

Assessing the Instructional Leadership of Elementary School Administrators at Parang West District, Sulu Division: Teachers' Perspectives

Widzdhan J. Mandangan^{1*}, Masnona S. Asiri^{2*}

School of Graduate Studies, Sulu State College, Jolo, Sulu, 4700, Philippines

*Corresponding author: sscgspub@sulustatecollege.edu.ph

ABSTRACT. This study investigated teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership practices of elementary school administrators in the Parang West District, Sulu Division. A descriptive–correlational research design was utilized, involving 100 teacher-respondents selected through purposive sampling during the School Year 2025–2026. Data were gathered using a carefully developed questionnaire adapted from Hallinger and Murphy (1985) and were analyzed using descriptive statistics, independent samples t-test, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and Pearson correlation coefficient. The results revealed that instructional leadership practices were generally rated at a very high level across all dimensions, including defining the school's mission, managing instructional programs, promoting a positive learning environment, and supervising and evaluating instruction. Significant differences were observed when respondents were grouped according to age, gender, and civil status, while no significant differences were found based on length of service and educational attainment. Furthermore, the correlation analysis showed strong and significant positive relationships among the different dimensions of instructional leadership. Overall, the findings suggest that instructional leadership functions as a cohesive system of practices that collectively enhance teaching effectiveness and student learning within the district.

KEYWORDS: *instructional leadership, school administrators, teachers' perceptions, school leadership practices, elementary education, Parang West District, Sulu*

ARTICLE DETAILS

JEAS-00078; Received: December 29, 2025; Accepted: January 12, 2026; Published: January 26, 2026

CITATION:

Mandangan, W. J. & Masnona, A. S. (2026). Assessing the Instructional Leadership of Elementary School Administrators at Parang West District, Sulu Division: Teachers' Perspectives. *Journal of Education and Academic Settings*, 3(1). DOI: 10.62596/ffk7vg80

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2026 by author(s). *Journal of Education and Academic Settings* is published by Stratworks Research Inc. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), allowing redistribution and reproduction in any format or medium, provided the original work is cited or recognized.

1. INTRODUCTION

Instructional leadership has been widely acknowledged as an important factor in improving school effectiveness and student achievement across educational settings. Studies have shown that school principals who demonstrate strong instructional leadership can positively influence teaching performance, enhance student learning, and contribute to overall school improvement (Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Leithwood et al., 2020). As leaders of instruction, principals are expected to establish a clear direction for the school and guide teachers toward achieving educational goals (Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008).

Effective instructional leadership encompasses defining the school's mission, aligning resources with instructional priorities, fostering a positive learning environment, and using data-driven decision-making to improve teaching and learning (Day, Gu, & Sammons, 2016). Moreover, collaborative leadership practices between school administrators and teachers contribute to the development of professional learning communities that support innovation, shared accountability, and continuous improvement (Bush, 2011). These leadership practices are particularly critical in addressing disparities in educational outcomes, especially in under-resourced and marginalized communities where school leadership plays a central role in influencing teacher engagement and student success (Marks & Printy, 2003).

In the Philippine educational context, instructional leadership is a fundamental responsibility of school administrators, particularly elementary school principals. The Department of Education (DepEd) mandates that school heads act as instructional leaders who guide teaching and learning processes, monitor instructional delivery, and support teachers' professional growth (DepEd, 2016). Empirical studies in the local context further affirm that principals' leadership significantly affects instructional quality, curriculum implementation, and student academic performance (Pangilinan, 2018; Reyes, 2020).

Despite its importance, the effective implementation of instructional leadership in Philippine schools faces several challenges. These include limited access to professional development, inadequate resources, large class sizes, and diverse learner needs within varied socio-cultural environments (Sarmiento, 2017). As a result, school administrators are required not only to fulfill administrative responsibilities but also to lead instructional improvement efforts, create supportive learning environments, and implement data-informed strategies to enhance student outcomes (David, 2019). Teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership are particularly valuable, as they reflect the actual influence of school administrators on classroom practices and provide insights into leadership effectiveness.

At the local level, Parang West District in Sulu reflects a distinct educational setting marked by geographic isolation, limited resources, and various socio-economic challenges. In this situation, school administrators play an important role in directing instructional practices, supporting effective curriculum delivery, and creating a positive learning environment. Their responsibilities include setting the school's direction, managing instructional programs, promoting a supportive atmosphere, and overseeing teaching processes, all of which contribute to improving the quality of education in the district.

Understanding teachers' views on instructional leadership is therefore important in identifying areas of strength and opportunities for improvement in school management. These insights may guide professional development efforts, inform policy decisions, and enhance overall instructional effectiveness. Considering the limited number of studies focusing on instructional leadership in geographically isolated areas such as Parang West District, Sulu, there is a need to explore how teachers perceive the leadership practices of elementary school administrators in this setting.

This study aimed to assess teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership of elementary school administrators in Parang West District, Sulu Division, by examining key leadership domains and determining differences across demographic variables, as well as the relationships among these domains.

2. METHODS

2.1. Research Design

This study utilized a descriptive–correlational research design with a quantitative approach to explore teachers’ perceptions of the instructional leadership of elementary school administrators in Parang West District, Sulu Division. This approach enabled the evaluation of instructional leadership practices across key domains, as well as the analysis of differences based on demographic variables and the relationships among these domains.

2.2. Research Locale

The study was conducted in selected public elementary schools in Parang West District, Division of Sulu, during the School Year 2025–2026. The district comprises a mix of schools situated in geographically and socio-economically diverse communities, providing a relevant context for examining teachers’ perceptions of instructional leadership.

2.3. Participants of the Study

A total of 100 elementary school teachers participated in the study. The respondents were drawn from ten (10) public elementary schools within the district, with ten teachers selected from each school to ensure balanced representation. All participants were actively engaged in classroom instruction and were considered capable of providing relevant insights regarding the instructional leadership practices of their respective school administrators.

Table 1. Distribution Of Respondents According to School

SCHOOLS	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
1. Alu Layag Layag Elementary School	10
2. Alu Pangkoh Primary School	10
3. Hji. Panglima Tingkahan Elementary School	10
4. Kahoy Sinah Elementary School	10
5. Kutah Sairap Elementary School	10
6. Lower Sampunay Primary School	10
7. Sampunay Primary School	10
8. Silangkan Elementary School	10
9. Utoh Laja Elementary School	10
10. Buka-Buka Primary School	10
Total:	100

2.4. Sampling Procedure

A purposive sampling method, which falls under non-probability sampling, was used in selecting the participants. Teachers were chosen based on their active involvement in classroom instruction and their ability to provide relevant information regarding the instructional leadership practices of their school administrators.

2.5. Research Instrument

Data were gathered through a carefully developed questionnaire derived from the instructional leadership framework of Hallinger and Murphy (1985), with slight modifications to fit the local setting of the study. The instrument consisted of two main sections: the first part collected respondents’ demographic information, including age, gender, civil status, length of service, and educational attainment; while the second part measured instructional leadership practices using 40 items grouped into four domains—defining the school’s mission, managing instructional programs, promoting a positive school learning environment, and monitoring and evaluating instruction.

Table 2. Scale Used for Interpreting Responses

Point	Scale Range	Interpretation
5	4.50 – 5.00	Always
4	3.50 – 4.49	Often
3	2.50 – 3.49	Sometimes
2	1.50 – 2.49	Seldom
1	1.00 – 1.49	Never

2.6 Data Gathering Procedure

Before the data collection process, approval to conduct the study was secured from the Schools Division Office of Sulu as well as from the school heads in Parang West District. The researcher personally distributed the questionnaires to the respondents and retrieved them after completion. Clear instructions were given to guide the respondents, and confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained to encourage honest and accurate responses.

2.7 Ethical Considerations

Ethical principles were carefully followed throughout the conduct of the study. Participation of respondents was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained prior to their involvement. The privacy of the participants was protected by ensuring confidentiality and anonymity, with no personally identifiable information being collected. The researcher upheld objectivity and integrity during data collection, analysis, and reporting. In addition, ethical clearance was obtained from the appropriate institutional review body before the start of the study.

3. RESULTS

Table 3. Demographic Profile of Respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Age	25 years old and below	7	7%
	26–35 years old	31	31%
	36 years old and above	62	62%
Gender	Male	6	6%
	Female	94	94%
Civil Status	Single	26	26%
	Married	66	66%
	Widowed/Separated	8	8%
Length of Service	5 years and below	24	24%
	6–10 years	33	33%
	11–15 years	16	16%
	16 years and above	27	27%
Educational Attainment	Bachelor’s Degree	80	80%
	Bachelor’s w/ Master’s Units	16	16%
	Master’s Degree	1	1%
	Doctorate Degree	3	3%

The data indicate that the majority of respondents are aged 36 years and above, predominantly female, and married. Most have moderate to long teaching experience, with the largest group having 6–10 years of service. In terms of educational attainment, most respondents are bachelor’s degree holders, with a smaller proportion pursuing graduate studies.

Domain	Mean	SD	Description
Defining the School’s Mission	4.648	0.272	Always
Managing the Instructional Program	4.654	0.276	Always

Promoting a Positive School Learning Climate	4.690	0.545	Always
Monitoring and Evaluating Instruction	4.578	0.288	Always

All instructional leadership domains were rated “Always,” indicating a consistently high level of perceived leadership practices among school administrators. Among the domains, promoting a positive school learning climate obtained the highest mean, while monitoring and evaluating instruction had the lowest, though still within the highest rating category.

Table 5. Differences According to Age (ANOVA)

Domain	F-value	p-value	Decision
Defining the School’s Mission	7.647	0.001	Significant
Managing the Instructional Program	0.881	0.418	Not Significant
Promoting a Positive School Learning Climate	0.433	0.650	Not Significant
Monitoring and Evaluating Instruction	0.190	0.828	Not Significant

A significant difference was observed in defining the school’s mission across age groups, while no significant differences were found in the other instructional leadership domains. This suggests that perceptions related to mission-setting may vary with age, whereas other leadership practices are perceived similarly across age groups.

Table 6. Differences According to Gender (t-test)

Domain	t-value	p-value	Decision
Defining the School’s Mission	-2.024	0.046	Significant
Managing the Instructional Program	-0.036	0.971	Not Significant
Promoting a Positive School Learning Climate	-0.383	0.703	Not Significant
Monitoring and Evaluating Instruction	-0.978	0.331	Not Significant

A significant difference was found in defining the school’s mission between male and female respondents. However, no significant differences were observed in the remaining domains, indicating generally consistent perceptions across gender in most instructional leadership practices.

Table 7. Differences According to Civil Status (ANOVA)

Domain	F-value	p-value	Decision
Defining the School’s Mission	10.623	0.000	Significant
Managing the Instructional Program	2.987	0.055	Significant
Promoting a Positive School Learning Climate	2.140	0.123	Not Significant
Monitoring and Evaluating Instruction	2.444	0.092	Not Significant

The results indicate that differences across civil status groups were evident in certain aspects of instructional leadership, particularly in setting the school’s direction and overseeing instructional programs. In contrast, no meaningful differences were observed in areas related to maintaining a positive learning environment and supervising instructional practices.

Table 8. Differences According to Length of Service (ANOVA)

Domain	F-value	p-value	Decision
Defining the School’s Mission	2.544	0.061	Not Significant
Managing the Instructional Program	2.115	0.103	Not Significant

Promoting a Positive School Learning Climate	1.144	0.335	Not Significant
Monitoring and Evaluating Instruction	1.438	0.237	Not Significant

No significant differences were found across all instructional leadership domains when grouped according to length of service, indicating that perceptions remain consistent regardless of teaching experience

Table 9. Differences According to Educational Attainment (ANOVA)

Domain	F-value	p-value	Decision
Defining the School’s Mission	0.258	0.855	Not Significant
Managing the Instructional Program	1.412	0.244	Not Significant
Promoting a Positive School Learning Climate	0.328	0.805	Not Significant
Monitoring and Evaluating Instruction	0.115	0.951	Not Significant

No significant differences were observed across all domains when grouped according to educational attainment, suggesting that teachers share similar perceptions regardless of their academic qualifications.

Table 10. Correlation Among Instructional Leadership Domains

Variables	r-value	p-value	Description
Defining Mission & Managing Program	0.530	0.000	High Correlation
Defining Mission & Learning Climate	0.450	0.000	Moderate Correlation
Defining Mission & Monitoring	0.463	0.000	Moderate Correlation
Managing Program & Learning Climate	0.688	0.000	High Correlation
Managing Program & Monitoring	0.773	0.000	Very High Correlation
Learning Climate & Monitoring	0.732	0.000	Very High Correlation

The findings show that there are significant positive relationships among all domains of instructional leadership. Strong associations were particularly evident between the management of instructional programs and the supervision of teaching practices, as well as between fostering a positive learning environment and instructional supervision. These results suggest that the different dimensions of instructional leadership are closely interconnected.

4. DISCUSSION

The results indicate that teachers generally view the instructional leadership of elementary school administrators in Parang West District as being implemented at a very high level across all areas. Specifically, aspects such as setting the school’s direction, overseeing instructional programs, fostering a positive learning environment, and supervising instructional practices were consistently rated as “Always,” reflecting strong and consistent leadership performance.

These findings suggest that school administrators are effectively carrying out their responsibilities as instructional leaders and are actively involved in improving teaching and learning processes. Moreover, the results are consistent with the work of Quimpo (2017) and Reyes (2015), who emphasized that clearly defined school goals and well-aligned instructional practices contribute to improved teacher performance and overall organizational effectiveness.

Among the domains, promoting a positive school learning climate obtained the highest rating, highlighting the importance of supportive environments in fostering teacher engagement and instructional effectiveness. This indicates that administrators prioritize collaboration, recognition, and a positive working atmosphere, which are essential in sustaining teacher motivation and productivity. This finding is consistent with Dela Cruz and Santos (2018), who reported that

principals who cultivate positive school climates significantly influence teaching practices and classroom outcomes. Similarly, Torres (2016) found that supportive leadership enhances teacher motivation and promotes stronger student engagement.

The results further revealed that monitoring and evaluating instruction, although still rated highly, obtained the lowest mean among the four domains. This suggests that while administrators are actively engaged in evaluation processes, there may be relatively less emphasis on systematic monitoring compared to other leadership practices. Nevertheless, the consistently high rating indicates that evaluation remains an integral component of instructional leadership. This finding aligns with Manalo (2021), who emphasized that continuous monitoring and feedback are essential in improving teaching effectiveness. Likewise, Cordero (2017) highlighted that structured evaluation processes contribute to improved instructional quality and curriculum implementation.

In terms of demographic differences, the study found that age significantly influences teachers' perceptions only in defining the school's mission, while no significant differences were observed in other domains. This suggests that perceptions related to vision-setting may vary across age groups, but overall instructional leadership practices are consistently experienced regardless of age. Similarly, gender differences were significant only in defining the school's mission, indicating minimal variation in perceptions across male and female teachers. These findings suggest a generally uniform perception of leadership practices across demographic groups.

The analysis also showed that differences emerged when respondents were grouped based on civil status, particularly in areas related to setting the school's direction and managing instructional activities. This suggests that certain personal or social characteristics may influence how teachers view specific leadership practices.

In contrast, no meaningful differences were observed in aspects related to maintaining a positive learning environment and supervising instructional processes, indicating that these areas are perceived similarly regardless of civil status.

On the other hand, no significant differences were found when respondents were grouped according to length of service and educational attainment. This indicates that teachers, regardless of experience or academic qualifications, share similar perceptions of instructional leadership. Such consistency suggests that leadership practices within the district are uniformly implemented and experienced across the teaching workforce.

The results of the correlation analysis indicate strong positive relationships among all domains of instructional leadership. The most notable associations were found between the management of instructional programs and instructional supervision, as well as between the promotion of a positive learning environment and supervisory practices.

These findings suggest that the different areas of instructional leadership are closely linked, such that improvements in one aspect may contribute to enhancements in others. This supports the idea that effective instructional leadership functions as an integrated system of practices rather than as separate or independent components.

Overall, the findings highlight that instructional leadership in Parang West District is characterized by strong, consistent, and interconnected practices across multiple domains. The high level of perceived leadership effectiveness suggests that school administrators play a critical role in fostering a supportive learning environment, guiding instructional processes, and ensuring the continuous improvement of teaching and learning outcomes.

5. CONCLUSION

The findings of the study indicate that teachers in Parang West District perceive the instructional leadership of elementary school administrators to be consistently implemented at a high level across all areas. These include setting the school's direction, managing instructional activities, fostering a positive learning environment, and supervising instructional practices. Among these domains, creating a positive learning environment was identified as the most prominent, while instructional supervision appeared to be less emphasized compared to the other areas. The results further revealed that teachers' perceptions are generally consistent across age, gender, length of service, and educational attainment, indicating a uniform experience of instructional leadership practices within the district. However, variations were observed when grouped according to civil status, suggesting that certain personal factors may influence how leadership practices are perceived. Moreover, significant positive relationships were identified among all instructional leadership domains, indicating that these practices function as interconnected components of effective school leadership. Overall, the findings highlight that instructional leadership in Parang West District is characterized by strong, consistent, and integrated practices that support teaching and learning processes.

Acknowledgement

The authors confirm that this study is entirely original and independently conducted. All ideas, analysis, and writing were developed by the authors, with AI tools used only for minor grammar and language refinement. The authors assume full responsibility for the accuracy and integrity of the work.

REFERENCES

- Alvarez, M. (2020). *Instructional supervision and teacher development in Quezon City public elementary schools*. Quezon City: Philippine Normal University Press.
- Aquino, F. (2020). *Instructional leadership practices and teacher motivation in public schools of Pampanga*. Pampanga: Holy Angel University Research Center.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid: The key to leadership excellence*. Gulf Publishing.
- Bush, T. (2008). *Leadership and management development in education*. London: Sage Publications.
- Bush, T. (2011). *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management*. Sage Publications.
- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2014). School leadership models: What do we know?. *School Leadership & Management*, 34(5), 553–571. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2014.928680>
- Cordero, E. (2017). *Monitoring and evaluating instruction: A study on public elementary schools in Zambales*. Olongapo City: Polytechnic University of the Philippines Research Journal.
- David, R. (2019). The Role of Instructional Leadership in Enhancing Teaching and Learning in Philippine Schools. *Philippine Journal of Education Research*, 12(1), 45–61.

Day, C., & Leithwood, K. (2007). Successful principal leadership: International perspectives. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 35(3), 243–273. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143207079013>

Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2013). *Successful leadership: A review of research*. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.

Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(2), 221–258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15616841>

Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The Impact of Leadership on Student Outcomes: How Successful School Leaders Use Transformational and Instructional Strategies to Make a Difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(2), 221–258.

Day, C., Harris, A., & Hadfield, M. (2001). Challenging the orthodoxy of effective school leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 4(1), 39–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360312012000308442>

De Guzman, C. (2017). *Monitoring and evaluating instruction: Teacher perceptions in Rizal elementary schools*. Antipolo City: Rizal Technological University Publications.

Dela Cruz, R., & Santos, J. (2018). *Teacher perceptions on the instructional leadership of public elementary school principals in Cebu*. Cebu City: Cebu Normal University Press.

DepEd. (2016). DepEd Order No. 41, s. 2016 – Revised Guidelines on the Roles of School Heads as Instructional Leaders. Department of Education.

Fernandez, J. (2019). *Defining the school mission and instructional leadership practices in Quezon elementary schools*. Lucena City: Quezon State University Research Office.

Garcia, L. (2019). *The role of principals in managing instructional programs in Philippine elementary schools*. Davao City: Ateneo de Davao University Research Publications.

Garcia, P. (2020). *Instructional leadership and its impact on teacher development in Tarlac public schools*. Tarlac City: Tarlac State University Research Division.

Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13(4), 423–451. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(02\)00120-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00120-0)

Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 30 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111116699>

Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125–142.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980–1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9(2), 157–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0924345980090203>

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2010). Collaborative Leadership and School Improvement: Understanding the Impact on School Effectiveness. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(2), 227–249.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional leadership behavior of principals. *Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–247. <https://doi.org/10.1086/461445>

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional leadership behavior of principals. *Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–247.

Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. C. (2015). Assessing instructional leadership in East Asian schools: Conceptual and methodological issues. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 35(3), 371–389. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2015.1044510>

Laja, F. T and Sabdani-Asiri, M. L. (2024). Perceived teaching effectiveness of elementary school teachers at Parang District, Ministry of Basic, Higher and Technical Education in Sulu. *Journal of Education and Academic Settings*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.62596/ef172e53>

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 201–227. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450600565829>

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, 28(1), 27–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632430701800060>

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven Strong Claims About Successful School Leadership Revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22.

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22.

Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement.

Lopez, A., & Reyes, T. (2018). Leadership and school climate: An assessment from teachers' perspectives in Zambales schools. Olongapo City: Polytechnic University of the Philippines Research Journal.

Lopez, J. (2019). The impact of principals' instructional leadership on teacher motivation and performance in Cebu. Cebu City: Cebu Technological University Research Division.

Manalo, F. (2021). Teachers' perception of instructional leadership in public elementary schools in Mindoro. Occidental Mindoro: Mindoro State College of Agriculture and Technology Research Publications.

Marks, H. M., & Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 370–397. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X03253412>

Marks, H. M., & Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal Leadership and School Performance: An Integration of Transformational and Instructional Leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 370–397.

Marks, H., & Nance, W. (2007). The effects of instructional leadership on teacher motivation and student achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Leadership Review*, 8(1), 1–28.

Mendoza, L. (2019). Teachers' evaluation of principals' instructional supervision in Batangas elementary schools. Batangas City: Batangas State University Research Office.

Pangilinan, J. (2018). Instructional Leadership and Teacher Performance in Philippine Public Elementary Schools. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 38(3), 301–317.

Quimpo, A. (2017). Instructional leadership practices of elementary school heads in the Division of Manila. Manila: University of the Philippines Press.

Ramos, P. (2018). The influence of school heads' instructional leadership on student learning outcomes in Laguna. Laguna: Laguna State Polytechnic University Publications.

Reyes, A. (2020). Principals' Leadership Styles and Their Impact on Student Learning in Philippine Schools. *Philippine Educational Leadership Review*, 15(2), 87–104.

Reyes, C. (2015). Defining school mission and instructional leadership: Teacher insights from Batangas schools. Batangas City: Batangas State University Research Office.

Robinson, V. M. J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The leadership of the improvement of teaching and learning: Lessons from research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(3), 300–317. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X07307168>

Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635–674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321509>

Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The Impact of Leadership on Student Outcomes: An Analysis of the Differential Effects of Leadership Types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635–674.

Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635–674.

Robinson, V., Lloyd, C., & Rowe, K. (2009). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(5), 635–674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08331883>

Santos, M., & dela Cruz, J. (2017). *Instructional leadership and teacher performance: Evidence from public elementary schools in Cavite*. Cavite City: Cavite State University Research Division.

Santos, R. (2021). *Teachers' perceptions on principals' instructional leadership in public elementary schools of Mindoro*. Occidental Mindoro: Mindoro State College of Agriculture and Technology Research Publications.

Sarmiento, M. (2017). *Challenges in Instructional Leadership: Perspectives from Philippine Elementary Schools*. *Journal of Southeast Asian Education*, 5(1), 14–29.

Torres, P. (2016). *Leadership and learning climate: Teachers' assessment of school heads in Baguio City*. Baguio City: University of the Philippines Baguio Research Center.

Valdez, R., & Santos, M. (2018). *Teacher perceptions on principals' leadership and school performance in Iloilo City*. Iloilo City: University of the Philippines Visayas Press.

Villanueva, R. (2016). *Teachers' perceptions of school principals' instructional leadership in Davao City elementary schools*. Davao City: University of Mindanao Research Journal.