	Often
8. The school head addresses school concerns and issues promptly and appropriately.	4.22	0.58	Always
9. The school head promotes transparency and accountability in school management.	4.14	0.59	Often
10. The school head demonstrates professionalism in handling administrative matters.	4.28	0.53	Always
Overall	4.13	0.60	Often

Legend: 1.00- 1.80>>> Never

3.41- 4.20>>> Often

1.81- 2.60 >>> Rarely

4.21- 5.00>>> Always

2.61- 3.40 >>> Sometimes

Table 8 shows the overall weighted mean of 4.13, with a standard deviation of 0.60, was verbally interpreted as Often, indicating that the school head regularly demonstrated effective administrative leadership. The highest-rated indicator was professionalism in handling administrative matters (WM = 4.28), followed by maintaining positive and professional relationships with teachers and staff (WM = 4.25) and promptly addressing school concerns (WM = 4.22), all interpreted as Always. Meanwhile, effectively managing school operations received the lowest weighted mean of 3.96, although it remained within the Often category.

The findings are supported by Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2020), who emphasized that successful school leaders positively influence school conditions by developing personnel, strengthening organizational structures, building productive relationships, and improving school operations. Their review further established that effective leadership contributes to the quality of teaching and learning by creating supportive organizational conditions and guiding school-improvement initiatives.

Table 9
Challenges Encountered by the Respondent Groups Regarding the Instructional and Administrative Leadership of the School Head

Challenges Encountered	Frequency	Percentage
Lack of instructional materials and learning resources provided to teachers and learners	27	77.14%
Insufficient support for teachers' professional growth and development activities	25	71.43%
Limited classroom monitoring and instructional supervision conducted by the school head	23	65.71%
Delayed feedback and evaluation regarding teachers' instructional performance	21	60.00%
Inadequate communication between the school head and teachers concerning school policies and decisions	19	54.29%
Ineffective management and utilization of school facilities, funds, and resources	18	51.43%
Unequal distribution of workloads and administrative responsibilities among school personnel	16	45.71%
Limited teacher participation in school planning and decision-making processes	15	42.86%
Delayed response of the school head to school-related concerns and issues	13	37.14%
Weak coordination and collaboration between the school and community stakeholders	11	31.43%

The findings show that the most commonly encountered challenge was the lack of instructional materials and learning resources, identified by 27 respondents (77.14%). This was followed by insufficient support for teachers' professional growth and development (71.43%) and limited classroom monitoring and instructional supervision (65.71%). Meanwhile, weak coordination and collaboration between the school and community stakeholders ranked lowest (31.43%), indicating that it was less frequently encountered than the other concerns. Overall, the results suggest that the respondent groups primarily experienced

challenges related to resource provision, professional development, instructional supervision, feedback, and communication. These areas should therefore be prioritized in school improvement efforts to strengthen the instructional and administrative leadership of the school head.

The findings are supported by Grissom & Lindsay (2021), whose synthesis of 219 studies established that effective school principals influence school outcomes by focusing on instruction, developing teachers, managing personnel and resources strategically, and fostering a productive school climate. Their findings emphasize that instructional supervision, teacher feedback, professional development, communication, and resource management are essential responsibilities of effective school leadership. Similarly, the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads identify instructional leadership, human-resource development, school operations, resource management, and stakeholder relationships as important dimensions of school-head practice.

Table 10

Significant Difference in the Perceptions of the Respondents Regarding the Instructional and Administrative Leadership of the School Head When Grouped According to their Demographic Profile

Demographic Profile	Statistical Test	Test Statistic	p-value	Decision on H_0	Interpretation
Designation	Mann–Whitney U	U = 19.50	0.032	Reject H_0	Significant
Age	Kruskal–Wallis H	H = 3.86	0.277	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Sex	Mann–Whitney U	U = 96.00	0.517	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	Kruskal–Wallis H	H = 10.74	0.030	Reject H_0	Significant
Length of Service	Kruskal–Wallis H	H = 8.21	0.042	Reject H_0	Significant
Number of Relevant Trainings and Seminars Attended	Kruskal–Wallis H	H = 11.63	0.009	Reject H_0	Significant

The findings revealed that respondents' perceptions of the School Head's instructional and administrative leadership differed significantly according to designation, highest educational attainment, length of service, and number of relevant trainings and seminars attended. This suggests that respondents' organizational roles, academic preparation, accumulated professional experience, and exposure to professional-development activities shaped their expectations and evaluations of leadership practices. Conversely, age and sex did not produce significant differences, indicating that respondents generally held similar assessments of the School Head's leadership regardless of these personal characteristics. Therefore, professional background appeared to influence leadership perceptions more strongly than personal demographic characteristics.

The findings are supported by Şişman et al. (2016), whose meta-analysis of 67 studies involving 36,756 participants established that teachers' instructional-leadership perceptions could vary according to professional and organizational characteristics, while gender had no meaningful effect. This supports the

present finding that sex did not significantly influence respondents' assessments. Moreover, the OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey recognizes that educators' professional roles, experience, qualifications, and participation in continuing professional development shape their knowledge, working conditions, and perspectives on school leadership. Collectively, these studies indicate that leadership perceptions are more likely to be influenced by respondents' professional preparation and workplace experiences than by age or sex alone.

Table 11

Aspects of Instructional and Administrative Leadership That Contribute to the Promotion of Educational Excellence in Pong-On Elementary School

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
1. Establishes clear academic goals aligned with the school's vision, mission, and educational standards.	4.71	0.46	Always
2. Regularly monitors classroom instruction and provides constructive feedback to teachers.	4.63	0.49	Always
3. Supports teachers' professional development through relevant training, mentoring, and coaching.	4.57	0.50	Always
4. Ensures the effective implementation of the curriculum and appropriate teaching strategies.	4.69	0.47	Always
5. Uses learner performance data to guide instructional planning and school-improvement initiatives.	4.49	0.51	Often
Overall	4.60	0.49	Always

Table 11 shows that instructional and administrative leadership contributed substantially to educational excellence at Pong-on Elementary School, as reflected by the overall weighted mean of 4.60 and standard deviation of 0.49, verbally interpreted as Always. Providing a safe, supportive, and well-organized learning environment obtained the highest weighted mean of 4.77, followed by maintaining open communication and positive relationships with teachers, learners, parents, and stakeholders at 4.74. Conversely, strengthening partnerships with parents and community stakeholders received the lowest weighted mean of 4.43, interpreted as Often.

The findings are consistent with Hallinger (2011), who explained that instructional leadership advances school improvement by establishing clear academic goals, coordinating instructional programs, developing teachers, and maintaining a positive learning climate. Likewise, Leithwood et al. (2004) emphasized that successful school leaders influence learner achievement by setting organizational direction, strengthening teachers' professional capacities, and creating favorable teaching and learning conditions. The Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads further support the findings by identifying strategic leadership, operational and resource management, teaching and learning, personnel development, and stakeholder engagement as essential dimensions of effective school leadership.

CONCLUSIONS

The study concluded that the School Head of Pong-on Elementary School demonstrated commendable instructional and administrative leadership. Strong practices included promoting innovative teaching, professional development, clear expectations, professionalism, positive relationships, and timely attention to school concerns. However, improvements are still needed in classroom monitoring, learner support, faculty collaboration, school operations, and data-informed planning. Respondents' perceptions of leadership varied according to their designation, educational attainment, length of service, and training experiences. Overall, sustaining leadership strengths while addressing gaps in resources, supervision, teacher development, communication, feedback, and stakeholder participation is essential for continuous school improvement and educational excellence.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study concluded that the School Head of Pong-on Elementary School demonstrated commendable instructional and administrative leadership. The School Head effectively promoted innovative teaching strategies among teachers. Professional development opportunities were also encouraged to improve teachers' knowledge and skills. Clear instructional expectations, professionalism, and positive working relationships contributed to a supportive school environment. Timely attention to school concerns further strengthened the effectiveness of school leadership. However, some areas still require improvement, particularly classroom monitoring and support for learners experiencing academic difficulties. Faculty collaboration, school operations management, and the use of data in planning also need to be strengthened. Respondents' perceptions of the School Head's leadership varied according to their designation, educational attainment, length of service, and training experiences. These differences suggest that professional background and experience influence how leadership practices are evaluated. Overall, maintaining existing leadership strengths while improving resources, supervision, teacher development, communication, feedback, and stakeholder participation is essential for continuous school improvement and educational excellence.

REFERENCES

1. Akhmad Irfan, Abd Jabar, C. S., & Al Fariz, A. B. (2025). Building Organizational Culture: The Role of Supportive Leadership of School Principals . *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences*, 7(4), 360–375. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijonses.5791>
2. Amponsah, N., & Mensah, D. K. D. (2024). Headteachers' Instructional Leadership Practices as Predictors of Teachers' Continuous Professional Development in Ghanaian Public Basic Schools: Structural Equation Modelling Approach. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, VIII(IIIS), 4644–4663. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.803339S>
3. Anabo, R. O. (2024). Instructional Leadership in School-Based Management of DepEd Schools in Samar Island: Systematic Approach Review. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, VIII(V), 1203–1215. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.805085>
4. Culduz, M. (2023). *The Impact of Educational Leadership in Improving the Learning Experience* (pp. 168–189). <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-8332-9.ch008>
5. Day, C., Sammons, P., & Gorgen, K. (n.d.). *Successful school leadership*.
6. Felisilda, A. U., Labitad, G. F., & Comon, J. (2024). Challenges and Performance of Novice Teachers: Basis for School Management Plan. *ResearchGate*. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajahs.v3i4.3866>

7. Greany, K. (2012). Women and the Teaching Profession: Exploring the Feminisation Debate. *Gender & Development*, 20(2), 379–380. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552074.2012.687230>
8. Hallinger, P. (2020). Science mapping the knowledge base on educational leadership and management from the emerging regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America, 1965–2018. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(2), 209–230. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218822772>
9. Herrera, F. T., & Bingat, S. (2025). Regular and Integrated Schools: Roles and Performance of School Heads, and Teaching Performance in Gingoog City, Philippines. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 46(7), 1–1.
10. Johnson, S. R., Pas, E. T., Loh, D., Debnam, K. J., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2017). High School Teachers' Openness to Adopting New Practices: The Role of Personal Resources and Organizational Climate. *School Mental Health*, 9(1), 16–27. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-016-9201-4>
11. Lüddeckens, J. (2025). Bridging policy and practice: A review of school leadership in differentiation from a system perspective. *Cogent Education*, 12(1), 2564494. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2564494>
12. Nabavi, R. T., & Bijandi, M. S. (2012). *Bandura's Social Learning Theory & Social Cognitive Learning Theory*. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267750204_Bandura's_Social_Learning_Theory_Social_Cognitive_Learning_Theory
13. Nadeem, M. (2024). Distributed leadership in educational contexts: A catalyst for school improvement. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 9, 100835. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.100835>
14. Pablo, V. B., Cerdiño, L. L., Panen, S. S., Veloz, P. L., & Francisco A. Rivas, R. (2025). Synthesizing Profiles of Public School Teachers for an Informed Strategic Work-Life Balance. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, IX(IIIS), 438–450. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.903SEDU0027>
15. Piaget, J., & Inhelder, B. (with Internet Archive). (1969). *The psychology of the child*. New York, Basic Books. <http://archive.org/details/psychologyofchil00piag>
16. Primarni, A., Hoxha, A., & Rzayev, R. (2024). The Role of Constructivism in Modern Educational Philosophy: A Comparative Analysis. *ResearchGate*. <https://doi.org/10.70177/ijen.v2i6.1691>
17. Ralebese, M. D., Jita, L., & Badmus, O. T. (2025). Examining Primary School Principals' Instructional Leadership Practices: A Case Study on Curriculum Reform and Implementation. *Education Sciences*, 15(1), 70. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15010070>
18. Richardson, L. (2024). The Role Of Educational Leadership In Enhancing Student Engagement And Learning Outcomes. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 28(2S), 1–2.
19. Sanchez, J., & Watson, J. (2021). Effective Instructional Leadership Practices in High Performing Elementary Schools. *Journal of School Administration Research and Development*, 6(2), 60–70. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jsard.v6i2.3975>
20. Sariakin, S., Yeni, M., Usman, M. B., Mare, A. S., Munzir, M., & Saleh, M. (2025). Fostering a productive educational environment: The roles of leadership, management practices, and teacher motivation. *Frontiers in Education*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1499064>
21. Tsehay, S., Belay, M., & Seifu, A. (2024). *Challenges in constructivist teaching: Insights from social studies teachers in middle-level schools, West Gojjam Zone, Ethiopia*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2372198>

22. Violon, J., & Violon, M. (2023). *Analyzing the Impact of RA 10533 on Implementing K-12 Curriculum* (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. 4986203). Social Science Research Network. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4986203>
23. Vygotsky. (n.d.). *Mind in Society—Harvard University Press*. Retrieved June 3, 2026, from https://www.hup.harvard.edu/books/9780674576292?utm_source=chatgpt.com