Instructional Leadership Skills Of The School Administrators

Margarito Balag Callao, "Department of Math and Sciences, College of Arts, Sciences, and Education, Cebu Technological University - Barili Campus, Cagay, Barili, Cebu, Philippines", yodnooallac@gmail.com, 0000-0003-0537-9913

Rotsenia J. Callao, "College of Arts, Sciences, and Education, Cebu Technological University – Barili Campus, Cagay, Barili, Cebu, Philippines", rotsie.callao@gmail.com, 0000-0003-3191-2072

ABSTRACT

This research determined the instructional leadership skills of the 18 school administrators of the 18 elementary schools of Barili 2 District, Barili, Cebu, DepEd Cebu Province Division, during the school year 2020-2021. The study utilized the descriptive method and the standardized assessment tool. Findings revealed that there was no significant relationship between the identified profiles and the instructional leadership skills of the school administrators. Generally, the instructional leadership skills in terms of competencies enumerated in the NCBSSH is interpreted as an expert (doing it well and can lead others to do the same) except for the level of leadership skills of the school heads in the assessment of learning interpreted as experienced (doing it but need to improve). Based on the findings it is concluded that the school leadership skills of the school heads are not influenced by the identified profiles. It is recommended that the proposed Supervision Plan be adapted and implemented.

Keywords: Educational Outcomes Supervision Plan Instructional Leadership Competencies NCBSSH

1. INTRODUCTION

For the past 20 years, the importance of school leadership and education theories grew. The development of school leadership has been accompanied by theory development. New models developing established methods are being developed and redefined (Bush, T. et. al., 2013).

2107 | Margarito Balag Callao School Administrators **Instructional Leadership Skills Of The**

According to Gunter (2016) as cited by Callao, M. (2021), the definition of school leadership is as old as the numerous positions that have been developed, discussed, and written about within formal educational organizations. Moreover, Dinham (2005), as cited by Callao, M. (2021) said that leadership was discovered to be an essential element in achieving excellent academic results. Often, the Principal exercised this leadership, but additional key personnel included Head Teachers, Deputy Principals, and teachers playing leading roles in faculties and programs.

This study is anchored on Organization Theory in Education of Max Weber, cited by (Bush, 2015). Organization theorists are advocating how organizations should be led and managed. Analysts seeking to explore the theory have drawn on four aspects of organizations:

Goals – At the heart of theory are the purposes of the organization and the practice in education and beyond. Oftentimes, theorists focus on two key scopes of aims and purpose. First, who determines the organizational goals? Second, relates to the level of agreement on the goals created.

Structure – Structure delineates the individuals in the organization. It could be vertical or horizontal. Structures could be fixed or flexible. Sometimes, problems are experienced in fixed structures, individual talents and experiences are not considered, while inflexible structures adapt to the capabilities of staff.

Culture – Organizational culture tends to be invisible and hard to develop. The organizational theory differs in the treatment of culture, how it is developed, continued, and improved. Because of its intangibility, leaders contend that culture is hard to change because of its resilience to innovation than structure.

Context – Schools are everywhere; it is a manifestation of every community throughout the world. However, a large school in a highly urbanized country is very much different from a small school in an underdeveloped country. The influence of context is characterized by the relationship between the organization and its external environment. The environment represents the stakeholders for public sector bodies and the customers of the school.

Anchored on the Instructional leadership model of Leithwood (Rudhumbu, 2015), this model of instructional leadership focuses on the direction rather than the source and nature of the influence of the school heads. It emphasizes the core activities of the school heads that are managing the teaching and learning process.

Instructional leadership is defined as the management of curriculum and instruction by a school principal. According to Nengasca (2015), Fred M. Hechinger said that the rise and fall of the quality of schools could be traced to the quality of instructional leaders. There are no good schools with poor instructional leaders. Unsuccessful schools turned around into successful ones by a performing

instructional leader, and regrettably outstanding schools slide rapidly into decline because of poor instructional leadership.

The focus of school heads in instructional leadership is the behavior of teachers as they perform activities directly affecting the growth of learners. Instructional leaders were considered builders of culture (Bush, 2013).

Education leaders create an "academic press" that cultivated high expectations and standards for learners, as well as for teachers. In instructional effective schools, its direction is focused primarily on the improvement of learner performance. Words like; vision, mission, and goals became centrally positioned in the vocabulary of school leaders who wish to succeed in the evolving environment of educational reform.

Instructional leaders need a combination of expertise and personality to attain the goals and objectives of the school.

Effective leadership is the nucleus of every successful school. This provides the vision and the climate for the teachers and learners to reach the highest level of achievement. Leadership in schools includes communicating the vision, mission, goals, and objectives of the department towards the internal and external stakeholders, creating a high-performance team, strategic planning, problem-solving, coordinating with others, and managing culture change. According to Fertig et.al. (2017) as cited by Callao, M. (2021), educational leadership is influencing others in educational settings to achieve goals through performing different activities. When subordinates perform intelligently delegated functions, the influence of leaders is evident, therefore, leading.

This study is also anchored on section 7 of Republic Act 9155, Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, and the National Adoption and Implementation of the National Competency-Based Standards for School Heads (NCBSSH) Framework (DepEd Order No. 32 s. 2010).

Republic Act 9155 says that; "There shall be a school head for all public elementary schools and public high schools or cluster thereof. The establishment of integrated schools from existing public elementary and public high schools shall be encouraged.

The school head, who may be assisted by an assistant school head, shall be both an instructional leader and administrative manager. The school head shall form among them with the school teachers/learning facilitators for the delivery of quality educational programs, projects, and services. A core of nonteaching staff shall handle the school's administrative, fiscal and auxiliary services.

According to Maxwell (2015) as cited by Callao, M. (2021), influence is the only source of authentic leadership. It cannot be assigned, awarded, or appointed. Leadership is a difficult task. Leadership performance is the application of learned skills, almost all of which can be learned and enhanced. Aspects of good leadership include respect, experience, emotional strength, people skills, discipline, vision, momentum, and timing.

According to Friesen et al. (2015), as cited by Callao, M. (2021), the school principal's role has evolved. Transforming a school from employment to a place of learning requires overturning the top-down authority tasked with assisting underperforming schools in becoming influential school leaders. A leader encourages learners and teachers to go beyond the four walls of the classroom by instilling these qualities in them.

In leadership, intentionality leads to actions that impact the group or organization's direction, mission, culture, and practice (Woods et al., 2018). To accomplish a specific purpose, leadership entails an obligation that uses available resources such as human and material resources while still maintaining a cohesive and coherent organization (Ololube, 2013). Recognizing employee perception, which frequently plays a significant role in decision implementation and outcome, is a vital addition to leadership ability (Weddle, 2013). Good leadership is founded on the leader's strong character and selfless devotion to an organization (Jenkins, 2013).

The principal serves as a leader. He has an impact on others. The act of shaping others to accomplish one's objectives is known as leadership. School leaders create a vision for their schools based on their personal and professional values (Murphy, 2018).

The Chair of the NPBEA Board and Executive Director of National Association of Secondary School Principals, Jo-Ann Bartoletti, said' "More than ever, schools need successful leaders to meet the demands of preparing educators in the 21st century".

There are five fundamental concepts in educational leadership. First, school leadership must be accepted by a team of leaders, with the principal serving as the "leader of leaders." Second, school leadership focuses on practical financial and human resource management — recruiting, hiring, developing, and evaluating — especially in changing environments. Third, for effective instructional leadership and the improvement of instructional practice, a culture of public and reflective practice is required. Fourth, instructional leadership addresses the school community's economic, political, cultural, social, and learning diversity. Finally, instructional leadership focuses on learning for both learners and teachers, and learning is measured by improvements in the teaching and learning process.

According to Murphy (2018), as cited by Callao M. (2021), school leaders should be more informed about the central business of teaching and learning to make a difference for students. This means that instructional leadership's results are much superior to those of other leadership styles.

The Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (NPBEA, 2015) stated that instructional leaders develop effective teaching and learning processes by modeling instructional strategies, developing opportunities to learn for teachers to learn efficient learning routines, assisting teachers in creating active learning environments, serving as a tool for effective instructional strategies, monitoring and evaluating instruction, and empowering teachers.

Bolliman et al. (2019) as cited by Callao, M. (2021), pointed out that school leaders, on average, were better at defending their stance than supporting and

soliciting the views of parents and teachers. School leaders gain trust and certainty in their decisions and behavior when they can imagine school circumstances. They are not stressed, so they're calmer, and they're more effective at getting the job done.

2. METHODS

Research Design

This study utilized the descriptive method which involved recording, describing, analyzing, and interpreting the data. This was used to determine the instructional leadership skills of the elementary school administrators of Barili 2 district, DepEd Cebu Province division in the school year 2020-2021.

Research Respondents

The respondents of the research were the 18 school administrators and 238 Elementary School teachers of Barili 2 District in the school year 2020-2021. The data was collected from the school administrators and teachers of the 18 Elementary Schools of Barili 2 District, Dep Ed Cebu Province Division.

Data Collection Tools

This research used the adopted questionnaire for the profile of the respondents and the NCBSSH-TDNA, based on Dep Ed Order No. 32, Series 2010, "The National Adoption and Implementation of the National Competency-Based Standards for School Heads", with some modifications, to gather the needed data and information.

3. RESULTS

Table 1 Demographic Profiles of the School Heads

Profiles	Frequency
Percentage	
Age	
55 years old and above	5
27.78	
50 – 54 years old	2
11.11	
45 – 49 years old	10
55.56	
35 – 39 years old	1
05.56	
Total	18
100.00	

Gender Male 4 22.22 4 Female 14 77.78 18 Total 18 100.00 10 Civil Status 1 Single 1 05.56 1 Married 17 94.44 1 Total 18 100.00 1 Educational Attainment 1 Doctor's Degree Holder 1 05.56 1 Masters Degree with CAR for Doctorate 1 05.56 1 Masters Degree Holder 6 33.33 1 BS with CAR for Masters 1 05.56 1 BS with Masters Units 3 16.67 1 Total 18 100.00 1 Position Title/Designation P P II 6 33.33 1 P I 1 05.56 1 P II 3 <			
Male 4 22.22 1 Female 1 77.78 18 Total 18 100.00 1 Single 1 05.56 17 Married 17 94.44 18 100.00 1 Educational Attainment 1 Doctor's Degree Holder 1 05.56 1 Masters Degree with CAR for Doctorate 1 05.56 6 Masters Degree Holder 6 33.33 6 BS with CAR for Masters 1 05.56 1 BS with Masters Units 3 16.67 1 Total 18 100.00 1 Position Title/Designation P II 6 33.33 1 P I 3 16.67 1 17 1 18 1 19 1 105.56 1	Gender		
Female		4	
77.78 Total 18 100.00 Civil Status Single 1 05.56 1 Married 17 94.44 1 Total 18 100.00 1 Educational Attainment 1 Doctor's Degree Holder 1 05.56 1 Masters Degree with CAR for Doctorate 1 05.56 6 Masters Degree with Doctorate Units 6 33.33 1 BS with CAR for Masters 1 05.56 1 BS with Masters Units 3 16.67 1 P III 1 05.56 1 P II 6 33.33 1 P II 6 33.33 1 P II 6 33.33 1 P II 3 667 1 HT III 1 05.56 </td <td>22.22</td> <td></td>	22.22		
Total 18 100.00 Civil Status Single	Female	14	
100.00 Civil Status Single	77.78		
Civil Status 1 Single 1 05.56 1 Married 17 94.44 18 Total 18 100.00 1 Educational Attainment Doctor's Degree Holder 1 05.56 1 Masters Degree with CAR for Doctorate 1 05.56 6 Master Degree Holder 6 33.33 1 BS with CAR for Masters 1 05.56 1 BS with Masters Units 3 16.67 1 P III 1 05.56 1 P III 6 33.33 1 P I 3 33.33 1 P I 3 16.67 1 HT III 1 05.56 1	Total	18	
Single 1 05.56 17 Married 17 94.44 18 100.00 18 Educational Attainment Doctor's Degree Holder 1 05.56 1 Masters Degree with CAR for Doctorate 1 05.56 1 Masters Degree with Doctorate Units 6 33.33 1 BS with CAR for Masters 1 05.56 1 BS with Masters Units 3 16.67 1 P III 1 05.56 1 P III 6 33.33 1 P I 3 33.33 1 P I 3 16.67 1 HT III 1 05.56 1	100.00		
Married			
Married 17 94.44 18 100.00 18 Educational Attainment Doctor's Degree Holder 1 05.56 3 Masters Degree with CAR for Doctorate 1 05.56 6 Masters Degree with Doctorate Units 6 33.33 6 BS with CAR for Masters 1 05.56 1 BS with Masters Units 3 16.67 18 Total 18 100.00 1 Position Title/Designation P II 6 33.33 1 P I 3 16.67 3 HT III 1 05.56 1		1	
94.44 Total 18 100.00 Educational Attainment Doctor's Degree Holder 1 05.56 Masters Degree with CAR for Doctorate Units 6 33.33 Master Degree Holder 6 33.33 BS with CAR for Masters 1 05.56 BS with Masters Units 3 16.67 Total 18 105.56 Position Title/Designation P II 1 05.56 P II 3 16.67 HT III 3 16.67 HT III 3 16.67 HT III 3 16.67 HT III 3 <th colspan<="" td=""><td></td><td></td></th>	<td></td> <td></td>		
Total 100.00 10		17	
Educational Attainment Doctor's Degree Holder 1		40	
Educational Attainment Doctor's Degree Holder 1 05.56 1 Masters Degree with CAR for Doctorate Units 1 05.56 6 Masters Degree with Doctorate Units 6 33.33 6 BS with CAR for Masters 1 05.56 1 BS with Masters Units 3 16.67 18 100.00 18 105.56 1 P III 6 33.33 1 P I 3 16.67 1 HT III 1 05.56 1		18	
Doctor's Degree Holder 1 05.56 1 Masters Degree with CAR for Doctorate 1 05.56 1 Masters Degree with Doctorate Units 6 33.33 6 Master Degree Holder 6 33.33 1 BS with CAR for Masters 1 05.56 3 BS with Masters Units 3 16.67 1 P III 1 05.56 1 P II 6 33.33 1 P I 3 16.67 1 HT III 1 05.56 1	100.00		
Doctor's Degree Holder 1 05.56 1 Masters Degree with CAR for Doctorate 1 05.56 1 Masters Degree with Doctorate Units 6 33.33 6 Master Degree Holder 6 33.33 1 BS with CAR for Masters 1 05.56 3 BS with Masters Units 3 16.67 1 P III 1 05.56 1 P II 6 33.33 1 P I 3 16.67 1 HT III 1 05.56 1	Educational Attainment		
Masters Degree with CAR for Doctorate Masters Degree with Doctorate Units Masters Degree With Doctorate Units 33.33 Master Degree Holder 33.33 BS with CAR for Masters 05.56 BS with Masters Units 16.67 Total 100.00 Position Title/Designation P III 05.56 P II 33.33 P I 16.67 HT III 05.56		1	
Masters Degree with CAR for Doctorate 1 05.56 1 Masters Degree with Doctorate Units 6 33.33 6 Master Degree Holder 33.33 6 BS with CAR for Masters 1 1 05.56 1 BS with Masters Units 1 3 16.67 18 Total 100.00 1 P III 1 1 05.56 6 P II 3 6 33.33 16.67 HT III 1 1 05.56 1		_	
05.56 Masters Degree with Doctorate Units 6 33.33 6 Master Degree Holder 6 33.33 8 BS with CAR for Masters 1 05.56 8 BS with Masters Units 3 16.67 18 Total 18 100.00 1 Position Title/Designation P II 1 05.56 6 P II 6 33.33 9 P I 3 16.67 1 HT III 1 05.56 1		1	
33.33 Master Degree Holder 33.33 BS with CAR for Masters 05.56 BS with Masters Units 16.67 Total 18 100.00 Position Title/Designation P III 05.56 P II 33.33 P I 16.67 HT III 05.56			
Master Degree Holder 6 33.33 BS with CAR for Masters 1 05.56 BS with Masters Units 3 16.67 Total 18 100.00 Position Title/Designation P II 1 05.56 P II 6 33.33 P I 3 16.67 HT III 1 05.56	Masters Degree with Doctorate Units	6	
33.33 BS with CAR for Masters 05.56 BS with Masters Units 16.67 Total 100.00 Position Title/Designation P III 05.56 P II 05.56 P II 33.33 P I 16.67 HT III 05.56	33.33		
BS with CAR for Masters 05.56 BS with Masters Units 16.67 Total 100.00 Position Title/Designation P III 05.56 P II 33.33 P I 16.67 HT III 05.56	Master Degree Holder	6	
05.56 BS with Masters Units 3 16.67 18 Total 100.00 18 Position Title/Designation P III 105.56 1 P II 1 105.56 6 P I 1 1 105.56 3 HT III 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	33.33		
BS with Masters Units 16.67 Total 100.00 Position Title/Designation P III 05.56 P II 633.33 P I 16.67 HT III 05.56		1	
16.67 Total 18 100.00 18 Position Title/Designation P III 1 05.56 6 P II 6 33.33 6 P I 3 16.67 1 HT III 1 05.56 1			
Total 100.00 Position Title/Designation P III 1 05.56 6 P II 6 33.33 6 P I 3 16.67 1 HT III 1 05.56 1		3	
100.00 Position Title/Designation P III 1 05.56 6 P II 6 33.33 8 P I 3 16.67 1 HT III 1 05.56 1		4.0	
Position Title/Designation P III 05.56 P II 33.33 P I 16.67 HT III 05.56		18	
P III 1 05.56	100.00		
P III 1 05.56	Position Title /Designation		
05.56 P II 6 33.33 P I 16.67 HT III 05.56		1	
P II 6 33.33 P I 3 16.67 HT III 1 05.56		1	
33.33 P I 3 16.67 HT III 1 05.56		6	
P I 3 16.67 HT III 1 05.56		_	
16.67 HT III 05.56		3	
HT III 1 05.56			
05.56		1	
HT I 2	05.56		
	НТ І	2	

11.11	
Teacher-In-Charge	5
27.78	
Total	18
100.00	
Years Of Experience as School Head	
21 years above	2
11.11	
16 - 20 years	3
16.67	
11 - 15 years	4
22.22	
6 – 10 years	4
22.22	
5 years and below	5
27.78	
Total	18
100.00	

Table 2 Level of Instructional Leadership Skills of the School Heads in Assessment for Learning as Perceived by School Heads and Teachers

Assessn	nent for Learning			School Heads
Teacher	rs			
		Weighted	Verbal	Weighted
Verbal				
		Mean		Interpretation
Mean	Interpretation			

1. Manage the processes and procedures in monitoring student achievement Experienced	3.00	Experienced	3.00
2. Ensure utilization of a range of assessment processes to assess student performance Experienced	3.13	Experienced	3.00
3. Assess the effectiveness of curricular/co-curricular programs and/or instructional strategies Experienced	2.93	Experienced	2.93
4. Utilize assessment results to improve learning Experienced	3.20	Experienced	3.07
5. Create & manage a school the process to ensure student progress is conveyed to students and parents/guardians regularly Experienced	3.00	Experienced	2.93
Over All Weighted Mean Experienced	3.05	Experienced	2.99

1.00-1.75 - Novice

1.76-2.50 - Emerging

2.51-3.25 - Experienced

Table 3 Level of Instructional Leadership Skills of the School Heads in Developing Programs and Adapting Existing Programs as Perceived by School Heads and Teachers

Developing Programs and			School Heads
Teachers			
Adapting Existing Programs	Weighted	Verbal	Weighted

Verbal			-
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean
Interpretation			
1. Develop/adopt a			
research-based school program	3.33	Expert	3.50
Expert			
2. Assist in implementing an existing, coherent, and responsive school-wide curriculum Expert	3.87	Expert	3.87
3. Address deficiencies and sustain successes of current programs in collaboration with teachers and learners Expert	3.67	Expert	3.67
4. 2Develop a culture of functional literacy Expert	3.50	Expert	3.93
Over All Weighted Mean Expert	3.59	Expert	3.74

1.00-1.75 - Novice

1.76-2.50 - Emerging

2.51-3.25 – Experienced

Table 4 Level of Instructional Leadership Skills of the School Heads in Implementing Programs for Instructional Improvement as Perceived by School Heads and Teachers

Implementing Programs for		Scho	ool Heads
Teachers			
Instructional Improvement		Weighted	Verbal
Weighted Verbal			
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean
Interpretation			_

Expert			
Over All Weighted Mean	3.78	Expert	3.71
Expert			
toward curricular responsiveness	3.83	Expert	3.59
instructional innovation programs			
5. Organize teams to champion			
Expert			
use of technology	3.85	Expert	3.83
and enrichment with the			
4. Manage curriculum innovation			
Expert		_	
based on local needs	3.93	Expert	3.63
3. Enrich curricular offerings			
Expert			
curriculum review	3.69	Expert	3.97
2. Work with teachers in			
Expert		•	
Dep Ed policies (e.g. BEC, Madrasah)	3.60	Expert	3.53
curriculum initiatives in line with			
1. Manage the introduction of			

1.00-1.75 - Novice

1.76-2.50 - Emerging

2.51-3.25 - Experienced

Table 5 Level of Instructional Leadership Skills of the School Heads in Instructional Supervision as Perceived by School Heads and Teachers

Instructional Supervision		9	School Heads
Teachers			
	Weighted	Verbal	Weighted
Verbal			
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean
Interpretation			

instructional supervisory plan	3.90	Expert	3.44
Expert			
2. Conduct Instructional			
Supervision using appropriate			
strategy	3.50	Expert	3.65
Expert			
3. Evaluate lesson plans as well			
as classroom and learning	3.63	Expert	3.57
Expert			
4. Provide in a collegial manner			
timely, accurate, and specific			
feedback to teachers regarding			
their performance	3.97	Expert	3.89
Expert			
5. Provide expert technical			
assistance and instructional			
support to teachers	3.85	Expert	3.75
Expert			
Over All Weighted Mean	3.77	Expert	3.66
Expert			

1.00-1.75 - Novice

1.76-2.50 - Emerging

2.51-3.25 - Experienced

3.26-4.00 - Expert

Table 6 Level of Instructional Leadership Skills of the School Heads in Setting High Social and Academic Expectations as Perceived by School Heads and Teachers

Setting High Social and	School Heads	
Teachers		
Academic Expectations	Weighted Verbal	
Weighted Verbal		
Mean	Interpretation	
Mean Interpretation		

3.73	Expert	3.87
3.60	Expert	3.60
3.53	Expert	3.60
3.80	Expert	3.73
3.97	Expert	3.80
3.80	Expert	3.87
3.74	Expert	3.75
	3.60 3.53 3.80 3.97	3.60 Expert 3.53 Expert 3.80 Expert 3.97 Expert

1.00-1.75 - Novice

1.76-2.50 - Emerging

2.51-3.25 - Experienced

Table 7 Level of Instructional Leadership Skills of the School Heads in Setting High Social and Academic Expectations as Perceived by School Heads and Teachers

Setting High Social and		School Heads	
Teachers			
Academic Expectations		Weighted	Verbal
Weighted Verbal			
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean
Interpretation		-	

3.97 3.80 3.74	Expert Expert	3.8° 3.7°
	Ŷ	
	Ŷ	
3.97	Expert	3.80
	_	
3.80	Expert	3.7
	*	
3.53	Expert	3.6
2.00	p 0 0	2.0
3.60	Expert	3.6
5.75	пиреге	3.8'
		3.60 Expert 3.53 Expert

1.00-1.75 - Novice

1.76-2.50 - Emerging

2.51-3.25 - Experienced

Table 8 Performance Ratings of School Heads and Teachers

Numerical De	scripti	on			Scl	hool Heads
Teachers						
	Verbal					
Verbal						
	Fre	quency	Interp	retation	Percentage	Frequency
Interpretation	Pe	ercentage				
3.500 - 4.499	18	Ve	ery	100.0	00 238	Very
100.00						
Total	18	Satisfac	ctory	100.00	238	Satisfactory
100.00			,			-

4.500 - 5.000 - Outstanding

3.500 - 4.499 - Very Satisfactory

2.500 - 3.499 - Satisfactory

1.500 - 2.499 - Unsatisfactory

0.000 - 1.499 - Poor

Table 9 Relationship between the Identified Profiles and Leadership Skills of the School Heads

Profiles	Computed Chi-Square Value	P-value	Decision
Interpretation	· uiu	1 14140	
	20.00	0.420	A
Age	38.00	0.128	Accept Ho
No Significance			
Gender	22.00	0.112	Accept Ho
No Significance			
Civil Status	45.00	0.154	Accept Ho
No Significance			
Position	50.00	0.177	Accept Ho
No Significance			
Highest Educational Attainment	85.00	0.126	Accept Ho
No Significance			
Years of Service	57.00	0.098	Accept Ho
No Significance			
Relevant Trainings and			
Seminars Attended	30.00	0.153	Accept Ho
No Significance			

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

4.1 DISCUSSION

The assessment of learning as perceived by the school heads and the teachers were both interpreted as experienced (doing it but need to improve).

In Developing Programs and Adapting Existing Programs as perceived by the school heads and the teachers indicated that the skills of the school heads in Developing Programs and Adapting Existing Programs were rated as an expert

(doing it well and can lead others to do the same) which means that the school heads were excellent in developing programs and adapting existing programs in their respective schools

In implementing programs for instructional improvement as perceived by the school heads and the teachers indicated that the skills of the school heads implementing programs for instructional improvement were rated as an expert (doing it well and can lead others to do the same) which means that the school heads were excellent in implementing programs for instructional improvement in their respective schools

In instructional supervision as perceived by the school heads and the teachers, the school heads were rated as experts (doing it well and can lead others to do the same)

which means that the school heads were excellent in their leadership skills in terms of instructional supervision in their respective schools.

Finally, in setting high social and academic expectations as perceived by the school heads, the school heads were rated as an expert (doing it well and can lead others to do the same). This means that the school heads were excellent in their leadership skills in terms of setting high social and academic expectations in their respective schools.

On the other hand, the school heads and teachers of the Barili 2 district got a very satisfactory performance rating. It means that all the school heads and teachers are performing very well in their school leadership and teaching tasks respectively.

Finally, all of the identified profiles were not significantly correlated to the instructional leadership skills of the school administrators.

4.2 CONCLUSION

Based on the findings it is concluded that the instructional leadership skills of the school administrators of Barili District 2, Cebu Province Division were not influenced by their identified profiles.

REFERENCES

Altun, S. A., Buyukozturk, S. (2013). How Elementary School Principals' Change Tendencies

Are Related with Their Opinion About Curriculum Change. WCLTA 2013.

Androniceaua, A., Risteaa, B., Udaa, M. M. (2014). Leadership Competencies for Project-Based School Management Success. 4th World Conference on Educational Technology Researches, WCETR- 2014.

- Arokiasamy, A. R., Abdullah, A. G. K., Ismail, A. (2014). Correlation Between Cultural Perceptions, Leadership Style and ICT Usage by school Principals in Malaysia
- Balyera, A., Karatasa, H. Alcia, B. (2015). School Principals' Roles in Establishing Collaborative Professional Learning Communities at Schools 7th World Conference on Educational Sciences (WCES-2015). Novotel Athens Convention Center, Athens, Greece.
- Bellibas, M.S. (2016). Multi-Level Analysis Of The Relationship Between Principals' Perceived Practices Of Instructional Leadership And Teachers' Self-Efficacy Perceptions.

 Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Bin Mat Ail, N. M., Taib, M. R., Jaafar, H., Rohana, W. A., Salleh, M., Nawawi, M. (2015). Principals' Instructional Leadership And Teachers' Commitment In Three Mara Junior Science Colleges. Pahang, Malaysia.
- Bolman, L.G., Deal, T.E., (2019). Reframing The Path to School Leadership: A Guide For Teachers

And Principals. Sage Publication Ltd.

- Bloom, N., Lemos, R., Sadun, R., Reenen, J.V. (2014). Does Management Matter in Schools? National Bureau of Economic Research. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Bush, T. (2015). Organization Theory in Education: How Does It Inform School Leadership? Journal of Organizational Theory in Education.
- Bush, T., and Glover, D. (2013), School Leadership: Concepts and Evidence Revisited, Nottingham, National College for Teaching and Leadership.
- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2014). School Leadership Models: What Do We Know. School

Leadership and Management.

- Bush, T. Hamid, S.A., Ng, A., Kaparou, M. (2018). School Leadership Theories And The
- Malaysia Education Blueprint: Findings from A Systematic Literature Review. School of
- Education, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK. Emerald Publishing.

- Choge, J. R. (2015). Gender Factor in Decision Making: Challenges Facing Women Leadership Development in Primary Schools' Management in Kenya. Journal of Education and Practice.
- Connolly, M., James, C., Fertig, M. (2017). The Difference Between Educational Management
- and Educational Leadership and The Importance Of Educational Responsibility. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217745880
- DepEd Order No. 32. S. 2010. The National Adoption and Implementation of the National Competency-Based Standards for School Heads.
- Friesen, S., Saar, C., Park, A., Marcotte, C., Hampshire, T., Martin, B., Brown, B., Martin, J. (2015). What Is Instructional Leadership? Galileo Educational Network. Werklund School of Education, University of Calgary.
- Gunter, H. (2016). An Intellectual History of School Leadership Practice and Research. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Hallinger, P. (2015). Developing Instructional Leadership. In: Davies B., Brundrett,
 M. (eds) Developing Successful Leadership. Studies in Educational
 Leadership, vol. 11.

Springer, Dordrecht.

- Halvorsen, K.A., Skrovset, S., Irgens, J. (2016). Learning for Leadership. Acta Didactica Norge. @adno.no.
- Jenkins, T. (2013). Reflections on Kenneth E. Boulding's The Image: Glimpsing The Roots of Peace Education Pedagogy. Journal of Peace Education and Social justice.
- Kanokorn, S., Pongtorn, P., Ngang, T. K., Collaborative Action Professional D Development of
 - School Principals. 5th World Conference on Educational Sciences WCES-2013.
- Department of Educational Administration, Faculty of Education, Khon Kaen University,

Khon Kaen and 40002, Thailand.

Khalil, U., Iqbal, J., & Khan, A. (2016). Exploring Leadership Styles of School A Administrators in Pakistan. FWU Journal of Social Sciences.

Kitson, N.E. (2018). School Administrators' Leadership Styles, Gender and Perceived

Self-Efficacy in Suburban Virginia: A Multiple Regression. A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Education. Liberty University.

Le Fevre, D.M., Robinson, V.M., (2014). The Interpersonal Challenges of Instructional

Leadership: Principals' Effectiveness in Conversations About Performance Issues.

The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.

- Lussier, R. N., & Achua, C. F. (2015). Leadership: Theory, Application, And Skill Development.

 Nelson Education.
- Maxwell, J.C. (2015). The Complete 101 Collection. Nelson Books. Christian Publishing, Inc.
- Murphy, J., (2018). Positive School Leadership: Building Capacity And Strengthening Relationship. Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Nengaska, M. K., (2015) School Leadership, Teacher Effectiveness, and Pupil Performance in the Public Elementary Schools in the Division of Toledo City, Basis for Management Development Program.
- Ololube, N. P. (2013). Educational Management, Planning, and Supervision: Model for Effective Implementation. Owerri: Springfield Publishers.
- Pansit, R. B., (2014). Transformational Study Habits Towards Academic Advancement of the Junior High School Students in the K to 12 Program.

Paustian-Underdahl, S. C., Walker, L., & Woehr, D. (2014). Gender and Perceptions of

leadership effectiveness: A meta-analysis of contextual Moderators.

Journal of Applied
Psychology.

Piawa, C. Y., Heeb, T. F., Ismael, N. R., Ying, L. H. (2013). Factors of Leadership Skills of Secondary School Principals. 5th World Conference Educational Sciences – WCES.

- Professional Standards for Educational Leaders, NPBEA, 2015. Copyright @ASAP Elearning Solutionshttps://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Instructional leadership 07/23/2016 03:20:03 PM UTC.
- Prytula, M., Noonan, B., Hellsten, L. (2013) Instructional Leadership: Principals' Perceptions of Large Scale Assessment in Schools. University of Saskatchewan.
- Quang Duc, P. (2015). A Rudimentary Guide To Educational Leadership. The HEAD Foundation.
- Republic Act No. 9155.Governance Of Basic Education Act Of 2001. An Act Instituting A

Framework Of Governance For Basic Education, Establishing Authority And

Accountability, Renaming The Department Of Education, Culture And Sports As

The Department Of Education, And For Other Purposes.

- Rudhumbu, N. (2015). Enablers of and Barriers To successful Curriculum in Higher Education: A Literature Review.Botho University, P.O. Box 501564, Gaborone, Botswana.
- Sayadi, Y. (2016). The Effect of Dimensions of Transformational, Transactional, and Non-

Leadership on The Job Satisfaction And Organizational Commitment of Teachers in

Iran. Management in Education.

- Toll, C.A. (2017). Five Perspective for Leadership Success.
- Weddle, J. (2013) Levels of Decision Making in the Workplace. Retrieve March 13, 2014,

from $\frac{http://www.jobdig.com/articles/1115/ \ Levels}{\text{Making in the}} \quad \text{of} \quad \text{Decision}$

Workplace.html

Woods, P., Roberts, A. (2018). Collaborative School Leadership: A Critical Guide. Sage

Publication Inc.

