IJGGSD
ISSN: 3155-7716
International Journal of Global Goals and Sustainable Development
RESEARCH | INNOVATION | INCLUSION | SUSTAINABLE FUTURES
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65339/ijggsd.V1.I1.83

Instructional Supervisory Efficacy of School Heads in Libon West District: Basis for Instructional Supervisory Framework

Belen Seva Satparam-Bata
Doctor of Philosophy, Major in Educational Management, University of Saint Anthony, Iriga City, Philippines

Email: belen.bata001@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the instructional supervisory efficacy of school heads in Libon West District, Albay, Philippines, and examined its relationship with their socio-demographic profiles as a basis for developing an Instructional Supervisory Framework. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, the study involved 24 school heads from 24 elementary schools selected through total enumeration. Data were collected using a validated, structured self-assessment questionnaire and analyzed through frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, and Chi-square tests of independence. Results revealed evident supervisory efficacy in planning conferences (WM = 4.38), classroom observations (WM = 4.40), and post-observation conferences (WM = 4.50), while post-conference analysis received the lowest rating (WM = 3.92), interpreted as moderately evident. Significant relationships were found between supervisory efficacy and age, sex, and supervisory experience, whereas civil status and educational attainment showed no significant relationships. The findings indicate that school heads demonstrate established supervisory competencies but require further development in reflective dialogue, feedback alignment, and post-conference analysis. Accordingly, targeted professional development, structured mentoring for less experienced school heads, and adoption of the proposed Instructional Supervisory Framework are recommended. The study's district-specific sample, reliance on self-assessments, and correlational design limit generalizability and causal interpretation. Nevertheless, the findings provide a contextualized, evidence-based foundation for strengthening instructional leadership, guiding professional development, and supporting systematic supervisory improvement in Libon West District.

Keywords: *Descriptive-Correlational Research, Instructional Leadership, Instructional Supervision, Libon West District, School Heads, Supervisory Efficacy, Supervisory Framework*

1. INTRODUCTION

Instructional supervisory efficacy is essential to effective school leadership, teacher professional development, and improved educational outcomes. School heads are responsible for guiding instructional practices, monitoring classroom performance, providing constructive feedback, and creating supportive learning environments. In the Philippines, these responsibilities are guided by the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), established under Department of Education (DepEd) Order No. 24, series of 2020 (Department of Education, 2020), and the professional development initiatives of the National Educators Academy of the Philippines (NEAP), supported by DepEd Order No. 11, series of 2019 (Department of Education, 2019). Effective instructional leadership requires professional competence, confidence, collaboration, and adaptability. He et al. (2024) emphasized the importance of clinical supervision, technical assistance, and instructional innovation, while Detalla (2024) established a significant relationship between school heads' instructional leadership capacity and teacher leadership. OECD (2026) further highlighted the influence of leadership support on educators' initiative and professional engagement. Research demonstrates that school leaders' supervisory efficacy influences teacher motivation, instructional performance, and school improvement. Hallinger et al. (2025) associated strong leadership efficacy with improved teacher confidence and collaborative school cultures, while Battad (2024) identified resource provision, communication, and visible leadership as important instructional leadership behaviors. He et al. (2024), Alcopra and Daigon (2024), and Quilala and Tantiado (2025) similarly emphasized the contribution of structured supervision, classroom observation, and constructive feedback to teacher development, although the strength of these relationships varies. Despite these findings, school heads encounter administrative demands, inadequate resources, limited professional development opportunities, and changing instructional requirements. These challenges underscore the importance of examining instructional supervisory efficacy within specific educational contexts. Accordingly, the present study assesses the instructional supervisory efficacy of school heads in Libon West District and provides a basis for developing an Instructional Supervisory Framework that supports continuous professional growth and educational improvement.

Research Problem

Instructional supervision is essential to school improvement, yet its effectiveness depends on school heads' competencies, leadership confidence, and institutional support. Kilag and Malbas (2023) emphasized the importance of instructional leadership and self-leadership, while Hallinger et al. (2025) and He et al. (2024) highlighted the role of instructional leadership in supporting teacher development and instructional effectiveness. Similarly, Baguio and Tagadiad (2023) and Ramos (2024) underscored the relevance of instructional leadership and supervisory competencies in strengthening teachers' professional practices and school performance. However, inadequate professional development opportunities, administrative workload, and limited institutional resources remain challenges to effective instructional supervision. OECD (2026) emphasized the importance of leadership support and professional engagement, while Garcia and Santos (2023) highlighted the relevance of supportive instructional leadership in resource-constrained educational settings. Furthermore, He et al. (2024) and Johnson (2023) discussed the importance of instructional leadership and teacher professional development in addressing diverse instructional needs. Engle et al. (2024) examined the relationship between teacher leadership, well-being, burnout, and retention intentions in rural schools, highlighting the relevance of leadership-related conditions to teachers' professional experiences. Meanwhile, Romero (2024) and Go and Eslabon (2024) examined relationships between instructional leadership or supervisory practices and teaching outcomes, indicating the need for further context-specific investigation. These studies provide a foundation for understanding

instructional leadership and supervision; however, further investigation is needed to examine the instructional supervisory efficacy of school heads in rural and resource-constrained educational settings. Thus, the present study assesses the instructional supervisory efficacy of school heads in Libon West District across planning conferences, classroom observations, post-observation conferences, and post-conference analyses. It also examines the relationship between school heads' socio-demographic profiles and their instructional supervisory efficacy as a basis for developing a contextualized Instructional Supervisory Framework.

Assumptions of the Study

The study assumes that school heads differ in their socio-demographic and professional characteristics, particularly age, sex, civil status, years of instructional supervisory experience, and highest educational attainment. These differences may influence leadership approaches, decision-making, and supervisory practices. It further assumes that school heads possess varying levels of instructional supervisory efficacy across planning conferences, classroom observations, post-observation conferences, and post-conference analyses. Their perceived competencies may be influenced by professional experience, leadership confidence, and institutional conditions. The study also assumes that an Instructional Supervisory Framework can be developed from its findings to address identified supervisory needs and strengthen instructional leadership practices. Consistent with the study's stated null hypothesis, there is no significant relationship between school heads' profiles and their level of instructional supervisory efficacy. This proposition is subject to statistical testing rather than being treated as an established finding.

Objectives of the Study

The primary objective of this study is to assess the instructional supervisory efficacy of school heads in Libon West District as a basis for developing an Instructional Supervisory Framework. Specifically, it aims to determine the socio-demographic profiles of school heads in terms of age, sex, civil status, years of instructional supervisory experience, and highest educational attainment; assess their level of instructional supervisory efficacy in planning conferences, classroom observations, post-observation conferences, and post-conference analyses; determine whether a significant relationship exists between their socio-demographic profiles and instructional supervisory efficacy; and formulate recommendations for developing an Instructional Supervisory Framework based on the findings. Ultimately, the study seeks to provide evidence-based guidance for strengthening school heads' supervisory competencies, supporting teachers' professional development, and improving instructional practices.

Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

The study is anchored in Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1997), which emphasizes self-efficacy in performing supervisory responsibilities; Bass's Transformational Leadership Theory (Bass & Riggio, 2006), which highlights motivation, collaboration, and professional empowerment; and the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), which explains how workload and organizational support influence leadership effectiveness. Together, these theories establish instructional supervisory efficacy as an interaction of personal confidence, leadership practices, and institutional conditions. Supporting studies emphasize the importance of leadership efficacy, collaboration, and professional development in improving instructional supervision. He et al. (2024), Alvarez and Reyes (2024), and Bautista (2024) highlighted organizational commitment, emotional intelligence, mentoring, and supportive school environments. Similarly, Hallinger et al. (2025) and OECD (2026) emphasized instructional leadership and teacher efficacy. He et al. (2024), Obi et al. (2024), and Iroegbu and Etudor-Eyo (2016) further underscored the contribution of structured supervision to instructional

effectiveness. He et al. (2024) highlighted the importance of instructional leadership, constructive feedback, and continuous professional development in improving teaching practices, while OECD (2025) emphasized the role of professional learning and adaptability in strengthening instructional leadership. Conceptually, the study adopts an input-process-output framework. The inputs include school heads' socio-demographic profiles and instructional supervisory efficacy in planning conferences, classroom observations, post-observation conferences, and post-conference analyses. The process involves statistical analysis using frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, and Chi-square tests to determine efficacy levels and significant relationships. The output is a proposed Instructional Supervisory Framework designed to strengthen supervisory competencies, promote teacher development, and support continuous instructional improvement.

Sustainable Development Goal and Multidisciplinary Sustainability Relevance

The study primarily aligns with Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education) by strengthening instructional supervision, teacher professional development, and teaching quality through an evidence-based Instructional Supervisory Framework. It also supports SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth) by promoting supportive working environments, professional growth, and teacher well-being, and SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions) by encouraging accountability, effective leadership, and evidence-based school governance. From a multidisciplinary perspective, the study contributes to educational, socio-economic, and institutional sustainability by enhancing supervisory competencies, strengthening teacher support, and promoting continuous instructional improvement. Ultimately, it seeks to improve educational quality and support sustainable school development in Libon West District.

2. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study utilized a descriptive-survey method with a descriptive-correlational design to examine the instructional supervisory efficacy of school heads. Specifically, it described their socio-demographic profiles, assessed their supervisory efficacy, and determined the relationship between these variables. According to Calderon and Gonzales (1993), the descriptive-survey method involves systematically gathering, classifying, analyzing, and interpreting data to describe existing conditions and examine relationships among variables. This approach provided a basis for identifying supervisory strengths, areas for improvement, and recommendations for enhancing instructional leadership.

Research Locale or Study Setting

The study was conducted in Libon West District, Division of Albay, Philippines. The district served as the research setting for assessing the instructional supervisory efficacy of school heads. Data collection covered the school heads within the district, including those assigned to geographically distant or less accessible schools. Both face-to-face and online survey distribution methods were utilized to accommodate respondents' locations and accessibility.

Participants or Data Sources

The respondents comprised 24 school heads from Libon West District, selected through total enumeration to ensure the inclusion of all school heads within the identified population. Their socio-demographic characteristics included age, sex, civil status, years of instructional supervisory experience, and highest educational attainment. Their self-assessments provided the primary data for determining instructional supervisory efficacy and examining its relationship with their profiles. The collected information also served as the basis for developing a contextualized Instructional Supervisory Framework.

Research Instruments or Materials

The primary research instrument was a structured questionnaire developed from the study objectives and relevant literature on instructional supervisory efficacy. It consisted of two parts: the respondents' socio-demographic profiles and their self-assessed instructional supervisory efficacy. The second part evaluated supervisory practices in planning conferences, classroom observations, post-observation conferences, and post-conference analyses using a five-point Likert-type scale, with 5 indicating Highly Evident, 4 Evident, 3 Moderately Evident, 2 Slightly Evident, and 1 Not Evident. The questionnaire included closed-ended and open-ended questions to obtain standardized and detailed responses. Before administration, the instrument underwent expert validation by senior school heads and educational professionals to assess its clarity, relevance, content, and structure. It was subsequently pre-tested with instructional leaders who were excluded from the actual respondents. The pre-test identified ambiguities, assessed the questionnaire's comprehensibility and completion time, and guided necessary revisions before final distribution.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher sought permission from the Schools Division Superintendent of the Division of Albay before conducting the study. Following the validation and pre-testing of the questionnaire, the finalized instrument was distributed to the 24 school heads through face-to-face and online methods. For accessible schools, the researcher personally administered printed questionnaires, explained the study's purpose, and provided instructions to respondents. For geographically distant schools or respondents preferring digital participation, questionnaires were distributed through email or messaging platforms, accompanied by completion and submission instructions. Respondents were given one week to accomplish the questionnaire, with follow-up communication conducted to facilitate timely submission. Completed printed questionnaires were retrieved personally, while electronic responses were collected through email or an online survey platform. The gathered responses were subsequently organized for statistical analysis.

Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, and the Chi-square test of independence. Frequency counts and percentages described the respondents' socio-demographic profiles, including age, sex, civil status, years of instructional supervisory experience, and highest educational attainment. Percentages were calculated by dividing the frequency of each category by the total number of respondents and multiplying the result by 100. Weighted means were used to determine the respondents' self-assessed instructional supervisory efficacy across planning conferences, classroom observations, post-observation conferences, and post-conference analyses. Responses were assigned numerical weights from 5 (Highly Evident) to 1 (Not Evident), and weighted means were computed by dividing the sum of weighted responses by the total number of respondents. The Chi-square test of independence was employed to determine whether significant associations existed between the school heads' socio-demographic characteristics and their instructional supervisory efficacy. The analysis compared observed and expected frequencies to evaluate relationships between categorical variables. The resulting statistical findings provided the basis for interpreting supervisory efficacy and formulating recommendations for the proposed Instructional Supervisory Framework.

Ethical Consideration

The researcher sought authorization from the Schools Division Superintendent of the Division of Albay before administering the research instrument. Respondents were informed of the study's purpose and provided with instructions for completing the questionnaire. Opportunities for clarification were available during face-to-face administration, while online respondents received written instructions. Confidentiality was emphasized throughout data collection. Respondents were assured that their answers would remain confidential and that the information gathered would be used exclusively for research purposes. These measures were intended to protect respondents' information and maintain the confidentiality of their survey responses.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Socio-Demographic Profile of School Heads

3.1.1 Age

The findings revealed that 9 school heads (38%) were aged 41–50 years, 8 (33%) were aged 31–40 years, and 7 (29%) were aged 50 years and above. The largest proportion belonged to the 41–50 age group, indicating a predominantly middle-aged leadership population. This distribution suggests a combination of emerging and experienced school leaders, with varying supervisory competencies and professional development needs. OECD (2026) emphasized that younger leaders benefit from mentoring and structured professional development, while experienced leaders contribute institutional knowledge and leadership guidance.

3.1.2 Sex

Of the 24 school heads, 14 (58%) were male and 10 (42%) were female, indicating a higher representation of males in school leadership positions within the district. This distribution highlights the importance of examining gender representation in educational leadership and recognizing the value of equitable opportunities for professional growth. The findings suggest that leadership development initiatives should remain accessible to both male and female school heads to support inclusive professional development and strengthen instructional supervisory competencies.

3.1.3 Civil Status

The results showed that 22 school heads (92%) were married, while 2 (8%) were single, indicating that married respondents constituted the majority. This distribution highlights the relevance of work-life balance and institutional support in managing professional and personal responsibilities. OECD (2026) emphasized that school leaders' well-being, resilience, and maturity contribute to sustained leadership effectiveness despite increasing professional demands.

3.1.4 Years of Instructional Supervisory Experience

The findings revealed that 9 school heads (38%) had 0–5 years of supervisory experience, 7 (29%) had 10–15 years, and 6 (25%) had 20 years or more. Meanwhile, 1 respondent (4%) had 5–10 years of experience, and another (4%) had 15–20 years. The varied experience levels suggest the importance of differentiated professional development. Relatively new school heads may require mentoring and capacity-building, while experienced leaders can contribute practical supervisory knowledge. These differences emphasize the need to balance professional experience with innovation in instructional leadership.

3.1.5 Highest Educational Attainment

The educational attainment results indicated that 11 school heads (46%) held a Master of Arts degree, 10 (42%) had earned master's degree units, 2 (8%) held bachelor's degrees, and 1 (4%) possessed a doctorate degree. Overall, 92% had pursued education beyond the bachelor's degree. These findings indicate substantial postgraduate preparation among school heads, potentially strengthening their knowledge of educational leadership, pedagogy, and instructional supervision. Their academic qualifications provide a foundation for professional growth and the effective implementation of supervisory responsibilities.

3.2 Level of Instructional Supervisory Efficacy

3.2.1 Planning Conferences

School heads demonstrated an overall instructional supervisory efficacy weighted mean of 4.38, interpreted as Evident. Facilitating planning conferences received the highest rating (WM = 4.46), followed by providing instructional feedback (WM = 4.42) and follow-up support (WM = 4.38). Time management (WM = 4.33) and assisting teachers in implementing instructional plans (WM = 4.29) received the lowest ratings. These findings indicate strong planning and facilitation competencies but suggest the need to strengthen implementation support and time management. He et al. (2024) emphasized collaborative instructional leadership and continuous teacher support, while OECD (2026) identified challenges in sustaining follow-up activities and highlighted the importance of integrating planning, observation, reflection, and mentoring for instructional improvement.

3.2.2 Classroom Observations

The findings showed an overall weighted mean of 4.40, interpreted as Evident. Understanding instructional strategies and teaching methodologies received the highest rating (WM = 4.50), followed by addressing teachers' instructional challenges (WM = 4.42) and encouraging reflective practices (WM = 4.38). Constructive two-way communication and promoting professional development both obtained the lowest ratings (WM = 4.33). These results indicate strong pedagogical knowledge and problem-solving competencies but comparatively weaker communication and professional development support. He et al. (2024) emphasized collaborative feedback, reflection, and coaching as contributors to instructional improvement during classroom observations. OECD (2026) further stressed that classroom observation should be accompanied by targeted training and mentoring to address teachers' instructional needs.

3.2.3 Post-Observation Conferences

School heads obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.50, interpreted as Evident. Establishing clear and measurable instructional development goals received the highest rating (WM = 4.58). Leading professional development sessions and providing instructional resources both obtained 4.50, while identifying areas for improvement and providing timely feedback received the lowest ratings (WM = 4.46). The findings suggest that school heads are effective in goal-setting and providing professional support but need to strengthen diagnostic assessment and timely instructional feedback. He et al. (2024) emphasized reflective dialogue and collaborative goal-setting, while OECD (2026) highlighted the importance of specific, actionable, and timely

feedback, alongside professional development and resource assistance following classroom observations, in supporting teacher motivation and instructional improvement.

3.2.4 Post-Conference Analyses

Post-conference analysis obtained an overall weighted mean of 3.92, interpreted as Moderately Evident. Adjusting supervisory strategies based on teacher progress and creating conditions for instructional improvement received the highest ratings (WM = 4.00). Facilitating reflective dialogue obtained 3.92, aligning feedback with professional goals received 3.88, and school heads' self-reflection received the lowest rating (WM = 3.79). These findings indicate that post-conference analysis is the least developed supervisory phase, particularly in self-reflection and aligning feedback with teacher development goals. He et al. (2024) emphasized continuous reflection and associated school leaders' self-reflection with improved teacher performance and school achievement, while OECD (2026) highlighted adapting supervisory strategies to teachers' progress. Together, these points underscore the need to strengthen reflective supervisory practices.

3.3 Significant Relationships Between School Heads' Profiles and Instructional Supervisory Efficacy

The Chi-square test of independence was conducted at the 0.05 significance level, following the statistical procedures discussed by Gravetter and Wallnau (2016) and Field (2013). The findings revealed significant relationships between instructional supervisory efficacy and age (χ^2 = 14.168, df = 6, critical value = 12.592), sex (χ^2 = 31.520, df = 3, critical value = 7.815), and supervisory experience (χ^2 = 22.339, df = 12, critical value = 21.026). Conversely, civil status (χ^2 = 1.638, df = 3, critical value = 7.815) and highest educational attainment (χ^2 = 8.073, df = 9, critical value = 16.919) showed no significant relationships. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected for age, sex, and supervisory experience but was not rejected for civil status and educational attainment. These findings suggest that age, sex, and supervisory experience are associated with differences in instructional supervisory efficacy. OECD (2026) discussed age, sex, and professional experience in relation to leadership strategies, communication, and supervisory practices. Conversely, the nonsignificant relationships involving civil status and educational attainment indicate that these characteristics were not statistically associated with instructional supervisory efficacy among the respondents in the present study. These findings suggest that educational qualifications alone may not adequately explain variations in supervisory efficacy, highlighting the importance of considering other professional and contextual factors when examining instructional leadership effectiveness.

3.4 Proposed Instructional Supervisory Framework

Based on the findings, an Instructional Supervisory Framework was proposed to strengthen school heads' supervisory competencies and address identified areas for improvement. The framework emphasizes instructional leadership, teacher evaluation, professional development, evidence-based decision-making, curriculum oversight, resource management, and collaborative supervision. It particularly addresses the need to improve instructional plan implementation, two-way communication, timely feedback, and reflective post-conference analysis. The proposed framework recognizes instructional supervision as both an evaluative and developmental process that promotes teacher growth, professional collaboration, and continuous instructional improvement. By integrating supervisory competencies with

institutional support and evidence-based practices, it aims to strengthen school heads' leadership effectiveness and align instructional supervision with educational goals. Ultimately, the framework provides a contextualized approach to improving supervisory practices and supporting teaching and learning in Libon West District.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study concludes that the 24 school heads from the elementary schools of Libon West District generally demonstrate evident instructional supervisory efficacy, particularly in planning conferences, classroom observations, and post-observation conferences. However, post-conference analysis emerged as the comparatively weakest area, indicating a need to strengthen reflective dialogue, feedback alignment, and continuous instructional improvement. The respondents represented varied age groups, supervisory experience, and educational attainment, with most being married and a greater proportion being male. Significant relationships were established between instructional supervisory efficacy and age, sex, and supervisory experience, while civil status and highest educational attainment showed no significant relationships. These findings indicate that supervisory efficacy varies across certain demographic and professional characteristics within the district. Overall, the study establishes a contextual basis for the proposed Instructional Supervisory Framework, emphasizing the importance of sustaining established supervisory competencies while strengthening reflective and developmental practices among school heads.

Based on the findings, school administrators and educational stakeholders in Libon West District should prioritize professional development programs that strengthen post-conference analysis, particularly reflective dialogue, constructive feedback, and alignment of supervisory practices with teachers' professional goals. School heads should consistently review instructional feedback, monitor teachers' progress, and adjust supervisory strategies according to identified developmental needs. Since a considerable proportion of respondents have limited supervisory experience, structured mentoring and coaching programs should pair newly appointed school heads with experienced instructional leaders to strengthen supervisory competencies. Existing effective practices in planning conferences, classroom observations, and post-observation conferences should be maintained through continuous professional learning and collaborative supervision. Educational authorities should also support academic advancement through scholarships, study leaves, and accessible graduate programs. Furthermore, the proposed Instructional Supervisory Framework should be adopted and utilized as a guide for systematic, collaborative, and development-oriented instructional supervision within the district.

The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design involving 24 school heads from 24 elementary schools in Libon West District, Albay. Its geographic coverage and respondent group limit the direct generalizability of the findings to school heads in other educational settings. Data were gathered through a questionnaire reflecting respondents' self-assessments of instructional supervisory efficacy, rather than independent observations of supervisory practices. Furthermore, the Chi-square analysis established statistical relationships but did not determine causal effects among the variables. Future studies may include school heads from other districts, incorporate additional sources of assessment, and employ broader research approaches to further examine instructional supervisory efficacy.

5. REFERENCES

Alcopra, J. M., & Daigon, R. M. (2024). Enhancing teacher performance through instructional supervision in Bukidnon schools. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research, 8*(1), 22–35.

Alvarez, M. A., & Reyes, M. E. (2024). Emotional intelligence and self-efficacy among school leaders: Implications for inclusive education. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Management, 12*(2), 45–59.

Baguio, A. S., & Tagadiad, R. P. (2023). Instructional leadership and organizational socialization: Their impact on teacher self-efficacy in Davao del Norte. *Asian Journal of Educational Leadership, 15*(3), 78–92.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands–resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*(3), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.

Battad, J. L. (2024). Instructional leadership skills of school heads and its relation to the self-efficacy of elementary teachers in Castillejos District. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research, 5*(8), 3071–3078. https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.08.12

Bautista, L. M. (2024). Leadership self-efficacy and school culture in private international schools in Metro Manila. *International Journal of Educational Management, 18*(4), 101–115.

Calderon, J. F., & Gonzales, E. C. (1993). *Methods of research and thesis writing*. National Book Store.

Department of Education. (2019). *DepEd Order No. 11, s. 2019*.

Department of Education. (2020). *DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads*.

Detalla, M. D. (2024). Instructional leadership capacity of school heads as a leading construct of teacher leadership in public elementary schools of Davao Del Norte Division. *International Journal of Research in Interdisciplinary Studies, 2*(2), 7–12.

Engle, J., Xia, J., & Butler, S. J. (2024). Teacher leadership, wellbeing, and intent to leave in US rural schools: Evidence from the 2020–21 National Teacher and Principal Survey. *Education Sciences, 14*(7), Article 758. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14070758

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics* (4th ed.). SAGE.

Garcia, R. M., & Santos, J. P. (2023). Instructional leadership and teacher morale during resource shortages in Philippine schools. *Asian Journal of Educational Leadership, 14*(4), 67–81.

Go, A. D. G., & Eslabon, R. T. (2024). School heads' instructional supervisory skills and teachers' performance. *Polaris Global Journal of Scholarly Research and Trends, 3*(1), 13–28. https://doi.org/10.58429/pgjsrt.v3n1a104

Gravetter, F. J., & Wallnau, L. B. (2016). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences* (10th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Hallinger, P., Liu, S., Aung, P. N., & Yan, M. (2025). A systematic review of instructional leadership research conducted with the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS), 1983–2024. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432251358575

He, P., Guo, F., & Abazie, G. A. (2024). School principals' instructional leadership as a predictor of teacher's professional development. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 9*, Article 63. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00290-0

Iroegbu, E. E., & Etudor-Eyo, E. (2016). Principals' instructional supervision and teachers' effectiveness. *British Journal of Education, 4*(7), 99–109.

Johnson, L. M. (2023). Teacher self-efficacy and the adoption of inclusive strategies in Philippine classrooms. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 27*(1), 12–26.

Kilag, O. K. T., & Malbas, M. H. (2023). The interplay of instructional leadership and self-leadership: A study on school leaders' self-efficacy. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence, 1*(1), 45–60.

Obi, M. O., Offu, O. E., & Otu, M. N. (2024). Clinical supervisory skills and teachers' instructional effectiveness in public secondary schools in Calabar Education Zone, Cross River State, Nigeria. *Journal of Association of Educational Management and Policy Practitioners,* 6(2), 325–334.

OECD. (2025). *Results from TALIS 2024: The state of teaching*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/90df6235-en

OECD. (2026). *The value of school principals in TALIS 2024*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/a2cdb777-en

Quilala, R. L., & Tantiado, R. C. (2025). Instructional supervision and teachers' efficacy. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis, 8*(3). https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v8-i03-13

Ramos, J. P. (2024). Supervisory self-efficacy and school compliance with the Department of Education's performance-based bonus system. *Philippine Journal of Educational Administration, 13*(3), 90–104.

Romero, J. P. (2024). Shared instructional leadership in public schools: A statistical analysis. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research, 8*(2), 50–64.