

Instructional Leadership Paradigms and Faculty Performance in a Private Philippine Higher Education Institution

John Paul J. Payos¹, Pauline Grace D. Cera¹, Mary Catherine A. Rosales¹, Vienna S. Cruz¹,

Daniel C. Fajilan¹, Dhurie A. Bogador¹, Rosalina Pangilinan¹

¹*Master of Arts in Education, Major in Educational Management, Graduate School, University of Perpetual Help System Laguna, Biñan City, Laguna, Philippines*

Publication history: Received: June 21, 2026; Revised: July 13, 2026; Accepted: July 16, 2026

Email of Corresponding Author: c25-3420-529@uphsl.edu.ph

Abstract

This study examined the instructional leadership paradigms practiced by academic administrators at Asia Technological School of Science and Arts (ASIATECH) and determined their relationship with faculty performance in a private higher education institution. The study was anchored on the Instructional Leadership Model of Hallinger and Murphy and the Multifactor Leadership Theory of Bass and Avolio. Using a descriptive-correlational quantitative research design, data were gathered from 106 actively teaching faculty members through total enumeration. A researcher-made questionnaire adapted from the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) was used to assess instructional leadership, while official faculty performance evaluation records from the Human Resource Office served as the measure of faculty performance. Descriptive and inferential statistics, including weighted mean, standard deviation, Pearson product-moment correlation, and one-way analysis of variance, were employed to analyze the data. Findings revealed that academic administrators demonstrated a high level of instructional leadership, with managing the instructional program receiving the highest rating. Faculty performance was rated very satisfactory, with instructional competence emerging as the strongest performance dimension, while research and extension obtained comparatively lower ratings. A very strong and statistically significant positive relationship was found between instructional leadership and faculty performance, indicating that stronger instructional leadership is associated with improved faculty outcomes. No significant difference was observed in instructional leadership perceptions between full-time and part-time faculty members. The study concludes that effective instructional leadership contributes to enhanced faculty performance and institutional quality. It recommends strengthening leadership development programs, implementing structured instructional supervision, expanding faculty research support, promoting inclusive professional development initiatives, and conducting broader multi-institutional and longitudinal studies. This study supports Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4: Quality Education by promoting effective instructional leadership and improved teaching quality, and SDG 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth through faculty professional development and effective educational leadership. Its sustainability impact lies in providing evidence that informs institutional leadership, quality assurance, and continuous improvement initiatives that strengthen long-term academic excellence in higher education.

Keywords: Faculty Performance, Higher Education Institutions, Instructional Leadership, Outcomes-Based Education, Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS), Private Higher Education Institutions, Quality Assurance

1. Introduction

Instructional leadership is widely recognized as a key determinant of institutional effectiveness, faculty performance, and student learning outcomes. International evidence shows that leadership is second only to classroom instruction in influencing educational achievement, while regional studies emphasize that instructional leadership in Southeast Asia operates within distinct governance and cultural contexts requiring localized investigation [1–5]. In the Philippines, the implementation of the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) quality assurance framework has intensified the need for private higher education institutions (HEIs) to strengthen instructional leadership in promoting academic excellence [6–10]. Despite extensive international scholarship, empirical evidence on instructional leadership using the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) within private HEIs in Laguna remains limited [14–16]. This study therefore examined the instructional leadership paradigms practiced by academic administrators at Asia Technological School of Science and Arts (ASIATECH) and their relationship with faculty performance.

1.1 Background of Instructional Leadership and Faculty Performance in a Private Higher Education Institution

Instructional leadership, as defined by Hallinger and Murphy [11], encompasses administrative practices that focus on defining the institutional mission, managing instructional programs, and promoting a positive learning climate. The

growing body of literature has reaffirmed the importance of instructional leadership in improving teacher effectiveness, professional development, and institutional quality [12, 13]. Within the Philippine higher education system, instructional leadership has likewise been associated with faculty engagement, teaching effectiveness, and positive school climate under the country's quality assurance initiatives [6–10]. However, evidence remains limited regarding its application in private HEIs situated in semi-urban Laguna, particularly using a PIMRS-adapted framework [14–16].

1.2 Themes and Insights from Related Literature on Instructional Leadership and Faculty Performance

Existing literature consistently demonstrates that instructional leadership positively influences teacher and institutional outcomes. Hallinger and Heck [2] emphasized the contextual nature of instructional leadership in Southeast Asia, while Robinson et al. [14] reported that instructional leadership has the strongest direct effect on teacher effectiveness among leadership approaches. Similarly, Leithwood and Sun [15] confirmed the positive effects of transformational leadership on teacher outcomes. Philippine studies likewise revealed that instructional leadership predicts faculty engagement, teaching effectiveness, and school climate, highlighting its importance in improving faculty performance in higher education institutions [8–10].

1.3 Global, Regional, National, and Institutional Context of Instructional Leadership in Private HEIs

Globally, educational scholars have called for stronger empirical evidence linking leadership practices with measurable institutional outcomes across diverse educational systems [3, 4]. Within Southeast Asia, instructional supervision and faculty evaluation in private institutions remain underexplored despite their importance to institutional quality [5]. Nationally, CHED's Outcomes-Based Education and quality assurance policies require Philippine HEIs to demonstrate academic excellence through effective leadership and instructional management [6, 7]. At the institutional level, ASIATECH, a private higher education institution in Sta. Rosa City, Laguna, serves five colleges within one of the country's rapidly developing economic regions, making it an appropriate setting to investigate instructional leadership and faculty performance [16].

1.4 Theoretical and Conceptual Basis of Instructional Leadership and Faculty Performance

This study is anchored on the Instructional Leadership Model of Hallinger and Murphy [11], which identifies three core leadership domains: defining the school mission, managing the instructional programme, and promoting a positive school learning climate. The framework has been validated in higher education and demonstrated cross-cultural applicability in Southeast Asia [2, 17]. Complementing this model is the Multifactor Leadership Theory of Bass and Avolio [18], which classifies leadership behaviors into transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire approaches. Together, these frameworks explain instructional leadership both in terms of leadership functions and behavioral approaches, providing the conceptual basis for examining instructional leadership as a predictor of faculty performance. Supporting empirical studies further validate this theoretical integration by demonstrating the positive influence of instructional and transformational leadership on teacher effectiveness and educational outcomes [14, 15].

1.5 Research Gaps and Rationale

Although instructional leadership has been extensively examined internationally, limited empirical research has investigated its relationship with faculty performance in private Philippine higher education institutions using a PIMRS-adapted framework [14–16]. Existing Philippine studies have focused primarily on leadership, faculty engagement, or teaching effectiveness separately [8–10], leaving insufficient evidence regarding instructional leadership paradigms within private HEIs in semi-urban Laguna. This study addresses this theoretical and empirical gap by examining instructional leadership paradigms and their association with faculty performance at ASIATECH.

1.6 Alignment with Relevant Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

This study aligns primarily with SDG 4 – Quality Education, as it investigates instructional leadership practices that contribute to improving teaching quality, faculty effectiveness, and institutional academic performance. It also supports SDG 8 – Decent Work and Economic Growth by promoting professional development, effective educational leadership, and quality human resource management within higher education institutions.

1.7 Importance of the Study to Multidisciplinary Sustainability

The study contributes to educational sustainability by providing empirical evidence that supports effective instructional leadership and continuous faculty development in higher education. It also promotes institutional sustainability by informing leadership development, instructional supervision, and quality assurance initiatives consistent with CHED standards. Furthermore, the findings contribute to policy and governance sustainability by strengthening evidence-based leadership practices that enhance institutional performance and long-term academic excellence in private higher education institutions.

2. Material and methods

2.1 Research Design

The study utilized a descriptive-correlational quantitative research design to determine the level of instructional leadership paradigms practiced by academic administrators and the level of faculty performance while examining the relationship between these variables. The descriptive component described the existing conditions of instructional leadership and faculty performance, whereas the correlational component measured the strength and direction of their association using appropriate statistical procedures (Creswell & Creswell [19]).

2.2 Locale of the Study

The research was conducted at Asia Technological School of Science and Arts (ASIATECH) in Sta. Rosa City, Laguna, Philippines, a Commission on Higher Education (CHED)-recognized private higher education institution in the CALABARZON region. The institution offers academic programs through five colleges, providing an appropriate setting for examining instructional leadership and faculty performance in a private higher education environment.

2.3 Respondents of the Study

The respondents consisted of 106 actively teaching faculty members representing the institution's five colleges. The participants included both full-time and part-time faculty members from the College of Criminology, College of Education, Arts and Science, College of Engineering and Information Technology Education, College of Business, Hospitality and Tourism, and College of Business and Accountancy, ensuring representation from all academic units.

2.4 Sample and Sampling Procedure

The study employed total enumeration (census sampling) by including all 106 actively teaching faculty members, comprising 70 full-time and 36 part-time instructors. This approach ensured complete representation of the target population and minimized sampling bias by involving all qualified faculty members during the conduct of the study.

2.5 Research Instrument

Data were collected using a three-part researcher-made questionnaire. The first part gathered respondents' demographic information, while the second part consisted of the Instructional Leadership Paradigm Scale, adapted from the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) developed by Hallinger and Murphy [11] and modified for the higher education context. The instrument contained 30 items measured using a five-point Likert scale to assess the dimensions of defining the school mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive school learning climate. The third part utilized the institution's official Faculty Performance Evaluation ratings for the Second Semester of Academic Year 2025–2026 obtained from the Human Resource Office, ensuring that faculty performance was measured independently from respondents' perceptions of instructional leadership. The instructional leadership instrument employed a five-point scale interpreted from very low to very high levels, whereas faculty performance ratings ranged from poor to outstanding. The instrument underwent content validation by five experts in educational management who evaluated its clarity, relevance, and alignment with the Hallinger-Murphy instructional leadership domains and the Bass-Avolio leadership typology. Pilot testing involving 30 faculty members from a comparable institution yielded a Cronbach's alpha of 0.91, indicating excellent reliability, with item-total correlations ranging from 0.42 to 0.78 (George & Mallery [20]). The study was conceptually anchored on the Hallinger-Murphy Instructional Leadership Model and the Bass-Avolio Multifactor Leadership Theory, illustrating that instructional leadership functions as the independent variable influencing faculty performance through instructional supervision, professional development, and mission-driven accountability.

2.6 Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to data collection, written authorization was obtained from the Office of the President of ASIATECH. Faculty members voluntarily participated after signing an informed consent form in compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 [21]. Faculty performance evaluation records were secured from the Human Resource Office through written authorization, and all personal information was anonymized to protect respondent confidentiality. The researchers successfully achieved a 100% retrieval rate, ensuring complete data collection for the study.

2.7 Data Analysis Techniques

Data were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Frequency count and percentage described the demographic characteristics of the respondents, while weighted mean and standard deviation determined the levels of instructional leadership paradigms and faculty performance. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) was employed to determine the relationship between instructional leadership and faculty performance, whereas one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) examined differences in instructional leadership perceptions between full-time and part-time faculty members. Before conducting inferential analyses, the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance were verified using the Shapiro-Wilk test and Levene's test, respectively. All statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics Version 26, with hypothesis testing conducted at the 0.05 level of significance.

2.8 Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to ethical standards governing research involving human participants. Institutional approval was secured before data collection, and participation was voluntary with written informed consent obtained from all respondents. Faculty performance records were accessed only through authorized institutional channels, and all data were anonymized to ensure confidentiality. The conduct of the study complied with the provisions of the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173) [21].

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Faculty Characteristics and Institutional Performance

3.1.1 Demographic Profile of Faculty Respondents

The respondents were composed of 106 faculty members representing different age groups, sexes, educational attainments, employment status, length of service, and academic ranks. Most respondents were between 30 and 39 years old, female, master's degree holders, employed full-time, had six to ten years of teaching experience, and occupied the ranks of instructor or assistant professor, indicating a relatively experienced and academically qualified faculty workforce. These findings reflect the current composition of faculty in Philippine private higher education institutions, where female educators and master's degree holders constitute a substantial proportion of the teaching workforce. The distribution also suggests continuing opportunities for graduate education and professional advancement to further strengthen faculty qualifications and institutional capacity [7].

3.1.2 Instructional Leadership Paradigms of Academic Administrators

Faculty respondents perceived the instructional leadership paradigms of academic administrators to be High overall (WM = 3.89, SD = 0.41). Among the three leadership dimensions, managing the instructional program obtained the highest rating (WM = 4.05), followed by defining the school's mission (WM = 3.93), while promoting a positive school learning climate received the lowest, although it likewise remained within the High category (WM = 3.67). The results indicate that administrators demonstrate strong instructional management practices, particularly in supervising instruction and coordinating academic programs. This finding supports Bush and Ng [5], who observed that educational leaders in Asian institutions tend to emphasize instructional supervision over climate-building initiatives. Likewise, the comparatively lower rating for the learning climate reflects the observations of Sheppard [22] regarding the continuing challenges in strengthening collegiality and recognition systems within hierarchical educational organizations. Similar patterns were also reported by Buenvinida [9] in CALABARZON higher education institutions.

3.1.3 Faculty Performance

Faculty performance was evaluated as Very Satisfactory overall (WM = 4.00, SD = 0.31). Instructional competence received the highest rating (WM = 4.29), followed by administrative responsibilities (WM = 4.18) and professional development (WM = 3.85), while research and extension recorded the lowest mean (WM = 3.66), although it also remained within the Very Satisfactory category. The findings suggest that faculty members perform strongly in instructional delivery while demonstrating comparatively lower engagement in research and extension activities. This pattern is consistent with Stronge [23], who noted that faculty in teaching-oriented institutions generally prioritize instructional effectiveness over research productivity. Reyes and Tongco [10] likewise emphasized that research performance in Philippine higher education institutions depends largely on institutional incentives and administrative support, both of which are influenced by instructional leadership.

3.2 Relationship Between Instructional Leadership and Faculty Performance

A very strong positive and statistically significant relationship was found between instructional leadership paradigms and faculty performance ($r = 0.9534$, $p < 0.001$), resulting in the rejection of the first null hypothesis. Among the instructional leadership dimensions, managing the instructional program demonstrated the strongest association with faculty performance, followed by promoting a positive school learning climate and defining the school's mission. The findings demonstrate that stronger instructional leadership is associated with better faculty performance. This supports Robinson et al. [14], who identified instructional leadership as the leadership approach with the greatest direct influence on teacher effectiveness, and Hallinger and Heck [24], who reported that instructional leadership significantly contributes to improved teacher performance across educational settings. Although the correlation obtained in this study was exceptionally high compared with those commonly reported in leadership literature, the use of separate measures for leadership perception and faculty performance helped reduce common method bias, although shared institutional context may still limit broader generalization [14, 15, 25].

3.3 Differences in Leadership Perceptions by Employment Status No significant difference was found in faculty perceptions of instructional leadership between full-time and part-time instructors ($F = 0.4202$, $p = 0.5183$). Both groups reported similar evaluations of the instructional leadership practices demonstrated by academic administrators, resulting in

the retention of the second null hypothesis. The findings suggest that employment status does not substantially influence how instructional leadership is perceived within the institution. This result aligns with Bush and Ng [5], who reported that well-integrated institutional cultures often promote consistent leadership experiences regardless of employment classification. Nevertheless, Zheng et al. [13] cautioned that similar perceptions should not be interpreted as evidence that part-time faculty receive equal opportunities for professional development and institutional engagement.

4. Conclusion & Recommendations

This study found that academic administrators demonstrated a high level of instructional leadership, particularly in managing instructional programs, while faculty members exhibited a very satisfactory level of performance, with instructional competence as their strongest area. A very strong and statistically significant positive relationship was established between instructional leadership and faculty performance, indicating that effective instructional leadership is associated with improved faculty outcomes. No significant difference was found in the perception of instructional leadership between full-time and part-time faculty members, suggesting consistent leadership practices across employment classifications. Overall, the findings support the relevance of instructional leadership in strengthening faculty performance and institutional quality within a private higher education institution.

The institution should institutionalize a comprehensive leadership development program for academic administrators, implement a structured classroom observation and feedback protocol, establish a faculty research incentive and support program, and ensure that part-time faculty members are included in institutional development initiatives. Future studies are encouraged to replicate the research across multiple private higher education institutions in Laguna and the CALABARZON region, utilize multi-source and longitudinal research designs, and further examine the influence of organizational culture on the relationship between instructional leadership and faculty performance.

The study was limited to a single private higher education institution, which may restrict the generalizability of the findings to other educational settings. Although separate measures were used for instructional leadership and faculty performance to minimize common method bias, the collection of data from one institution at a single point in time may still have introduced shared contextual influences. These limitations highlight the need for broader institutional coverage and longitudinal investigations in future research.

Compliance with ethical standards

The authors declare no conflict of interest. This study received no external funding and was conducted as part of graduate academic requirements. Participation was voluntary, and written informed consent was obtained from all faculty respondents before data collection. Data were collected using non-invasive survey procedures and authorized institutional faculty performance records, with permission from Asia Technological School of Science and Arts (ASIATECH); all information was anonymized to protect participant confidentiality, and no identifying information is disclosed.

REFERENCES

- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. SAGE Publications.
- Buenvinida, L. P. (2022). Transformational leadership dimensions and teaching effectiveness in CALABARZON HEIs: Implications for academic policy. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 88(1), 54–67. <https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP100881120222804>
- Bush, T., & Ng, A. (2019). Distributed leadership and the Singapore model: Variations on a theme. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 57(3), 279–297. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-10-2018-0187>
- Commission on Higher Education. (2012). *CMO No. 46, s. 2012: Policy-standard to enhance quality assurance in Philippine higher education through an outcomes-based and typology-based QA*. <https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/CMO-No.46-s2012.pdf>
- Commission on Higher Education. (2023). *State of Philippine higher education report 2023*. CHED.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dacles, D. D., Ormilla, H. A., Rebong, M. T., & Limpot, R. B. (2021). Instructional leadership and faculty engagement in private higher education institutions in the Philippines. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 14(2), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2021/v14i230348>
- Fullan, M. (2014). *The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact*. Jossey-Bass.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference* (4th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.

- Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 221–239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500244793>
- 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>
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2010). Assessing the contribution of distributed leadership to school improvement and growth in math achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 47(2), 332–369. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831209355744>
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2011). Exploring the journey of school improvement: Classifying and analyzing patterns of change in school improvement processes and learning outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 22(1), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2010.536322>
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. F. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–247. <https://doi.org/10.1086/461445>
- Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. C. (2015). *Assessing instructional leadership with the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-280-5>
- Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning: A review of research for the Learning from Leadership Project*. The Wallace Foundation.
- Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2012). The nature and effects of transformational school leadership: A meta-analytic review. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(3), 387–423. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X11436268>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
- Pont, B., Nusche, D., & Moorman, H. (2008). *Improving school leadership* (Vol. 1, *Policy and practice*). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264044715-en>
- Republic of the Philippines. (2012). *Republic Act No. 10173: Data Privacy Act of 2012*. <https://www.privacy.gov.ph/data-privacy-act/>
- Reyes, R. V., & Tongco, M. C. (2022). School climate as mediator of instructional leadership and faculty outcomes in Philippine HEIs. *Journal of Education Research and Practice*, 12(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.5590/JERAP.2022.12.1.01>
- 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>
- Sheppard, B. (1996). Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 42(4), 325–344.
- Stronge, J. H. (2018). *Qualities of effective teachers* (3rd ed.). ASCD.
- Zheng, X., Yin, Y., & Liu, M. (2020). Leadership, organizational learning, and teacher professional capital: The mediating effect of teacher learning community. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 87, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102949>