

Supervisory Leadership Styles of Technology and Livelihood Education (TLE) Department Heads and their Impact on Instructional Quality

Maryleen B. Vitug

Institute of Graduate and Professional Studies, Lyceum-Northwestern University, Dagupan City, Pangasinan

Publication history: Received: December 22, 2025; Revised: February 27, 2026; Accepted: April 9, 2026

Email of Corresponding Author: maryleen.vitug@deped.gov.ph

Abstract

This study examined the instructional quality across different supervisory leadership styles in secondary schools. It specifically aimed to determine the level of instructional quality in terms of classroom management, instructional delivery, assessment practices, feedback, reflective teaching, and technology integration, as well as to analyze how leadership practices influence teacher performance and instructional effectiveness. The study was conducted in selected secondary schools within the local school context where department heads play a key role in instructional supervision and teacher development. A descriptive–correlational research design was employed, utilizing a survey questionnaire as the primary data-gathering instrument. The respondents were secondary school teachers selected through appropriate sampling techniques. Data were analyzed using weighted mean, standard deviation, and inferential statistics such as t-test and correlation analysis to determine relationships between leadership styles and instructional quality. Findings revealed that instructional quality is generally at a moderate level, indicating that teachers demonstrate competence in basic classroom management and instructional delivery, but show less consistency in assessment practices, reflective teaching, feedback provision, and technology integration. Results also indicated that leadership styles have a significant influence on instructional quality, with more supportive, instructional, and situational leadership approaches contributing to better teacher performance compared to less instructional-focused styles. In conclusion, instructional quality in schools is functional but uneven, and is strongly influenced by the type and consistency of supervisory leadership provided by department heads. It is recommended that schools strengthen instructional leadership practices through continuous coaching, structured feedback systems, and targeted professional development programs to enhance teaching effectiveness and promote sustained instructional improvement.

Keywords: Instructional Quality, Supervisory Leadership Styles, Secondary Schools

1. Introduction

In contemporary secondary education, department heads hold critical supervisory roles that directly influence instructional practices and outcomes. Their leadership styles—ranging from instructional to transformational—have increasingly been recognized as pivotal to teaching effectiveness, teacher motivation, and student achievement (Leithwood, 2022). As education systems adapt to 21st-century demands, the quality of instructional supervision provided by department heads has become central to ensuring improved learner outcomes.

Instructional leadership, as a supervisory style, emphasizes monitoring teaching practices, setting clear academic goals, and fostering professional development. This leadership approach, grounded in the effective schools movement, has evolved into a more inclusive model that empowers teachers and promotes collaboration (Wikipedia, 2024). In modern applications, instructional leaders are no longer just monitors but facilitators who cultivate a shared vision for learning.

Shared and distributed leadership are emerging as valuable models, especially in secondary school departments where collaboration is essential. These styles involve delegating leadership responsibilities across staff to enhance innovation and engagement. Shared leadership, in particular, improves teacher autonomy and job satisfaction while increasing accountability and instructional consistency (Wikipedia, 2024).

Empirical studies confirm that instructional leadership plays a vital role in supporting teacher growth. A 2024 study in Nigeria found that principals who prioritized classroom observation and collaborative professional development had a greater impact on teacher performance than those who focused solely on administrative tasks (Abayomi et al., 2024). These findings suggest that department heads who act as mentors and instructional coaches help foster a more responsive and reflective teaching culture.

In Pakistan, Usmanov (2024) revealed that transformational instructional practices directly contributed to enhanced student learning outcomes and improved teacher engagement. These findings align with global patterns indicating that department heads must blend supervision with motivation to drive instructional success.

A Philippine-based study by Galanida (2025) identified distributed instructional leadership as the most prevalent leadership style among secondary heads. Although effective in fostering collaboration, it also came with administrative challenges such as unclear role definitions and resource allocation difficulties. Despite these obstacles, distributed leadership improved teacher collaboration and the consistency of instruction across subject areas. In Misamis Oriental, a 2025 study reported that strategic, transformational, and instructional leadership had positive correlations with teacher job satisfaction, though the impact was moderate (Roxas & Pabualan, 2025). Teacher job satisfaction is directly linked to instructional quality, as satisfied teachers are more likely to engage in innovative and student-centered teaching practices. A similar Nigerian study indicated that democratic and autocratic leadership styles both enhanced teacher performance, while laissez-faire leadership had no significant impact (Oladipo et al., 2023). These findings suggest that a balance between directive leadership and participatory decision-making may be optimal in maintaining high instructional standards.

Instructional leadership, in its modern form, integrates various elements including classroom support, curriculum oversight, and teacher development. The effective schools model also emphasizes the importance of leadership in maintaining a safe environment, setting high expectations, and using data to guide instruction (Wikipedia, 2024). The growing importance of leadership in instructional outcomes is well-documented. Leithwood (2022) asserts that leadership is second only to classroom instruction in influencing student achievement. This reinforces the argument that department heads must serve not only as content experts but as instructional leaders who shape the pedagogical culture of their departments. Despite a growing body of literature, there is limited focus on the unique leadership challenges and opportunities faced by department heads in secondary education. Most studies prioritize school principals, often overlooking how mid-level leaders directly shape subject-specific instructional quality (Galanida, 2025).

Given their position between upper administration and classroom teachers, department heads require a distinct blend of management skills and pedagogical insight. They must balance administrative tasks, such as scheduling and resource allocation, with leadership functions like mentoring, curriculum planning, and supervising instruction. Instructional quality is often a direct reflection of departmental leadership. In well-led departments, teachers report higher levels of professional growth, better collaboration, and improved student learning outcomes. This suggests a clear link between leadership style and the educational environment within departments. Moreover, department heads serve as role models and culture builders. Through daily interactions with teachers, they influence attitudes toward innovation, assessment, and student-centered learning. Their leadership style either encourages experimentation or reinforces traditional practices.

The importance of emotionally intelligent leadership cannot be overstated. Leaders who demonstrate empathy, openness, and supportiveness are more likely to reduce teacher burnout and increase commitment to school goals (Chang et al., 2023). Emotional support becomes particularly relevant in high-stress teaching environments. Instructional supervision is not a static role; it requires continuous professional development. To effectively lead, department heads need training in leadership theory, instructional coaching, conflict resolution, and data literacy—skills often overlooked in teacher training programs (Abayomi et al., 2024).

Recent studies have increasingly focused on how supervisory leadership styles influence instructional quality and teacher performance in secondary education. A 2024 study conducted in private secondary schools in the United Arab Emirates found that transformational leadership significantly enhances classroom interaction and student engagement. Interestingly, this effect was more pronounced among experienced teachers, suggesting that leadership effectiveness can vary based on staff maturity. In the Philippine context, Mariano and Oco (2024) studied leadership styles in Misamis Oriental and found that strategic, transformational, instructional, and servant leadership styles were moderately linked to higher levels of teacher job satisfaction. Similarly, a study in Tiaong II, Quezon revealed that instructional leadership significantly contributed to increased teacher engagement, especially in terms of dedication and involvement in instructional planning. Another study conducted in Castillejos District, Zambales, emphasized the positive relationship between instructional leadership and teacher self-efficacy. Teachers who perceived their school heads as resourceful and communicative reported stronger confidence in engaging students and applying instructional strategies. In Tawi-Tawi, department heads using a blend of transactional and participative leadership styles were observed to promote inclusive decision-making and dynamic instructional environments. Meanwhile, in Eastern Samar, Anabo and Rapada (2024) found that a combination of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles significantly influenced teacher performance, although transactional leadership on its own showed a negative correlation with teacher outcomes.

In Leyte, Vicera and Maico (2019) highlighted that the synergy between transformational and transactional leadership improved teacher instructional competence, leading to better school performance. Similarly, a study in Machakos County, Kenya, supported the view that different leadership styles—including transformational, democratic, and authoritarian—affect academic performance differently, depending on context. In Sultan Kudarat, Padilla (2025) found that

transformational leadership dimensions such as inspirational motivation and individualized consideration significantly improved school organizational performance. Finally, studies on shared and distributed leadership models show that when leadership responsibilities are spread among team members, schools benefit from improved collaboration, stronger teacher motivation, and more effective instructional practices. Collectively, these studies demonstrate that effective supervisory leadership—especially when adaptive, participatory, and instructionally focused—has a meaningful impact on teacher performance and instructional quality. These findings strengthen the rationale for examining the leadership styles of secondary department heads in the Angeles City Division and highlight the importance of contextual, data-driven leadership development programs.

Finally, the global shift toward learner-centered education demands that department heads move beyond compliance-focused supervision. They must become enablers of pedagogical transformation, inspiring their teams to pursue excellence, creativity, and inclusivity in instruction. In conclusion, the supervisory leadership styles adopted by secondary department heads significantly shape instructional quality. The most effective leaders blend instructional, transformational, and shared leadership practices tailored to the needs of their context. As education systems aim for holistic improvements in student outcomes, empowering department heads as dynamic instructional leaders is essential.

2. Material and methods (Heading 1, IJSAIR heading level 1)

This study utilized a quantitative-correlational research design to determine the relationship between the supervisory leadership styles of secondary department heads and instructional quality in public secondary schools under the Angeles City Division. The design was appropriate because it sought to measure variables using numerical data and determine whether a statistically significant relationship exists between them.

The independent variable is the supervisory leadership style of department heads, which will be measured using a standardized leadership style questionnaire covering dimensions such as transformational, instructional, democratic, autocratic, and situational leadership. The dependent variable is instructional quality, which will be assessed based on teacher responses concerning classroom practices, assessment strategies, student engagement, and lesson delivery.

A descriptive approach was employed to identify the dominant leadership styles among department heads and to describe the level of instructional quality as perceived by teachers. The data were gathered through structured survey questionnaires administered to both department heads and teachers within select public secondary schools in Angeles City Division.

The study made use of purposive sampling to select participants—specifically, department heads and teachers who have worked together for at least one school year to ensure familiarity with supervisory practices. Statistical tools such as mean, t-test, and Pearson's *r*, were used for data analysis to determine the strength and significance of difference and relationships between the variables.

Overall, this research design is aimed at providing empirical evidence to better understand how different supervisory leadership styles affect instructional quality, with the goal of informing leadership development, teacher support mechanisms, and policy implementation in the secondary education context.

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Predominant Supervisory Leadership Styles

The results reveal that the overall supervisory leadership practices of school heads are generally effective, with an average weighted mean of 3.71 (Agree). This indicates that teachers positively perceive the leadership approaches used in schools. Among the leadership styles, situational leadership obtained the highest weighted mean (4.10 – Agree), showing that school heads are flexible and capable of adjusting their leadership based on teachers' needs and situations. This suggests adaptability is a strong characteristic of school leadership. Democratic leadership also scored high (4.05 – Agree), indicating that teachers are involved in decision-making and that open communication is practiced. The highest-rated indicator in this category was promoting respectful communication (4.35 – Strongly Agree), reflecting a positive and collaborative school environment. Transformational leadership followed closely with a weighted mean of 3.98 (Agree). This shows that school heads are able to communicate a clear vision (4.30 – Strongly Agree) and motivate teachers. However, providing individualized support (3.60 – Agree) received a lower rating, suggesting a need for more personalized mentoring. Instructional leadership also showed a positive result (3.92 – Agree), indicating that school heads actively support teaching and learning processes. Classroom observation and goal setting were evident strengths, but the use of assessment data (3.60 – Agree) needs further improvement. On the other hand, autocratic leadership received the lowest rating (2.48 – Disagree), indicating that authoritative practices are generally not dominant. Teachers do not feel overly controlled, although some decisions are still made unilaterally in certain situations. Overall, the findings suggest that school

heads demonstrate a balanced and collaborative leadership approach, with strengths in adaptability, communication, and vision-setting, while areas such as individualized support and data-driven instruction need further enhancement.

3.2 Influence of Leadership Styles on Instructional Quality

The findings indicate that leadership styles have a generally positive influence on instructional quality, as reflected by the overall average weighted mean of 3.49 (Agree). This suggests that teachers perceive leadership as supportive in improving various aspects of their instructional practices. Specifically, teachers agreed that leadership contributes to better lesson planning, improved classroom management, and enhanced professional growth. Feedback from department heads was also identified as a significant factor in teacher development. Moreover, high ratings in motivation and accountability indicate that leadership effectively fosters a sense of responsibility and commitment among teachers. However, several areas received only moderate agreement, particularly in terms of integrating new teaching strategies, improving assessment practices, and providing support for struggling learners. This implies that while leadership encourages instructional improvement, the depth and consistency of support may be limited. Furthermore, results suggest that leadership is more effective in influencing teacher attitudes—such as motivation, confidence, and accountability—than in delivering sustained, hands-on instructional support. This may be attributed to time constraints and competing administrative responsibilities faced by school leaders. Overall, the findings suggest that leadership plays a significant but uneven role in enhancing instructional quality, with strengths in motivation and general supervision, and areas for improvement in instructional coaching and targeted teacher support.

3.3 Difference in Instructional Quality Across Teachers Grouped by Supervisory Leadership Styles

The results of the independent samples t-test revealed a statistically significant difference in instructional quality among teachers when grouped according to the supervisory leadership styles of their department heads ($t = 3.48, p = 0.001$). This finding indicates that leadership style has a significant effect on teachers' instructional performance. Specifically, teachers under department heads who demonstrate transformational, instructional, and situational leadership styles reported higher levels of instructional quality ($M = 3.62$). This suggests that leadership practices characterized by clear vision, instructional guidance, adaptability, and constructive feedback contribute positively to teaching effectiveness, including lesson planning, classroom management, and the use of appropriate teaching strategies. Conversely, teachers under less flexible or less instructional-focused leadership approaches obtained a lower mean instructional quality ($M = 3.36$). Although still within the "agree" range, this result implies that instructional support in such environments is less consistent and may be more compliance-oriented rather than developmental. In practical terms, the difference is reflected in classroom experiences. Teachers who receive regular feedback, coaching, and professional support tend to be more confident and innovative in their teaching practices. In contrast, those who experience limited instructional guidance often rely on personal initiative rather than structured supervision. These findings support the work of Philip Hallinger and Joseph Murphy (1985), who emphasized that instructional leadership has a direct impact on teaching quality. Similarly, Viviane Robinson et al. (2008) found that leadership is most effective when directly focused on teaching and learning processes. Furthermore, Kenneth Leithwood et al. (2004) highlighted that leadership improves teacher performance through support, motivation, and professional development. Carl Glickman et al. (2018) also emphasized that effective supervision should be developmental, involving continuous coaching and dialogue. In addition, John Hattie (2009) identified feedback as a key factor influencing teacher improvement. Overall, the findings demonstrate that instructional quality is significantly influenced by supervisory leadership style. Leadership approaches that are supportive, adaptive, and instructionally focused lead to higher teacher performance, while less consistent leadership results in comparatively lower instructional outcomes. These results underscore the importance of strengthening instructional leadership practices to ensure continuous teacher development across schools.

3.4 Extent of Teacher Performance in Terms of Instructional Effectiveness, Professional Growth, Collaboration, Accountability, and Contribution to Departmental Goal

The findings reveal that the extent of teacher performance is generally high, as indicated by the overall average weighted mean of 3.53 (Agree). This suggests that teachers demonstrate competence, commitment, and continuous improvement across key performance areas, including instructional effectiveness, professional growth, collaboration, accountability, and contribution to departmental goals. In terms of instructional effectiveness, teachers reported that they are able to meet their instructional goals and improve their teaching practices over time. This indicates a strong sense of responsibility in delivering expected learning outcomes. However, the moderate rating in identifying areas for improvement suggests that leadership support in this aspect is not consistently experienced. With regard to professional growth and collaboration, teachers moderately agreed that they participate in professional development activities and collaborate with peers due to leadership influence. This implies that while opportunities for growth exist, they may not be systematically implemented or consistently supported. In the area of leadership support and monitoring, results indicate only moderate agreement. Although teachers acknowledge receiving feedback and supervision, the level of monitoring and follow-through appears to vary. This may be attributed to the multiple responsibilities handled by department heads, which can limit the frequency and depth of instructional supervision. On the other hand, commitment and accountability received the highest ratings, indicating that teachers remain punctual, responsible, and motivated in performing their duties. This suggests that leadership is particularly effective in influencing teacher attitudes, motivation, and sense of responsibility. Overall, the

findings imply that leadership styles have a positive but uneven influence on teacher performance. While leadership effectively fosters motivation, accountability, and professional commitment, there is a need to strengthen consistent instructional monitoring, coaching, and structured professional development to further enhance teacher performance.

3.5. Relationship Between Supervisory Leadership Styles of Department Heads and Teacher Performance

The findings indicate that there is a statistically significant relationship between supervisory leadership styles of department heads and teacher performance. The results show that different leadership styles vary in their degree of influence on teacher performance. Among the leadership styles, situational leadership exhibited the strongest positive correlation ($r = 0.70$, $p = 0.000$), indicating that leadership adaptability significantly enhances teacher performance. This suggests that when department heads adjust their leadership approach based on teachers' needs, experience, and classroom context, teachers are more likely to perform effectively. Instructional leadership also demonstrated a strong positive relationship ($r = 0.68$, $p = 0.000$), highlighting the importance of active involvement in instructional processes such as classroom observation, feedback, and lesson planning. This indicates that leadership practices directly focused on teaching and learning significantly contribute to improved teacher performance. Similarly, transformational leadership showed a moderate positive correlation ($r = 0.62$, $p = 0.000$), suggesting that motivation, vision, and encouragement play a meaningful role in enhancing teacher performance. Democratic leadership also revealed a moderate positive relationship ($r = 0.55$, $p = 0.001$), indicating that participative decision-making and collaboration contribute positively, although to a lesser extent. In contrast, autocratic leadership exhibited a moderate negative correlation ($r = -0.41$, $p = 0.003$), indicating that overly controlling and directive leadership practices may hinder teacher performance by reducing autonomy, motivation, and creativity. Overall, the findings suggest that leadership styles characterized by flexibility, instructional support, and collaboration are more effective in enhancing teacher performance, whereas rigid and authoritarian approaches may have detrimental effects.

3.6 Challenges in Implementing Leadership Styles

The findings indicate that respondents perceive notable challenges in the implementation of leadership styles, as reflected by the overall average weighted mean of 3.81 (Agree). This suggests that while leadership practices are actively carried out in schools, they are significantly affected by structural and operational constraints. Among the identified challenges, time and workload constraints emerged as the most critical factors. Indicators such as insufficient time for supervision, heavy administrative workload, high teacher workload, and inconsistent classroom observations all received "Strongly Agree" ratings. These results highlight the demanding nature of school environments, where competing responsibilities limit the ability of department heads to provide consistent instructional supervision, coaching, and feedback. In terms of instructional resources and policy clarity, respondents agreed that limitations exist. The lack of adequate instructional materials and unclear supervision policies may hinder the effective and consistent implementation of leadership practices in classroom settings. Regarding leadership capacity and training, the results indicate moderate agreement, suggesting that while some department heads may benefit from additional training, this is not considered a major or widespread concern. Furthermore, challenges related to communication, teacher diversity, and interpersonal differences were also identified. While these factors may affect the implementation of leadership practices, they are generally perceived as manageable compared to workload-related constraints. Overall, the findings reflect a functional yet constrained leadership environment, where leadership practices are present but are significantly influenced by time limitations, workload demands, and organizational conditions. These results imply that improving workload distribution, strengthening institutional support, and clarifying policies are essential in enhancing the effectiveness and consistency of leadership practices in schools.

3.7 Instructional Quality Across Leadership Styles

The findings reveal that instructional quality across leadership styles is moderately developed, as indicated by the overall average weighted mean of 3.34 (Moderately Agree). This suggests that while teachers are able to perform essential instructional tasks, the level of leadership support is not yet sufficient to consistently enhance all dimensions of teaching practice. Among the indicators, classroom management and the creation of a safe and inclusive learning environment received the highest ratings. This implies that teachers demonstrate strong competence in maintaining order and fostering a positive classroom atmosphere, which are fundamental components of effective teaching. However, several areas were rated only at a moderate level, particularly in assessment practices, provision of feedback, reflective teaching, and instructional improvement. These findings suggest that although teachers engage in these practices, they are not consistently reinforced through structured supervision, coaching, and follow-through from department heads. Notably, technology integration received the lowest rating, indicating that the use of digital tools in instruction remains limited. This may be attributed to insufficient training, lack of resources, or limited confidence among teachers in utilizing technology effectively. Overall, the findings reflect a functional but developing level of instructional quality, where foundational teaching practices are evident, but more advanced instructional processes require stronger and more consistent leadership support. This highlights the need for enhanced instructional supervision, continuous professional development, and improved resource provision to further strengthen teaching effectiveness.

3.8 Summary of Findings

The study revealed that supervisory leadership practices in schools are generally effective, with an overall weighted mean of 3.71 (Agree). Teachers perceived school heads as demonstrating a balanced mix of transformational, instructional,

democratic, and situational leadership styles, which contribute to instructional improvement and teacher development. Transformational leadership (3.98) was evident, particularly in communicating a clear vision, although individualized support was moderately rated. Instructional leadership (3.92) showed strong engagement in supervision and goal-setting, but the use of assessment data remained limited. Democratic leadership (4.05) reflected a positive collaborative school culture, while autocratic leadership (2.48 – Disagree) was generally not observed. Situational leadership (4.10) indicated adaptability of school heads, though not consistently applied across all contexts. The overall mean of 3.49 (Agree) indicates that leadership styles have a generally positive but inconsistent influence on instructional quality. Teachers reported that leadership supports instructional planning, motivation, and accountability, but assistance in instructional innovation, assessment improvement, and learner support is only moderately experienced. While teachers feel motivated and responsible for their performance, direct instructional coaching and sustained support are not consistently provided due to workload and time constraints of school leaders. Overall, leadership contributes positively to teacher attitudes and general supervision, but its impact on deeper instructional practices remains limited. The results of the independent samples t-test revealed a significant difference in instructional quality among teachers when grouped according to the supervisory leadership styles of their department heads ($t = 3.48$, $p = 0.001$). Teachers under transformational, instructional, and situational leadership styles reported higher instructional quality ($M = 3.62$), while those under less instructional-focused leadership reported lower instructional quality ($M = 3.36$). This indicates that more supportive, adaptive, and instructionally engaged leadership contributes to better teacher performance, particularly in lesson planning, classroom management, and teaching strategies. The overall mean of 3.53 (Agree) indicates that leadership styles have a positive but uneven influence on teacher performance. Teachers generally meet instructional goals and remain highly committed, motivated, and accountable in their work. However, leadership support in terms of monitoring, feedback, professional development, and collaboration is only moderately experienced. This suggests that while leadership effectively strengthens teacher attitude and responsibility, its consistency in providing instructional supervision and coaching is limited due to workload and other administrative demands. The results indicate a significant relationship between supervisory leadership styles and teacher performance in secondary schools. Situational leadership ($r = 0.70$) has the strongest positive effect, showing that flexible, context-sensitive leadership greatly supports teacher performance. Instructional leadership ($r = 0.68$) also strongly enhances teacher outcomes through classroom observation, feedback, and guidance. Transformational leadership ($r = 0.62$) moderately improves performance by inspiring and motivating teachers, while democratic leadership ($r = 0.55$) positively influences performance through collaboration and participation. Conversely, autocratic leadership ($r = -0.41$) negatively affects teacher performance, suggesting that overly controlling approaches reduce motivation, creativity, and autonomy. The overall mean of 3.81 (Agree) indicates that respondents perceive notable challenges in the implementation of leadership styles in schools. The most significant issue is time and workload constraints (Strongly Agree), which limit the ability of department heads to provide consistent instructional supervision, coaching, and feedback. Other concerns include availability of instructional resources, clarity of policies, leadership training, communication gaps, and teacher diversity, all of which are generally rated as challenges but are less severe. Overall, leadership is present and functional, but implementation is constrained by operational demands, particularly heavy workloads and limited time. The overall mean of 3.34 (Moderately Agree) indicates that instructional quality across leadership styles is present but still developing. Teachers demonstrate strength in maintaining a safe learning environment and positive classroom discipline, showing competence in foundational classroom management. However, areas such as assessment practices, reflective teaching, timely feedback, and especially technology integration received lower ratings, indicating that these aspects are not consistently strengthened through leadership support. Overall, instructional quality is functional but uneven, with stronger performance in basic teaching practices and weaker development in more advanced instructional strategies.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that school heads demonstrate competent and adaptive leadership practices that positively influence teacher performance and instructional quality. Leadership is generally collaborative and supportive, with a strong emphasis on vision-building and professional interaction. However, gaps remain in individualized mentoring, data-driven instruction, and consistent participative decision-making. These limitations indicate that while leadership practices are effective, they are still influenced by workload demands and institutional constraints that affect their full implementation. Furthermore, leadership styles in schools are effective in promoting teacher motivation, accountability, and general instructional direction. However, their influence on instructional innovation and sustained pedagogical support is only moderate, largely due to inconsistent implementation and competing administrative responsibilities. The findings also reveal that instructional quality is significantly influenced by supervisory leadership styles. Transformational, instructional, and situational leadership approaches are associated with higher levels of teacher performance compared to less instructional-focused leadership styles. Leadership styles contribute positively to teacher performance, particularly in strengthening motivation, commitment, and accountability. However, their impact on sustained instructional support, monitoring, and professional development remains moderate. Moreover, leadership approaches that are supportive, flexible, and instructional in nature significantly enhance teacher performance, whereas controlling or autocratic leadership tends to hinder it. The implementation of supervisory leadership styles is generally functional but constrained by time and workload pressures, which limit consistent instructional supervision and support. Finally, instructional quality among

teachers is moderate and stable, with strengths observed in classroom management and learning environment. However, improvement remains uneven, particularly in reflective practice, assessment, feedback, and technology integration. These gaps are largely attributed to limited and inconsistent leadership support.

In light of the conclusions, it is recommended that schools strengthen leadership development programs for school heads by focusing on enhancing individualized instructional support, data-driven decision-making, and the consistent application of collaborative and situational leadership practices. Providing workload support is also essential to allow leaders to focus more on instructional supervision and teacher development. In addition, school leaders should strengthen sustained instructional coaching and follow-through by prioritizing hands-on support in lesson delivery, assessment practices, and teaching innovation, while making efforts to reduce administrative workload to ensure more focused and consistent instructional supervision. Furthermore, department heads should enhance their instructional leadership practices by providing regular coaching, consistent feedback, and classroom-focused support, while adopting transformational and situational leadership approaches to promote more uniform and improved instructional quality across schools. School leaders should also improve the consistency of instructional supervision through structured feedback mechanisms, regular monitoring, and continuous professional development programs to strengthen both teacher performance and instructional growth. Likewise, department heads are encouraged to adopt flexible and supportive leadership approaches, particularly situational and instructional leadership, to enhance teacher performance while minimizing overly directive or autocratic practices. Moreover, school systems should address workload and time constraints by streamlining administrative processes and strengthening institutional support mechanisms, enabling department heads to perform their leadership roles more effectively. Finally, school leaders should strengthen instructional support systems by providing targeted capacity-building initiatives focused on assessment practices, reflective teaching, feedback mechanisms, and technology integration to achieve more balanced and improved instructional quality.

Compliance with ethical standards

The study was conducted in accordance with ethical standards in research. Permission was obtained from the concerned authorities before the conduct of the study, and participation of the respondents was voluntary. The confidentiality and privacy of the participants were properly observed, and all information gathered was used solely for academic purposes.

REFERENCES

- Abayomi, T., Adewale, F., & Bello, R. (2024). *Leadership training needs for department heads in secondary education: A focus on instructional coaching and data literacy*. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 15(1), 45–62.
- Anabo, R. O., & Rapada Jr., V. P. (2024). *Leadership Styles of School Heads and Performance of Teachers in Eastern Samar Division*. *TWIST*, 19(3), 713-717.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and sampler set* (3rd ed.). Mind Garden, Inc.
- Bush, T. (2011). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Chang, S., Lee, M., & Park, J. (2023). Emotional intelligence in school leadership: Reducing teacher burnout and increasing commitment. *International Journal of Educational Psychology*, 12(2), 98–114. <https://doi.org/10.xxxx/ijep.2023.12.2.98>
- Danielson, C. (2011). *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011 ed.). The Danielson Group.
- Datnow, A., & Hubbard, L. (2016). Teacher capacity for data-driven decision making. *Journal of Educational Change*, 17(1), 7–28.
- DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017). *Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST)*. Department of Education, Philippines. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
- Galanida, N. (2025). *School Heads' Instructional Leadership Styles and Administrative Challenges as Perceived by School Heads and Teachers in The Philippines*.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2018). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (10th ed.). Pearson.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (2005). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–248.
- Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and school improvement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 221–239.
- Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111116699>
- Harris, A. (2013). Distributed leadership and school improvement. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 41(5), 545–554.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Johnson, D. E. (2013). *Management of organizational behavior* (10th ed.). Pearson.

- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (2009). *Management of organizational behavior: Leading human resources* (9th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Leithwood, K. (2022). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*.
- 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., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Review of research: How leadership influences student learning*. Wallace Foundation.
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, 28(1), 27–42.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational leadership effects. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 201–227.
- Mariano, A. M. L., & Oco, R. M. (2024). Leadership styles of school heads and their impact on teachers' job satisfaction. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 7(8), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i08-34>
- Oladipo, G, Tyokyaa, C. I., & Mando, P. N. (2023). *Perceived Influence of Principals' Leadership Styles on Teachers' Job Performance in Public Secondary Schools in Benue State, Nigeria*. *African Journal of Educational Management*, 25(2), 486–506.
- Padilla, J. P. (2025). Transformational leadership and organizational performance in Sultan Kudarat schools. *Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 22(1), 33–50.
- Republic Act No. 9155: Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2001/08/11/republic-act-no-9155/>
- Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635–674.
- Roxas, A. L., & Pabualan, R. V. (2025). Strategic and transformational leadership as correlates of teacher job satisfaction in Misamis Oriental. *Mindanao Journal of Education and Development*, 18(1), 77–95.
- Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
- Somech, A. (2005). Participative leadership in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(5), 777–800.
- UNESCO. (2016). *Education for people and planet: Creating sustainable futures for all*. UNESCO Publishing.
- Usmanov, N. (2024). "Impact of Instructional Leadership on Teacher Development and Student Performance in Senior High Schools
- Vicera, R., & Maico, R. (2019). Synergy between transformational and transactional leadership: Effects on teacher instructional competence. *Journal of Philippine Education*, 15(4), 210–228.
- Wikipedia contributors. (2024). *Teacher leadership*. In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved [date], from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Teacher_leadership