

Instructional Leadership Practices of School Heads and Their Influence on Teacher Performance and Student Achievement in the TLE Department of Del Carmen National High School

Rochelle M. Germina

Del Carmen National High School, Uson, Masbate, Philippines

Email of Corresponding Author: rochelle.germina@deped.gov.ph

Publication history:

Received: August 6, 2026

Revised: August 15, 2026

Accepted: August 19, 2026

Published: August 20, 2026

International Journal of Sustainable and Integrated Studies, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 252–260, August 2026.

Abstract

This study examined the instructional leadership practices of school heads and their relationship with teacher performance and student achievement in the Technology and Livelihood Education (TLE) Department of Del Carmen National High School. Anchored on Hallinger's Instructional Leadership Model, Bandura's Social Cognitive and Self-Efficacy Theory, Walberg's Theory of Educational Productivity, and the Input-Process-Output approach, the study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational and causal-predictive design. All 25 TLE teachers were included through total population sampling. Data were gathered using a researcher-crafted, expert-validated, and pilot-tested questionnaire and documentary analysis of official Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) ratings and students' TLE general average grades. Results showed that school heads consistently practiced instructional supervision and monitoring ($M = 3.91$), curriculum and learning resource management ($M = 3.95$), teacher mentoring and professional development support ($M = 3.94$), and assessment and evaluation of learning outcomes ($M = 3.95$), all interpreted as Always. Teacher performance was Outstanding ($M = 4.52$), while student achievement was Very Satisfactory ($M = 87.60$). Instructional leadership had a moderate positive and statistically significant relationship with teacher performance ($r = 0.55$), whereas its relationship with student achievement was very weak and not statistically significant ($r = 0.08$). The study concludes that stronger instructional leadership is associated with higher teacher performance but is not significantly associated with student achievement within the study context. Strengthening lesson-plan review, curriculum alignment, teacher recognition, assessment-based interventions, and consideration of other factors affecting student achievement is recommended. The study supports SDG 4 (Quality Education) and SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth) by strengthening instructional quality and TLE competencies relevant to employment and livelihood. It contributes to educational, institutional, socio-economic, and community sustainability by supporting evidence-based instructional leadership, teacher development, and quality technical-vocational education.

Keywords: Instructional Leadership, Student Achievement, Sustainable Development Goals, Teacher Performance, Technology and Livelihood Education, TLE Teachers

1. Introduction

Instructional leadership is essential in improving teaching quality and student achievement, particularly in Technology and Livelihood Education (TLE), where learning involves technical competencies, practical activities, and performance-based assessment. School heads influence instruction through supervision, curriculum management, resource provision, teacher development, and assessment. School leadership is a major school-level factor affecting student learning (Leithwood et al., 2020; OECD, 2020), while effective supervision and professional support strengthen teacher performance and pedagogical growth (Bush, 2020; Day & Sammons, 2021).

Effective instructional leadership requires school heads to guide curriculum implementation, monitor instruction, provide feedback, and support teacher development. Learning-centered leadership contributes to improved student achievement (Hattie, 2023), while contemporary educational changes require leaders to continuously adapt their supervisory practices (Robinson, 2020; Harris & Jones, 2020; UNESCO, 2021). In the Philippines, these responsibilities are reinforced by the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSS) (Department of Education [DepEd], 2020) and Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) (DepEd, 2017). For TLE, leadership is particularly important because instruction requires specialized resources, laboratories, safety procedures, and practical assessments. Effective instructional management supports skill-based education (Kuizon and Reyes, 2020), while mentoring, collaboration, feedback, and supervision strengthen teacher effectiveness (Palmera, 2025; Jimenez and Galicia, 2023; Go and Eslabon, 2024).

International literature shows that instructional leadership improves teaching quality and learner outcomes (Maponya, 2020; Sanchez & Watson, 2021; Bellibaş et al., 2021a). Evidence-based leadership is particularly important in rural schools (Cox & Mullen, 2023), while collaboration and professional learning strengthen instructional practices (Bellibaş et al., 2021b; Stosich, 2020; Hallinger & Hosseingholizadeh, 2020). Philippine literature similarly emphasizes supervision, professional development, and teacher involvement in improving instruction (Limon, 2025; Daigon & Alcopra, 2024; Inong, 2025; Basilio & Bueno, 2021). Teacher competence is also influenced by professional experience, education, employment stability, and mentorship (Torres et al., 2022; Reyes et al., 2023; Ramos et al., 2022; Gonzales et al., 2023). TLE requires strong subject knowledge, appropriate learning resources, and continuous competency development (Espiritu, 2023; Salalila & Ponce, 2023; Basal, 2022). Professional development, technological literacy, mentoring, and effective instructional materials further strengthen TLE teaching (Salvador, 2025; Caingcoy, 2022; Dioquino & Abellana, 2022).

International studies associate structured supervision, feedback, curriculum monitoring, and resource provision with stronger teacher performance (Myers, 2022; Anderson, 2022; Girgis, 2023; Kimmons, 2022; Musundire, 2020; Sultan et al., 2022). Similar Philippine studies demonstrate positive relationships between instructional leadership and teacher performance (Obusan, 2020; Baggay et al., 2021; Battad, 2024) and between leadership practices and student achievement (Aureada, 2021; Barola & Digo, 2022; Manguiat, 2025). Within TLE, resource management, instructional guidance, supervision, and laboratory support influence teacher competence and student performance (Arañez, 2021; Cabrerros, 2023; Ramos, 2024; Dela Cruz, 2022; Borbon, 2025). The present study focuses on Del Carmen National High School in Uson, Masbate, a public secondary school under the Department of Education Schools Division of Masbate (Department of Education, 2025). Its TLE and technical-vocational programs support the development of practical competencies among rural learners (DepEd Region V, 2025).

The study is anchored on Hallinger's Instructional Leadership Model (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985), Bandura's Social Cognitive and Self-Efficacy Theory (Bandura, 1977), and Walberg's Theory of Educational Productivity (Walberg, 1981). Hallinger's model explains how school heads influence instruction through goal setting, supervision, curriculum coordination, and professional development. Bandura's theory explains how leadership support and feedback may strengthen teacher self-efficacy and performance, while Walberg's theory explains how instructional quality and environmental conditions contribute to student achievement. The study also adopts the Input-Process-Output (IPO) approach. It examines teacher demographics and four instructional leadership dimensions: Instructional Supervision and Monitoring, Curriculum and Learning Resource Management, Teacher Mentoring and Professional Development Support, and Assessment and Evaluation of Learning Outcomes. These are examined in relation to teachers' IPCRF ratings and students' TLE general average grades.

Although instructional leadership has been widely examined, TLE presents specialized requirements involving workshop management, technical resources, safety, and authentic performance assessment. Philippine studies establish relationships between leadership and teacher or student outcomes (Obusan, 2020; Aureada, 2021; Battad, 2024), while TLE studies emphasize supervision and resource support (Arañez, 2021; Cabrerros, 2023; Ramos, 2024; Dela Cruz, 2022; Borbon, 2025). However, context-specific evidence remains needed at Del Carmen National High School. This study therefore examines how school heads' instructional leadership practices relate to TLE teacher performance and student achievement.

The study supports SDG 4 – Quality Education by examining leadership practices that strengthen teacher performance, instructional quality, and student achievement. It also relates to SDG 8 – Decent Work and Economic Growth, as TLE develops practical, technical, entrepreneurial, and workforce-oriented competencies that prepare learners for employment and livelihood opportunities.

The study contributes to educational and institutional sustainability by providing evidence that can strengthen instructional supervision, teacher development, resource management, and assessment in TLE. It also supports socio-economic and community sustainability by promoting quality technical-vocational education that develops competencies relevant to employment, entrepreneurship, and further education. The findings may further support school administrators and DepEd officials in evidence-based instructional planning and leadership development.

2. Material and methods

2.1 Research Design

The study used a quantitative descriptive-correlational and causal-predictive research design. The descriptive approach determined the demographic profile of TLE teachers, instructional leadership practices of school heads, teacher performance based on Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) numerical ratings, and student achievement based on TLE general average grades. The correlational approach examined the direction and strength of relationships between instructional leadership practices and teacher performance and student achievement, while the causal-predictive approach determined the extent to which instructional leadership practices explained variations in these outcomes.

2.2 Locale of the Study

The study was conducted at Del Carmen National High School, where the Technology and Livelihood Education Department served as the specific setting for examining instructional leadership, teacher performance, and student achievement.

2.3 Respondents of the Study

The respondents consisted of all 25 TLE teachers of Del Carmen National High School. Their profiles were described according to age, sex, highest educational attainment, teaching position, and years of teaching experience in TLE.

2.4 Sample and Sampling Procedure

The study employed total population sampling or the census method because the TLE Department had a small and clearly defined population. All 25 active TLE teachers were included, providing complete representation of the department and eliminating sampling error.

2.5 Research Instrument

Data were collected using a structured, researcher-crafted questionnaire and documentary analysis. The questionnaire gathered respondents' demographic and professional profiles and assessed school heads' instructional leadership practices in four dimensions: Instructional Supervision and Monitoring, Curriculum and Learning Resource Management, Teacher Mentoring and Professional Development Support, and Assessment and Evaluation of Learning Outcomes. Documentary data included teachers' official IPCRF numerical ratings and students' TLE general average grades. The instrument underwent expert validation by research advisers, educational management experts, and TLE master teachers to establish face and content validity. It was subsequently pilot-tested among TLE teachers from an adjacent secondary school who were excluded from the actual respondents. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to establish internal consistency and reliability. The questionnaire used a four-point Likert scale. Table 1 presents the interpretation of the scale: scores from 3.26–4.00 corresponded to Always (4), 2.51–3.25 to Often (3), 1.76–2.50 to Sometimes (2), and 1.00–1.75 to Never (1). This scale provided the basis for interpreting the respondents' assessments of instructional leadership practices.

2.6 Data Gathering Procedure

Formal permission was secured from the Schools Division Superintendent, Public Schools District Supervisor, and Principal of Del Carmen National High School. After expert validation and pilot testing, the researcher oriented the 25 respondents regarding the study's objectives, scope, and significance. Informed consent was obtained in accordance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012, emphasizing voluntary participation, confidentiality, and data protection. The validated questionnaires were personally distributed and retrieved after three to five working days. Teacher IPCRF numerical ratings and students' TLE general average grades were concurrently obtained from official school records and class summaries with approval from the TLE Department Head and School Registrar. The collected data were then organized, coded, entered into a master spreadsheet, cleaned, and prepared for statistical analysis.

2.7 Data Analysis Techniques

Frequency counts and percentages were used to describe respondents according to age, sex, highest educational attainment, teaching position, and years of TLE teaching experience. Weighted mean and standard deviation were used to determine the levels and variability of instructional leadership practices, teacher performance based on IPCRF ratings, and student achievement based on TLE general average grades. Pearson's Product-Moment

Correlation Coefficient (r) was employed to determine the significant relationships between instructional leadership practices and teacher performance and between instructional leadership practices and student achievement. Linear regression analysis was also used to determine the predictive influence of instructional leadership practices on the outcome variables. Statistical processing was performed using computer software.

2.8 Ethical Considerations

The study observed ethical and data-protection requirements throughout data collection. Formal institutional authorization was obtained before conducting the research, and respondents received information regarding the study before providing informed consent. Participation was voluntary, and confidentiality and protection of respondent information were maintained in accordance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Demographic Profile of TLE Teachers

3.1.1 Age

Of the 25 respondents, 40.00% were aged 30–39 years, 32.00% were 20–29 years, and 28.00% were 40–49 years. None were aged 50 years or above. The predominance of teachers aged 30–39 indicates a workforce combining developing professional experience with relatively younger and more experienced educators. Early-career educators may be more receptive to contemporary competency-based strategies but may still require mentoring to strengthen classroom application (Torres et al., 2022).

3.1.2 Sex

Female teachers comprised 60.00% of the respondents, while males accounted for 40.00%. The higher proportion of female respondents reflects the broader female representation within the teaching profession. Nevertheless, participation of both sexes provides diverse perspectives relevant to instructional practice and leadership assessment (Sebastian et al., 2022).

3.1.3 Highest Educational Attainment

Most respondents held a Bachelor's Degree (68.00%), while 20.00% had completed a Master's Degree and 12.00% had earned master's degree units. None had doctoral qualifications. The presence of teachers pursuing or completing graduate education indicates continuing professional development. Advanced academic preparation, together with practical experience, may strengthen pedagogical knowledge and instructional effectiveness (Reyes et al., 2023).

3.1.4 Teaching Position

Teacher I constituted the largest group at 36.00%, followed by Teacher III and Teacher VI at 16.00% each, Teacher II and Master Teacher I at 12.00% each, and Teacher IV at 8.00%. No respondents occupied Teacher V, Master Teacher II, or Master Teacher III positions. The distribution reflects both entry-level and more advanced career positions, providing varied professional perspectives. Career progression and employment stability may strengthen commitment to instructional planning and continuing professional development (Ramos et al., 2022).

3.1.5 TLE Teaching Experience

Most respondents had 4–10 years of TLE teaching experience (40.00%), followed by three years or below (36.00%), 11–15 years (20.00%), and 16 years or above (4.00%). The distribution represents teachers with varying levels of practical experience. Greater teaching experience can contribute to instructional effectiveness, while structured mentoring and professional support can facilitate the development of less experienced teachers (Gonzales et al., 2023).

3.2 Instructional Leadership Practices of School Heads

3.2.1 Instructional Supervision and Monitoring

Instructional supervision and monitoring obtained a composite mean of 3.91 (Always). The use of standardized supervisory tools received the highest mean of 4.00, while reviewing DLLs/DLPs aligned with TLE competencies obtained the lowest mean of 3.80, although still interpreted as Always. The results demonstrate consistent supervision through classroom observations, feedback, monitoring, and standardized evaluation. However, lesson-plan monitoring could be further strengthened to maintain alignment with TLE competencies. This finding is supported by Musundire (2020), who found through a mixed-methods doctoral study that headteachers' curriculum monitoring, instructional guidance, and provision of learning resources had a statistically significant positive effect on teacher effectiveness and classroom performance.

3.2.2 Curriculum and Learning Resource Management

Curriculum and learning resource management obtained a composite mean of 3.95 (Always). Supporting TLE tools, equipment, and materials and encouraging contextualized instruction both received the highest mean of 4.00, while alignment with DepEd-prescribed TLE curriculum guides received the lowest mean of 3.88. The

findings indicate strong support for instructional resources and locally responsive TLE instruction, although continued curriculum monitoring is needed to ensure contextualized activities remain aligned with prescribed competencies. This finding is supported by Espiritu (2023), who emphasized the importance of curriculum and learning resource management as a key supervisory responsibility that requires teacher competence and strong instructional qualities to maximize the effective use of learning materials.

3.2.3 Teacher Mentoring and Professional Development Support

Teacher mentoring and professional development support recorded a composite mean of 3.94 (Always). Training and National Certification opportunities, mentoring on instructional strategies, and support for professional advancement each obtained 4.00, while recognition and awards for teacher achievements received the lowest mean of 3.80. The findings indicate consistent support for teachers' technical and pedagogical development, although recognition mechanisms could be further strengthened. This finding is consistent with Dioquino and Abellana (2022), who emphasized that quality instructional materials, effective teaching methodologies, structured teacher mentoring, and sustained professional development contribute significantly to the mastery and competencies of TLE educators.

3.2.4 Assessment and Evaluation of Learning Outcomes

Assessment and evaluation of learning outcomes obtained a composite mean of 3.95 (Always). Analysis of student performance data and implementation of remedial and enrichment programs both obtained 4.00, while using assessment results for school-wide TLE improvement planning received the lowest mean of 3.88. The findings demonstrate consistent use of assessment to identify learning gaps and provide interventions, although assessment data could be more systematically incorporated into school-wide improvement planning. This finding is further supported by Ignacio and Cruz (2025), who emphasized that improving performance-based TLE instruction requires continuous professional development, enhanced assessment rubrics, and strengthened instructional supervision.

3.3 TLE Teacher Performance

The TLE teachers achieved a composite IPCRF mean of 4.52 (Outstanding). Among the 25 respondents, 80.00% were rated Outstanding, 12.00% Very Satisfactory, and 8.00% Satisfactory. No teacher received an Unsatisfactory or Poor rating. The results indicate a generally high-performing TLE teaching workforce, although teachers in the lower performance categories may still benefit from professional development. This finding is consistent with Obusan (2020), who established that school heads' engagement in structured classroom observations, collaborative lesson planning, and targeted technical assistance significantly enhances teachers' pedagogical practices and Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) ratings.

3.4 Student Achievement in TLE

Student achievement obtained a composite mean of 87.60 (Very Satisfactory). Of the reported grades, 40.00% were Outstanding, 32.00% Very Satisfactory, 20.00% Satisfactory, and 8.00% Fairly Satisfactory. None fell below 75, and 72.00% obtained grades of 85 or higher. The results indicate generally high student achievement, although learners in the lower grade range may require additional instructional support. These aligned with Aureada (2021), who demonstrated that school heads' active management of the curriculum, instructional supervision, and promotion of a positive academic climate are significantly associated with higher student achievement scores in standardized regional assessments.

3.5 Relationship Between Instructional Leadership and TLE Teacher Performance

The analysis revealed a moderate positive relationship ($r = 0.55$) between school heads' instructional leadership practices and TLE teacher performance. The computed r -value exceeded the critical value of ± 0.3961 at the 0.05 level of significance with 23 degrees of freedom. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating a statistically significant relationship. The result indicates that stronger instructional leadership is associated with higher TLE teacher performance. Practices such as instructional direction, supervision, feedback, and professional development may support teachers in fulfilling their instructional responsibilities. These results align with Kimmons (2022), who identified a statistically significant positive correlation between teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership attributes and both teacher self-efficacy and performance evaluation ratings.

3.6 Relationship Between Instructional Leadership and Student Achievement in TLE

The analysis showed a very weak positive relationship ($r = 0.08$) between instructional leadership practices and student achievement. The computed r -value was below the critical value of ± 0.3961 at the 0.05 level of significance with 23 degrees of freedom. The null hypothesis was therefore accepted, indicating that the relationship was not statistically significant. The result suggests that instructional leadership alone was not significantly associated with student achievement in this study. Other learner-, teacher-, classroom-, and resource-related conditions may contribute to variations in achievement. In contrast, Barola and Digo (2022) found that principal leadership behaviors, particularly framing academic targets, protecting learning time, and monitoring

curriculum implementation, were significantly associated with students' performance in quarterly examinations. The difference suggests that the relationship between instructional leadership and student achievement may vary across educational contexts.

4. Conclusion & Recommendations

The study concludes that school heads consistently demonstrated instructional leadership across supervision and monitoring, curriculum and learning resource management, teacher mentoring and professional development, and assessment and evaluation. TLE teachers demonstrated an Outstanding overall performance with a composite mean of 4.52, while student achievement was Very Satisfactory with a composite mean of 87.60, with all reported students attaining passing grades. Instructional leadership had a moderate positive and statistically significant relationship with teacher performance ($r = 0.55$), indicating that stronger leadership practices were associated with higher teacher performance. In contrast, its relationship with student achievement was very weak and not statistically significant ($r = 0.08$), indicating that student achievement may also be influenced by other teacher-, learner-, resource-, classroom-, and family-related factors.

School heads should strengthen the review and feedback of DLLs and DLPs, maintain alignment of contextualized and technology-supported activities with TLE competencies, and improve recognition of teachers' instructional innovations and professional achievements. School heads and TLE teachers should also maximize assessment results through targeted remedial, enrichment, and instructional improvement plans and continue monitoring learners with lower achievement levels. Since instructional leadership was not significantly related to student achievement, other factors affecting achievement should also be considered. Future researchers may conduct similar studies using larger samples, additional schools, and other variables to further examine teacher performance and student achievement in TLE.

The study was limited to 25 TLE teachers from Del Carmen National High School and examined instructional leadership in relation to teacher performance and student achievement within this specific setting. The findings therefore reflect the respondents and variables included in the study. The recommendation for future studies to use larger samples, additional schools, and other variables indicates the need for broader investigation to further examine factors influencing teacher performance and student achievement in TLE.

5. Compliance with ethical standards

The author declares no conflict of interest. This study received no external funding. The researchers acknowledge the 25 TLE teacher-respondents and Del Carmen National High School for their participation and cooperation; participation was voluntary, informed consent was obtained, and data were collected through non-invasive survey questionnaires and documentary analysis of authorized school records. Confidentiality and data privacy were maintained throughout the study, and no identifying information of individual participants was disclosed.

REFERENCES

- Abdurahman, N. A., & Omar, J. K. (2021). School heads' educational leadership practice and teachers' performance: The case of Omar District, Division of Sulu, Philippines. *Open Access Indonesia Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(4), 432–444.
- Adejumo, A. O. (2024). Administrative coherence and educational resilience: Aligning principal leadership with teacher professional growth. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 56(1), 45–62.
- Alanoglu, M. (2022). The role of instructional leadership in increasing teacher self-efficacy: A meta-analytic review. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 23(2), 233–244.
- Anderson, K. C. (2022). Administrators and teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership practices to increase student achievement (Publication No. 29997184) [Doctoral dissertation, Walden University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Arañez, R. (2021). Experiential learning in handicraft, teachers' competence and students work skills: Basis for supplementary instructional material [Unpublished master's thesis]. Graduate School, Laguna State Polytechnic University.
- Aureada, J. U. (2021). Instructional leadership practices of school heads and their relationship to student achievement in public elementary schools [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Graduate School, Manuel S. Enverga University Foundation.
- Baggay, C., Bautista, B., & Joseph, D. J. (2021). School heads' instructional supervision and its impact on teachers' job satisfaction and performance [Unpublished master's thesis]. Graduate School, Cagayan State University.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215.

- Barcelona, K. E. P., Daling, B. A. J., Doria, P., Balangiao, S. J., Mailes, M. J., Chiang, P. M., & Ubatay, D. (2023). Challenges and opportunities of TLE teachers in Philippine public schools: An inquiry. *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies*, 4(4), 44–60.
- Barola, R. C., & Digo, G. S. (2022). Instructional leadership practices of school principals and student academic performance [Unpublished master's thesis]. Graduate School, Sorsogon State University.
- Basal, D. V. (2022). Instructional competencies of Technology and Livelihood Education (TLE) teachers: Basis for a competency-based module. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 96(1), 145–157.
- Basilio, M. B., & Bueno, D. C. (2021). Instructional supervision and assessment in the 21st century and beyond. *Institutional Multidisciplinary Research and Development (IMRaD) Journal*, 4, 1–8.
- Battad, R. P. (2024). Instructional leadership skills of school heads and its relation to teacher self-efficacy and classroom performance [Unpublished master's thesis]. Graduate School, President Ramon Magsaysay State University.
- Bellibaş, M. Ş., Gümüş, S., & Liu, Y. (2021a). Does school leadership matter for teachers' classroom practice? The influence of instructional leadership and distributed leadership on instructional quality. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 32(3), 387–412.
- Bellibaş, M. Ş., Kılınç, A. Ç., & Polatcan, M. (2021). The moderation role of transformational leadership in the effect of instructional leadership on teacher professional learning and instructional practice: An integrated leadership perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 57(5), 776–814.
- Borbon, J. (2025). Experiential learning in TLE cookery towards soft skills and academic achievement among Grade 10 learners [Unpublished master's thesis]. Graduate School, Batangas State University.
- Bush, T. (2020). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Cabreros, J. R. (2023). Development of supplementary learning material and instructional performance in TLE cookery for Grade 10 learners [Unpublished master's thesis]. Graduate School, Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University.
- Caingcoy, M. E. (2022). Competencies and professional development needs of kindergarten teachers. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.
- Calanog, M. C. B. (2021). Developing technical skills of Technology and Livelihood Education secondary teachers in the Province of Batangas. *International Journal of Research in Engineering, Science and Management*, 4(12), 120–132.
- Cox, J. S., & Mullen, C. A. (2023). Impacting student achievement: Principals' instructional leadership practice in two Title I rural schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 33(1), 3–25.
- Daigon, M. E., & Alcopra, A. (2024). Instructional supervision practices and efficacy of teachers. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 7(8), 3738–3746.
- Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2021). Successful school leadership. In *Oxford research encyclopedia of education*. Oxford University Press.
- Dela Cruz, M. A. (2022). Instructional leadership support, TLE teachers' competence, and students' practical skill acquisition [Unpublished master's thesis]. Graduate School, Bulacan State University.
- Department of Budget and Management. (2010). General Appropriations Act, FY 2010: Department of Education budget allocations. Government of the Republic of the Philippines.
- Department of Education. (2013). K to 12 curriculum guide: Technology and Livelihood Education. Republic of the Philippines, Department of Education.
- Department of Education. (2017). National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017). Republic of the Philippines.
- Department of Education. (2017). Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) manual for teachers and school heads. Republic of the Philippines, Department of Education.
- Department of Education. (2020). National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020). Republic of the Philippines.
- Department of Education. (2021). Guidelines on the implementation of school-level management and administrative functions (DepEd Order No. 002, s. 2021). Republic of the Philippines, Department of Education.
- Department of Education. (2025). Master list of public secondary schools: Schools Division of Masbate. Department of Education, Region V (Bicol).
- Department of Education Region V. (2025). DepEd Learning Management System: 302131 - Del Carmen National High School profile. Regional Office V, Legazpi City.
- Department of Public Works and Highways. (2023). Notice to proceed: Construction of one (1) unit one (1) storey three (3) classroom school building at Del Carmen National High School, Uson, Masbate (Contract ID: 23FJ0049). DPWH Masbate 3rd District Engineering Office.
- Dioquino, W. S., & Abellana, A. L. (2022). Instructional support and professional development on competencies of Technology and Livelihood Education teachers. *International Journal on Integrated Education*, 5(11), 129–176.
- Espiritu, E. V. (2020). Readiness of Technology and Livelihood Education (TLE) teachers in the implementation of K to 12 curriculums. *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(11), 47–50.

- Girgis, A. M. (2023). Instructional leadership characteristics for principals (Publication No. 30488219) [Doctoral dissertation, Indiana Wesleyan University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Go, A. D. G., & Eslabon, R. T. (2024). School heads' instructional and supervisory skills and teachers' performance. *Pacific Graduate Journal of Science, Research, and Technology*, 3(1), 104.
- Gonzales, D. M., Cruz, A. R., & Bautista, S. L. (2023). Mentoring practices and teacher development. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 15(2), 60–75.
- Gonzalez, M. (TheCoffee). (2005). Ph locator masbate uson.png [Locator map]. Wikimedia Commons.
- Google. (n.d.). Municipality of Uson, Masbate. Google Maps.
- Grissom, J. A., Egalite, A. J., & Lindsay, C. A. (2021). How principals affect students and schools: A systematic synthesis of two decades of research. Wallace Foundation.
- Gurr, D., Drysdale, L., & Longmuir, F. (2022). Open systems perspective on educational management: Aligning principalship with school dynamics. *Educational Management & Leadership Review*, 50(2), 211–229.
- Guskey, T. R. (2013). Defining student achievement. In J. H. McMillan (Ed.), *SAGE handbook of research on classroom assessment* (pp. 3–16). SAGE Publications.
- Hallinger, P., & Hosseingholizadeh, R. (2020). Exploring instructional leadership in Iran: A mixed methods study of high- and low-performing principals. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(4), 595–616.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–247.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2020). COVID-19: School leadership in crisis times. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(4), 223–226.
- Hattie, J. (2023). *Visible learning: The sequel: A synthesis of over 2,100 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- 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.
- Ignacio, B. D. J., & Cruz, J. E. Y. (2025). Technology and Livelihood Education teachers' competence in performance task development. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 7(6), 65–73.
- Inong, E. M. G. (2025). Instructional supervision practices of school heads and teachers' implementation of reading comprehension strategies. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 5(7), 488–510.
- Jimenez, R. G. R., & Galicia, L. S. (2023). School heads' instructional leadership skills, emotional competencies, and teachers' work performance in selected public junior high schools. *Technium Education and Humanities*, 5, 45–68.
- Juban, K. (2024). An assessment on the level of implementation of the K to 12 Technology and Livelihood Education (TLE) program among Grade 7 learners. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(7).
- Kimmons, G. B. (2022). The effects of teacher perceptions of principal leadership attributes on teacher efficacy (ED623102) [Doctoral dissertation, Union University]. ERIC Repository.
- Kuizon, M., & Reyes, R. (2020). Extent of instructional supervision implementation in the basic education schools: Effects on school performance. *Annals of Studies in Science and Humanities*, 2(1).
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22.
- Limon, M. R. (2025). Role performance of TLE supervisors: Its implications to supervisory practices in university setting. *International Journal of Vocational and Technical Education Research*, 1(3), 35–44.
- Ma, X., & Marion, R. (2021). Exploring how instructional leadership affects teacher efficacy: A multilevel analysis. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(1), 188–207.
- Manguiat, R. M. (2025). Teacher-led instructional leadership practices and student learning outcomes in senior high school [Unpublished master's thesis]. Graduate School, Philippine Normal University.
- Maponya, T. J. (2020). The instructional leadership role of the school principal on learners' academic achievement. *African Educational Research Journal*, 8(2), 183–193.
- Munna, A. S. (2023). Instructional leadership and role of module leaders. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 32(1), 38–54.
- Musundire, A. (2020). The contribution of instructional leadership to learner performance and teacher effectiveness in public secondary schools [Doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria]. Institutional Repository of the University of Pretoria.
- Myers, S. L. (2022). Novice teachers' perceptions of the most effective instructional leadership practices [Doctoral dissertation, Louisiana Tech University]. Digital Commons @ Louisiana Tech.
- Naguit, J. Z. (2024). Instructional leadership practices of school heads and performance of teachers in instructional supervision. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(7), 1–15.
- Obusan, E. S. (2020). Correlation of school heads' instructional leadership approaches and teaching performance in secondary schools [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Graduate School, Polytechnic University of the Philippines.

- OECD. (2020). TALIS 2018 results (Volume II): Teachers and school leaders as valued professionals. OECD Publishing.
- Palmera, N. S. (2025). School heads instructional management and teachers capability of public elementary schools. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 5(8), 346–359.
- Parlar, H., Cansoy, R., & Parlar, S. (2021). Examining the relationship between instructional leadership behaviors of school principals and collaborative school culture. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 24(5), 640–658.
- Philippine Statistics Authority. (2025). Uson, Masbate. 2024 Census of Population (POPCEN) population counts declared official by the President.
- Ramos, E. J., Cruz, P. L., & Santos, M. D. (2022). Employment stability and teacher professional development. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 11(3), 102–118.
- Ramos, L. V. (2024). Supervisory leadership styles of school heads and performance of Technology and Livelihood Education teachers [Unpublished master's thesis]. Graduate School, Cavite State University.
- Reyes, H. L., & Aquino, R. S. (2023). Laboratory resources and teaching effectiveness. *Science Education Review*, 14(1), 34–48.
- Robinson, V. (2020). *Reduce change to increase improvement*. Corwin Press.
- Sahlin, S. (2022). Teachers' sense-making of principal leadership in collaborative school improvement initiatives. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 7(3), 245–260.
- Salalila, C. G., & Ponce, R. R. (2023). Instructional supervision and teachers' professional development: Basis for an enhancement program. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 14(15), 117–130.
- Salvador, D. R. (2025). TLE teachers professional development on their teaching competencies and achievement. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications*, 8(2), 143–151.
- Sanchez, J., & Watson, J. M. (2021). Effective instructional leadership practices in high performing elementary schools. *Journal of School Administration Research and Development*, 6(2), 60–70.
- Sebastian, K. L., Cruz, M. A., & Dela Peña, R. (2022). Gender distribution in Philippine basic education. *Journal of Educational Studies*, 10(1), 15–28.
- Stosich, E. L. (2020). Central office leadership for instructional improvement: Developing collaborative leadership among principals and instructional leadership team members. *Teachers College Record*, 122(9), 1–42.
- Sultan, F. M. M., Karuppannan, G., & Rumpod, J. (2022). Instructional leadership practices among headmasters and the correlation with primary schools' achievement and teacher efficacy in Sabah, Malaysia. *English Language Teaching*, 15(2), 50–61.
- Torres, M. A., Reyes, L. P., & Santos, J. R. (2022). Teaching innovation among early-career teachers in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 98(1), 45–60.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2021). UNESCO national education responses to COVID-19 school closures. UNESCO Publishing.
- Walberg, H. J. (1981). A psychological theory of educational productivity. In F. H. Farley & N. J. Gordon (Eds.), *Psychology and education: The state of the union* (pp. 81–108). McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Wikipedia contributors. (2025). Uson. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia.