

Managerial Competencies and Instructional Leadership Practices of School Heads in Batuan and San Fernando Districts

Elvie R. Ensalada

Royroy Integrated School, Batuan, Masbate, Philippines

Email of Corresponding Author: elvie.ensalada01@deped.gov.ph

Publication history:

Received: July 18, 2026

Revised: August 19, 2026

Accepted: August 25, 2026

Published: August 26, 2026

International Journal of Sustainable and Integrated Studies, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 400–8, August 2026.

Abstract

This study examined the managerial competencies and instructional leadership practices of school heads in the Batuan and San Fernando Districts and determined the relationship between these variables as a basis for a leadership development program. It was anchored on Instructional Leadership Theory, Transformational Leadership Theory, Management Functions Theory, and the Input-Process-Output model. The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design involving 40 school heads from public elementary and secondary schools selected through total enumeration. Data were gathered using a structured researcher-made questionnaire based on the study objectives, the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads, and related literature, with expert validation conducted before administration. Results showed that school heads consistently demonstrated managerial competencies in planning, organizing, leading, decision-making, communication, and monitoring and evaluation, with all dimensions interpreted as Always Practiced. Their instructional leadership practices in curriculum implementation, supervision of instruction, teacher professional development, learner performance monitoring, school climate, and community engagement were likewise consistently practiced. A statistically significant moderate positive relationship was found between managerial competencies and instructional leadership practices ($r = 0.42$), indicating that stronger managerial competence was associated with stronger instructional leadership. The study concluded that both areas are important to effective school management, teaching and learning, and educational outcomes. It recommended continued leadership development, mentoring, professional development, improved monitoring and evaluation, timely communication, instructional supervision, data-based learner interventions, stakeholder collaboration, and possible implementation of the LEAD Excellence Program. The study aligns with SDG 4 - Quality Education by supporting stronger school leadership, teacher development, learning environments, and educational management. It contributes to educational, institutional, and community sustainability by strengthening leadership capacity, governance, professional learning, stakeholder engagement, and continuous school improvement.

Keywords: Community Engagement, Instructional Leadership, Leadership Development, Managerial Competencies, School Heads, School Leadership, Teacher Professional Development

1. Introduction

Effective school leadership is essential to school effectiveness, instructional quality, and learner achievement. School heads are expected to perform administrative and instructional responsibilities involving planning, resource management, supervision, teacher development, and stakeholder engagement. Research indicates that

leadership influences teacher motivation, school climate, instructional quality, and student outcomes (Hallinger & Wang, 2021; OECD, 2020), while strong managerial competencies support resource management, educational innovation, and collaboration (Ng, 2021; Leithwood et al., 2020). In the Philippines, Republic Act No. 9155 and the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) under DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020 recognize school heads as both administrative managers and instructional leaders. Within this context, the study examines the managerial competencies and instructional leadership practices of school heads in the Batuan and San Fernando Districts and determines the relationship between these variables as a basis for a leadership development program.

Managerial competence enables school heads to plan, organize, lead, communicate, make decisions, and monitor school operations. Grissom et al. (2021) emphasized that effective principals integrate organizational, instructional, relational, and strategic practices. Alamsyah et al. (2021), Elfira et al. (2024), Bustami and Putra (2023), and Ulandari and Rustan (2021) likewise demonstrated the importance of planning, organizational management, monitoring, and managerial competence in school leadership. Lin (2024) further identified strategic thinking, teamwork, communication, and innovative management as important leadership capabilities. Instructional leadership focuses these managerial capacities on teaching and learning. Gümüş et al. (2021) emphasized teacher support, instructional monitoring, and the learning environment, while Dutta and Sahney (2022) associated instructional leadership with school climate, teacher performance, and student achievement. He et al. (2024) and Nguyen et al. (2025) demonstrated its contribution to teacher professional development. Akgöz et al. (2024) and Chen and Rong (2023) further connected instructional leadership with teacher autonomy, self-efficacy, collegiality, and school climate. Community engagement is also important, as emphasized by Stanley and Gilzene (2023) and Alamsyah et al. (2021).

International studies consistently show that managerial and instructional leadership are interconnected but context-dependent. Tan et al. (2022) and Wu and Shen (2022) found positive associations between principal leadership and school outcomes, while Sun et al. (2024) emphasized the influence of organizational and contextual conditions. Pietsch et al. (2025) similarly showed that instructional leadership effects vary across educational settings. Leadership development must therefore respond to actual school conditions, as supported by Liljenberg (2021) and Ulandari and Rustan (2021). Research also highlights teacher professional learning, supervision, collaboration, and stakeholder relationships. Kim and Lee (2020), Nguyen et al. (2025), and He, Guo, and Abazie (2024) associated instructional leadership with professional development. Akgöz, Şahin, and Erdoğan (2024), Gümüş et al. (2021), and Hsieh, Chen, and Li (2023) emphasized supervision, school climate, and professional collaboration. Smith, Reinke, Herman, and Sebastian (2021) and Mayger and Provinzano (2022) further identified family and community engagement as important leadership responsibilities. Mincu, Colman, Day, and Gu (2024), Sun et al. (2024), and Pietsch, Aydin, and Gümüş (2025) reinforced the importance of contextualized leadership. Philippine studies present similar findings. Ganaden (2020), Ultra (2021), Bedaure and Bedaure (2023), and Ubongen and Revuelta (2022) emphasized managerial leadership, professional competence, school management, and accountability. Daud (2021), Ornopia et al. (2022), Arombo (2023), Guamos and Jalos (2023), and Trongco and Benolirao (2023) highlighted instructional supervision, teacher support, and interpersonal competencies. Professional characteristics may also influence leadership, although findings remain inconsistent. Ultra (2021) and Faculo and Yango (2022) identified relationships between professional characteristics and leadership competence, while Ciocon (2022) and Caritativo and Fernandez (2025) reported varying results. Caritativo and Fernandez (2025) found a positive relationship between administrative and instructional competencies, whereas Hernandez et al. (2023) reported a negative relationship between strategic thinking and instructional leadership. Local research further emphasizes communication, collaboration, and professional development. Dargantes (2020), Tablate (2022), Dinampo and Balones (2023), Silad and Zainudin (2024), and Dando and Abad (2024) examined managerial and administrative capabilities. Lasaca and Escote (2025) and Caluscusin and Bajas-Caluscusin (2025) emphasized communication, human relations, shared leadership, and school climate. Rodulfa (2022), Francisco (2022), Tatoy (2024), and Capillanes (2025) highlighted instructional leadership, teacher support, collaboration, and professional development. Licayan and Pabalan (2023), Agravante et al. (2023), Guamos and Jalos (2023), and Trongco and Benolirao (2023) further identified mentoring, supervision, decision-making, stakeholder engagement, and leadership training as areas for continuing development.

Globally, school leadership is recognized as a multidimensional process influencing teachers, learners, school climate, professional collaboration, and stakeholder engagement. Tan et al. (2022), Wu and Shen (2022), Kim and Lee (2020), Akgöz et al. (2024), Hsieh et al. (2023), Smith et al. (2021), Mayger and Provinzano (2022), Sun et al. (2024), Mincu et al. (2024), and Pietsch et al. (2025) demonstrate that leadership outcomes are influenced by both leadership practices and contextual conditions. In the Philippine setting, Republic Act No. 9155 and the PPSSH establish school heads as leaders responsible for school operations, teaching and learning, professional development, and stakeholder relationships. Local studies including Dargantes (2020), Tablate (2022), Rodulfa (2022), Francisco (2022), Arombo (2023), Hernandez et al. (2023), Tatoy (2024), Capillanes (2025), Lasaca and Escote (2025), and Caluscusin and Bajas-Caluscusin (2025) support the importance of managerial, instructional, supervisory, and interpersonal competence. The study focuses specifically on school heads in the Batuan and San

Fernando Districts of Masbate. Both districts are located on Ticao Island, where school heads perform managerial and instructional functions within geographically dispersed educational settings. Examining leadership within these districts provides localized evidence relevant to their specific organizational and educational conditions.

The study is supported by Instructional Leadership Theory, Transformational Leadership Theory, and Management Functions Theory. Philip Hallinger (1985; continuously refined in Hallinger, 2020) emphasizes the responsibility of school leaders to improve teaching and learning through school mission, instructional management, supervision, learner monitoring, teacher development, and a positive learning environment. Bernard M. Bass (1985), expanded with Bruce J. Avolio, explains through Transformational Leadership Theory how leaders inspire, motivate, support, and empower organizational members. This supports the study's emphasis on leadership, communication, collaboration, professional development, school climate, and stakeholder engagement. Henri Fayol's (1916) Management Functions Theory identifies planning, organizing, commanding or leading, coordinating, and controlling as fundamental management functions. These correspond with the study's managerial competencies in planning, organizing, leading, decision-making, communication, and monitoring and evaluation. Together, these theories explain the integration of managerial and instructional leadership. This perspective is supported by Leithwood et al. (2020), Hallinger and Kovačević (2021), Grissom et al. (2021), and Liu and Hallinger (2021). The study also uses the Input-Process-Output (IPO) model. Inputs include the respondents' profile, managerial competencies, and instructional leadership practices. The process involves data collection and analysis, while the output provides the basis for recommendations and a leadership development program intended to strengthen school leadership and support the PPSSH.

Although previous studies have established the importance of managerial and instructional leadership, limited localized research has examined their relationship among school heads in both elementary and secondary schools in the Batuan and San Fernando Districts. Many foreign studies were conducted in different educational contexts, while Philippine studies frequently examined leadership styles, administrative competence, instructional supervision, school climate, or teacher effectiveness separately. The study therefore examines managerial competencies in planning, organizing, leading, decision-making, communication, and monitoring and evaluation alongside instructional leadership practices in curriculum implementation, supervision of instruction, teacher professional development, learner performance monitoring, school climate, and community engagement. It determines the relationship between these variables and provides localized evidence that may serve as a basis for a leadership development program.

The study aligns with SDG 4 - Quality Education, which promotes inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning opportunities. Strengthening managerial and instructional leadership can improve school governance, curriculum implementation, teacher professional development, learning environments, and learner support. By identifying the leadership strengths and development needs of school heads, the study may support initiatives intended to strengthen educational management and improve the quality of teaching and learning in the Batuan and San Fernando Districts.

The study contributes to educational and institutional sustainability by providing localized evidence that may guide leadership development, school management, professional learning, and the continued implementation of the PPSSH. Strengthened managerial competencies can support more effective planning, decision-making, communication, supervision, and monitoring, while improved instructional leadership can promote teacher development and better learning environments. The study also supports community sustainability through stakeholder engagement, parental participation, and school-community partnerships. Its multidisciplinary contribution lies in strengthening educational quality, institutional capacity, professional development, governance, and community participation toward continuous school improvement.

2. Material and methods

2.1 Research Design

The study used a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design. The descriptive component determined the respondents' demographic profile, level of managerial competencies in planning, organizing, leading, decision-making, communication, and monitoring and evaluation, and extent of instructional leadership practices in curriculum implementation, supervision of instruction, teacher professional development, learner performance monitoring, school climate, and community engagement. The correlational component determined the significant relationship between managerial competencies and instructional leadership practices using the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson r) at the 0.05 level of significance. According to Creswell and Creswell (2018)¹, quantitative research is appropriate for examining relationships among variables through numerical data and statistical procedures. Likewise, Ary, Jacobs, and Sorensen (2019)² explained that descriptive research describes the characteristics of a group or phenomenon, while correlational research examines naturally occurring relationships among variables without manipulation. This design was therefore appropriate for describing the variables and determining their statistical relationship.

2.2 Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in the Batuan and San Fernando Districts. The research covered public elementary and secondary schools within the two districts where the participating school heads performed their managerial and instructional leadership responsibilities.

2.3 Respondents of the Study

The respondents were 40 school heads from the Batuan and San Fernando Districts, consisting of Principals, Head Teachers, Teachers-in-Charge, and an Officer-in-Charge assigned to elementary and secondary schools. They were included because they were directly responsible for managing school operations and implementing instructional leadership practices in their respective schools.

2.4 Sample and Sampling Procedure

The study employed total enumeration sampling because the target population consisted of only 40 qualified school heads. All members of the population were included, providing a complete assessment of managerial competencies and instructional leadership practices within the two districts. All questionnaires were retrieved, resulting in a 100% retrieval rate.

2.5 Research Instrument

A structured researcher-made survey questionnaire served as the primary data-gathering instrument. It was developed based on the objectives of the study, the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), and related literature on educational management and instructional leadership. The questionnaire gathered information on the respondents' demographic profile, managerial competencies, and instructional leadership practices. Managerial competencies covered planning, organizing, leading, decision-making, communication, and monitoring and evaluation, while instructional leadership covered curriculum implementation, supervision of instruction, teacher professional development, learner performance monitoring, school climate, and community engagement. A four-point Likert scale was used, with 3.26-4.00 interpreted as Always Practiced, 2.51-3.25 as Often Practiced, 1.76-2.50 as Sometimes Practiced, and 1.00-1.75 as Never Practiced. Before administration, the questionnaire underwent expert validation for clarity, relevance, content validity, and alignment with the study objectives. Necessary revisions were incorporated based on the validators' recommendations.

2.6 Data Gathering Procedure

The research began with the preparation and approval of the research capsule, which included the title, research problems, theoretical background, respondents and sampling plan, research design, and possible data sources. Following approval, the researcher developed the questionnaire and subjected it to expert validation. A formal permission letter noted by the research adviser was submitted to the Schools Division Superintendent of Masbate Province and subsequently forwarded to the school heads in the Batuan and San Fernando Districts. After permission was granted, the researcher personally administered the validated questionnaires, provided instructions, and retrieved the completed instruments. Confidentiality of responses was maintained during data collection. The completed questionnaires were checked, encoded, organized, and tabulated for statistical analysis. An expert statistician assisted in the analysis and interpretation of the data. The findings were then used in formulating the conclusions and recommendations of the study.

2.7 Data Analysis Techniques

Frequency count and percentage were used to describe the respondents' demographic profile in terms of age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, length of service as school head, position/designation, and school classification. Weighted mean was used to determine the level of managerial competencies and extent of instructional leadership practices. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson r) was used to determine the significant relationship between managerial competencies and instructional leadership practices at the 0.05 level of significance. Correlation coefficients were interpreted from very weak to very strong relationships, with negative values indicating inverse relationships and positive values indicating direct relationships.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Demographic Profile of School Heads

3.1.1 Age

Of the 40 school heads, 29 or 72.50% were 41 years old and above, 7 or 17.50% were 36-40 years old, and 4 or 10.00% were 31-35 years old. No respondents were 30 years old or younger. Thus, most respondents belonged to the older age group. The predominance of school heads aged 41 years and above indicates that leadership positions were generally occupied by experienced educators. Mangulabnan, Dela Rosa, and Vargas (2021) similarly found that school leadership positions were commonly held by mature and experienced professionals, while OECD (2020) reported that most principals across participating educational systems were between 40 and 59 years old.

3.1.2 Sex

Among the respondents, 21 or 52.50% were female and 19 or 47.50% were male, showing a nearly balanced distribution with a slight female majority. The result reflects the participation of both sexes in educational leadership. UNESCO Global Education Monitoring (GEM) Report (2024) recognized the significant role of women in educational leadership, while UNICEF's Women in Learning Leadership (WiLL) initiative (2025) highlighted the contribution of female leaders to collaborative and supportive school environments.

3.1.3 Civil Status

Most respondents were married, comprising 25 or 62.50%, while 13 or 32.50% were single. One respondent or 2.50% was widowed, and another 2.50% was legally separated. The predominance of married school heads suggests that many respondents managed both personal and professional responsibilities. Beausaert et al. (2021) emphasized the importance of social support to principals' well-being and leadership effectiveness, while Ferrer (2021) associated demographic characteristics, including civil status, with the organizational climate fostered by school principals.

3.1.4 Highest Educational Attainment

All respondents had pursued graduate education. Twenty-six or 65.00% had master's degree units, 8 or 20.00% had completed a master's degree, 4 or 10.00% had doctoral units, and 2 or 5.00% had completed a doctoral degree. The findings demonstrate continued professional learning among school heads. Philippine Institute for Development Studies by Orbeta and Paqueo (2023) emphasized that graduate education strengthens competencies necessary for educational management, while Darling-Hammond et al. (2022) highlighted the value of advanced professional preparation in evidence-based leadership, teacher development, and student outcomes.

3.1.5 Length of Service as School Head

The respondents represented varied leadership experience. Eleven or 27.50% had served for 5 years and below, another 11 or 27.50% for 16 years and above, 10 or 25.00% for 6-10 years, and 8 or 20.00% for 11-15 years. The distribution shows representation from both relatively new and highly experienced school leaders. Hallinger and Chen (2022) emphasized that professional experience contributes to instructional leadership and organizational effectiveness, while Pont (2020) noted that accumulated experience, reflective practice, and continuous professional development strengthen leadership effectiveness.

3.1.6 Position or Designation

Head Teachers comprised the largest group at 15 or 37.50%, followed by Principal I at 12 or 30.00%, Teacher-In-Charge at 6 or 15.00%, Principal II at 4 or 10.00%, and Principal III and Officer-In-Charge at 1 or 2.50% each. No respondent held the position of Principal IV. The varied positions reflect different levels of administrative and supervisory responsibility. Leithwood et al. (2020) emphasized that school leadership may be shared among administrators and teacher leaders. Likewise, DepEd's Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), officially adopted through DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020, recognizes that school leaders across designations are expected to demonstrate competencies in instructional leadership, school governance, human-resource management, and community engagement.

3.1.7 School Classification

Most respondents, 33 or 82.50%, were assigned to elementary schools, while 7 or 17.50% were from secondary schools. The predominance of elementary school heads reflects the larger representation of elementary institutions in basic education. World Bank (2023) emphasized the importance of strengthening elementary school leadership because foundational learning develops during the early years. Similarly, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Philippines (2024) highlighted effective elementary school leadership as important to foundational education, teacher support, and learning recovery.

3.2 Managerial Competencies of School Heads

3.2.1 Planning

Planning obtained a composite mean of 3.95, interpreted as Always Practiced. Alignment of school plans with Department of Education goals received the highest mean of 4.00, while regular review of school plans obtained the lowest mean of 3.90. Overall, school heads consistently demonstrated planning competencies. The findings indicate strong attention to strategic planning, stakeholder participation, and alignment with educational priorities. Harris and Jones (2020) emphasized planning as fundamental to school improvement and organizational coherence, while Hallinger and Azah (2022) found that systematic planning and collaborative goal-setting strengthen school performance.

3.2.2 Organizing

Organizing registered a composite mean of 3.96, interpreted as Always Practiced. Proper resource management and clear work arrangements both obtained the highest mean of 4.00, while maintaining organized records and

reports received the lowest mean of 3.90. The result demonstrates the school heads' capacity to coordinate resources, responsibilities, and organizational systems. Bush (2021) emphasized strategic organization of human and material resources in achieving school goals, while UNICEF (2022) highlighted strong organizational management as essential to maximizing resources and supporting quality teaching and learning.

3.2.3 Leading

Leading obtained a composite mean of 3.95, interpreted as Always Practiced. All indicators received an identical mean of 3.95, including motivating teachers, modeling positive values, recognizing accomplishments, encouraging participation, and maintaining supportive relationships. The consistent ratings demonstrate a balanced leadership approach centered on motivation, professional conduct, recognition, and relationships. Leithwood et al. (2020) emphasized collaboration, trust, and shared commitment in effective leadership, while Grissom, Egalite, and Lindsay (2021) identified motivation, positive organizational culture, and instructional support as characteristics of successful school leadership.

3.2.4 Decision-Making

Decision-making achieved a composite mean of 3.95, interpreted as Always Practiced. Considering the welfare of learners and teachers obtained the highest mean of 4.00, while addressing school concerns promptly and fairly obtained the lowest mean of 3.90. The findings indicate that school heads consistently practiced informed and people-centered decision-making. OECD (2021) emphasized evidence-based decision-making and stakeholder participation in improving school performance, while Fullan (2020) highlighted collaborative and purpose-driven decisions that prioritize student learning, teacher development, and continuous school improvement.

3.2.5 Communication

Communication obtained a composite mean of 3.95, interpreted as Always Practiced. Communicating policies clearly, encouraging open communication, and maintaining professionalism each obtained 3.98, while providing timely feedback received the lowest mean of 3.88. The findings demonstrate strong communication practices involving transparency, dialogue, and professional relationships. Pollock (2021) emphasized effective communication as essential to trust and collaboration, while Grissom et al. (2021) found that clear communication, feedback, and stakeholder relationships contribute to positive school climates and improved school performance.

3.2.6 Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation recorded a composite mean of 3.94, interpreted as Always Practiced. Using school data and reports in evaluating performance obtained the highest mean of 3.98, while assessing whether targets and objectives were achieved received the lowest mean of 3.90. The findings show that school heads consistently used monitoring, data, and feedback to assess and improve school performance. UNICEF (2021) emphasized monitoring and evaluation in evidence-based decision-making and accountability, while Reimers and Schleicher (2020) identified continuous monitoring and performance evaluation as essential practices for responding to educational needs and sustaining school improvement.

3.3 Instructional Leadership Practices of School Heads

3.3.1 Curriculum Implementation

Curriculum implementation obtained a composite mean of 3.94, interpreted as Always Practiced. Supporting programs that improve learner achievement received the highest mean of 4.00, while guiding teachers in preparing lessons aligned with learning competencies received the lowest mean of 3.85. The result indicates that school heads consistently supported curriculum standards, instructional delivery, and learner-centered programs. Hallinger and Kovačević (2021) emphasized the role of instructional leaders in curriculum guidance and monitoring, while Darling-Hammond and Hyler (2020) highlighted leadership support for curriculum implementation and evidence-based instructional practices.

3.3.2 Supervision of Instruction

Supervision of instruction recorded a composite mean of 3.89, interpreted as Always Practiced. Assisting teachers with instructional challenges and encouraging reflective teaching received the highest mean of 3.93, while classroom observation and monitoring of lesson preparation both obtained the lowest mean of 3.85. The findings demonstrate consistent supervisory support through monitoring, feedback, and professional guidance. Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe (2021) emphasized the positive contribution of classroom observation and feedback to teacher effectiveness and student learning, while Grissom et al. (2021) highlighted coaching, classroom monitoring, and professional support as important instructional leadership practices.

3.3.3 Teacher Professional Development

Teacher professional development obtained a composite mean of 3.94, interpreted as Always Practiced. Encouraging training, supporting professional learning, identifying development needs, and promoting collaboration each received 3.95. Monitoring the application of professional learning obtained the lowest mean of 3.90. The findings show consistent support for continuous teacher learning and competency development.

Darling-Hammond et al. (2022) emphasized the role of school leaders in creating professional learning opportunities, while Timperley (2021) asserted that sustained development supported by leadership and monitoring enables teachers to apply new learning and contribute to school improvement.

3.3.4 Learner Performance Monitoring

Learner performance monitoring obtained a composite mean of 3.89, interpreted as Always Practiced. Supporting programs that improve learner achievement obtained the highest mean of 4.00, while reviewing learners' academic performance data received the lowest mean of 3.78. The findings indicate that school heads consistently monitored learner progress and supported interventions. Datnow and Park (2020) emphasized the use of student achievement data to guide instructional decisions and address learning gaps, while Hamilton et al. (2021) highlighted continuous performance monitoring as important to evidence-based decisions and appropriate learner support.

3.3.5 School Climate

School climate obtained a composite mean of 3.95, interpreted as Always Practiced. Promoting a safe and positive learning environment received the highest mean of 3.98, while maintaining harmonious relationships among teachers, learners, and stakeholders obtained the lowest mean of 3.93. The findings demonstrate consistent efforts to establish a safe, respectful, and supportive school environment. Wang and Degol (2021) associated positive school climate with effective leadership, teacher collaboration, student engagement, and achievement. Similarly, Thapa and Cohen (2022) emphasized that safe and inclusive school climates contribute to learner well-being, positive behavior, and school effectiveness.

3.3.6 Community Engagement

Community engagement recorded a composite mean of 3.93, interpreted as Always Practiced. Promoting open communication between the school and community obtained the highest mean of 3.98, while coordinating with local stakeholders regarding school concerns and projects received the lowest mean of 3.88. The findings indicate that school heads consistently involved parents and stakeholders in school programs and learner development. Epstein et al. (2022) emphasized that strong school-family-community partnerships support student achievement, school programs, and stakeholder participation. Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (2021) likewise highlighted open communication and meaningful collaboration as important to learner success and school improvement.

3.4 Relationship Between Managerial Competencies and Instructional Leadership Practices

The analysis yielded a Pearson correlation coefficient of $r = 0.42$, indicating a moderate positive linear relationship between managerial competencies and instructional leadership practices. The computed value exceeded the critical value of ± 0.3120 at the 0.05 level of significance with 38 degrees of freedom. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected, indicating a statistically significant relationship between the variables. The significant positive relationship indicates that higher managerial competencies were associated with stronger instructional leadership practices among school heads. Competencies in planning, organizing, leading, decision-making, communication, and monitoring and evaluation therefore operated alongside practices supporting teaching and learning. This finding is consistent with Liu and Hallinger (2021), who found that managerial and leadership competencies influence instructional leadership effectiveness and school improvement. Similarly, Day et al. (2020) emphasized that strong managerial capabilities support teacher development, instructional quality, and positive student outcomes.

4. Conclusion & Recommendations

The study concludes that school heads in the Batuan and San Fernando Districts consistently demonstrated high managerial competencies in planning, organizing, leading, decision-making, communication, and monitoring and evaluation, as well as instructional leadership practices in curriculum implementation, supervision of instruction, teacher professional development, learner performance monitoring, school climate, and community engagement. The statistically significant moderate positive relationship between managerial competencies and instructional leadership practices indicates that stronger managerial competence is associated with stronger instructional leadership, emphasizing the importance of both areas in promoting effective school management, teaching and learning, and educational outcomes.

The Department of Education may continue strengthening leadership development, succession, and mentoring programs while encouraging school heads to pursue continuing professional development and higher academic qualifications. Greater attention may be given to monitoring and evaluation, timely communication, instructional supervision, teacher professional development, data-based learner interventions, and collaboration with parents and community stakeholders. The proposed Leadership Enhancement for Administrative Development and Instructional Excellence (LEAD Excellence) Program may also be implemented to integrate managerial and instructional leadership development through capability-building, coaching and mentoring, professional learning activities, and data-driven school management.

The study was limited to 40 school heads from public elementary and secondary schools in the Batuan and San Fernando Districts and focused specifically on their managerial competencies and instructional leadership practices. Consequently, the findings represent the school leadership conditions of the respondents and educational settings covered by the study. Further studies involving larger populations and different educational settings may help validate and expand the findings.

5. Compliance with ethical standards

The study observed ethical considerations throughout the data-gathering process. Prior to data collection, a formal permission letter noted by the research adviser was submitted to the Schools Division Superintendent of Masbate Province and the concerned school heads in the Batuan and San Fernando Districts. After permission was granted, the researcher personally administered the validated questionnaire, provided instructions to the respondents, and maintained the confidentiality of their responses.

REFERENCES

- Agravante, M. B., Digo, G. S., & Janer, S. S. (2023). Upskilling of the school heads in the new normal. *East Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(6), 2509–2524.
- Akgöz, E. E., Şahin, F., & Erdoğan, O. (2024). The mediator role of school climate in the relationship between instructional leadership behaviors of school principals and teacher autonomy. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 38(4), 1142–1159.
- Alamsyahril, Syukri, M., Kristiawan, M., Kesumawati, N., & Rohana. (2021). Mapping managerial competence of primary school principals in South Sumatera. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 8(11), 112–121.
- Arombo, C. M. (2023). Master teachers-school heads designate's instructional competencies, instructional leadership practices and challenges. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 15(9).
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C., & Razavieh, A. (2019). *Introduction to research in education* (10th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Beusaert, S., Froehlich, D. E., Riley, P., & Gallant, A. (2021). What about school principals' well-being? The role of social capital. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 51(2), 222–240.
- Bedaure, N. G., & Bedaure, J. T. (2023). Leadership and managerial capabilities of secondary school heads in the Division of Negros Occidental: Basis for enhanced capability training program. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 7, 733–740.
- Bush, T. (2021). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Bustami, Y., & Putra, E. (2023). An analysis of school principal's managerial competencies on accreditation ranking. *Jurnal Educatio FKIP UNMA*, 9(2), 744–752.
- Caluscusin, M. M. M., & Bajas-Caluscusin, A. M. (2025). School heads' managerial skills and school climate in TESDA-technical and vocational institutions of Negros Oriental. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(8).
- Capillanes, M. J. A. (2025). School heads' instructional leadership on teachers' work performance. *GEO Academic Journal*, 6(1).
- Caritativo, A. L., & Fernandez, S. F. (2025). School leaders' instructional and administrative competencies. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(2), 2738–2750.
- Chen, S., & Rong, J. (2023). The moderating role of teacher collegiality in the relationship between instructional leadership and teacher self-efficacy. *SAGE Open*.
- Ciocon, L. A. (2022). Professional characteristics and instructional leadership of school heads: Their relationship to the implementation of Special Education (SPED) program. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 3.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dando, R. P., Jr., & Abad, E. M. (2024). Best practices and management capability of school heads in Labo East District. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*.
- Dargantes, M. O. (2020). Qualities of leadership relating to management skills of school heads. *SMCC Higher Education Research Journal*, 7(1).
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Hyler, M. E. (2020). Preparing educators for the time of COVID... and beyond. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(4), 457–465.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Schachner, A., Wojcikiewicz, S., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2022). *Educating the whole child: Improving school climate to support student success*. Learning Policy Institute.
- Datnow, A., & Park, V. (2020). *Data-driven leadership*. Jossey-Bass.

- Daud, A. L. (2021). Correlates of school heads' supervisory competence and their relevant 21st century literacies. *LAMDAG*, 12(1).
- Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2020). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to improve learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(2), 221–258.
- Department of Education. (2020). DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH).
- Dinampo, C. L., & Balones, J. G. (2023). Leadership character of school heads and managerial competence of head teachers. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 10(4).
- Dutta, V., & Sahney, S. (2022). Relation of principal instructional leadership, school climate, teacher job performance and student achievement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 60(2), 148–166.
- Elfira, E., Nurochmah, A., & Mus, S. (2024). Analysis of principal managerial competencies in sub school planning at Petualang Pantai Elementary School. *JMSP (Jurnal Manajemen dan Supervisi Pendidikan)*, 8(2), 94–107.
- Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., Sheldon, S. B., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K. C., Jansorn, N. R., Van Voorhis, F. L., Martin, C. S., Thomas, B. G., Greenfeld, M. D., Hutchins, D. J., & Williams, K. J. (2022). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action* (4th ed.). Corwin Press.
- Faculo, S. T., & Yango, D. M. (2022). Professional development and leadership competence of school heads in urban and rural areas. *Mountain Journal of Science and Interdisciplinary Research*, 82(1), 43–60.
- Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial management* (C. Storrs, Trans.). Pitman Publishing. (Original work published 1916).
- Ferrer, J. A. B. (2021). Organizational climate of secondary schools and its relationship to the demographic variables of principals. *Education Review*, 10(1).
- Francisco, L. B. (2022). School heads as instructional leaders in support of teachers' holistic development. *American Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Innovation*, 1(2).
- Fullan, M. (2020). *Leading in a culture of change* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Ganaden, A. R. (2020). Managerial competency of laboratory high school principals of state universities and colleges in Region III, Philippines. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 8(3), 112–122.
- Grissom, J. A., Egalite, A. J., & Lindsay, C. A. (2021). How principals affect students and schools: A systematic synthesis of two decades of research. The Wallace Foundation.
- Guamos, A. L., & Jalos, L. M., Jr. (2023). Instructional supervisory practices of school heads during the new normal at Buenavista Districts I and II, Division of Quezon. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 15(7), 721–736.
- Gümüş, S., Hallinger, P., Cansoy, R., & Bellibaş, M. Ş. (2021). Instructional leadership in a centralized and competitive educational system: A qualitative meta-synthesis of research from Turkey. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 59(6), 702–720.
- Hallinger, P. (2020). Leadership for learning: What we have learned from 30 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(1), 1–23.
- Hallinger, P., & Azah, V. N. (2022). Leading school improvement in challenging contexts: The role of instructional leadership and strategic planning. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(6), 1007–1025.
- Hallinger, P., & Chen, J. (2022). Review of research on educational leadership and management in Asia: A comparative analysis of research topics and methods, 1995–2018. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(2), 287–307.
- Hallinger, P., & Kovačević, J. (2021). Mapping the intellectual lineage of educational management, administration, and leadership, 1970–2018. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(2), 192–216.
- Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. C. (2021). *Developing instructional leadership*. Routledge.
- Hamilton, L. S., Steiner, E. D., Woo, A., & Diliberti, M. K. (2021). Using data to improve student learning: Findings from the American Educator Panels. RAND Corporation.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2020). COVID-19—School leadership in disruptive times. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(4), 243–247.
- 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.
- Hernandez, M. M., Mendoza, S. D. C., & Pacheco, M. M. (2023). Innovative leadership practices and management styles of school heads in the Schools Division of Bulacan. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(6), 1904–1913.
- Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (2021). *Parental involvement in children's education: Why does it make a difference?* Teachers College Press.
- Hsieh, C.-C., Chen, Y.-R., & Li, H.-C. (2023). Impact of school leadership on teacher professional collaboration: Evidence from multilevel analysis of Taiwan TALIS 2018. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 9(1).

- Kim, T., & Lee, Y. (2020). Principal instructional leadership for teacher participation in professional development: Evidence from Japan, Singapore, and South Korea. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 21, 261–278.
- Lasaca, J., & Escote, M. J. (2025). Managerial skills and distributive leadership of school heads as predictors to organizational commitment of teachers. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 44(6).
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22.
- Licayan, M. S., & Pabalan, A. P. (2023). Building capabilities of the neophyte school heads: Initiatives and needs. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 14(7), 901–908.
- Liljenberg, M. (2021). A professional development practice to enhance principals' instructional leadership—Enabling and constraining arrangements. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 6(4), 354–366.
- Lin, H.-C. (2024). Study on construction of an indicator system for leadership competencies of primary and junior high school candidate principals. *Psychological Testing*, 71(1), 149–174.
- Liu, S., & Hallinger, P. (2021). Principal instructional leadership, teacher self-efficacy, and teacher professional learning in China: Testing a mediated-effects model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 57(4), 501–528.
- Mangulabnan, B., Dela Rosa, R., & Vargas, D. (2021). Transformational leadership styles of school principals in Central Luzon, Philippines. *Social Science Research Network (SSRN)*.
- Mayger, L., & Provinzano, K. (2022). Leadership for family and community engagement: A qualitative policy analysis of state principal evaluation processes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 58(1).
- Mincu, M., Colman, A., Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2024). Lessons from two decades of research about successful school leadership in England: A humanistic approach. *Education Sciences*, 14(2), 187.
- Ng, P. T. (2021). *Educational leadership in Singapore*. Springer.
- Nguyen, H. T., Vu, N. T. T., Ha, X. V., Dinh, H. V. T., Truong, T. D., & Reynolds, B. L. (2025). Principal instructional leadership and its influence on teachers' professional development at Vietnamese primary schools. *Education* 3–13, 53(3), 408–416.
- Orbeta, A. C., Jr., & Paqueo, V. B. (2023). Teacher professional development in the Philippines: Policies, programs, and challenges (PIDS Discussion Paper Series No. 2023-09). Philippine Institute for Development Studies.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development & United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2024). *Global education monitoring report 2024/5: Leadership in education*. UNESCO.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2020). *School leadership for learning*. OECD Publishing.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2020). *Teachers getting the best out of their students: From primary to upper secondary education*. OECD Publishing.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2021). *Education policy outlook 2021: Shaping responsive and resilient education in a changing world*. OECD Publishing.
- Ornopia, V. B., Franca, G. C., & Bauyot, M. M. (2022). Instructional management of school principals in implementing new normal learning modality related to teachers competence and school achievement goals: Locus of quality education amidst COVID-19. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 29(2), 11–24.
- Pietsch, M., Aydin, B., & Gümüş, S. (2025). Putting the instructional leadership–student achievement relation in context: A meta-analytical big data study across cultures and time. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 47(1), 29–64.
- Pollock, K. (2021). *School leadership during a pandemic: Navigating tensions*. Routledge.
- Pont, B. (2020). A literature review of school leadership policy reforms. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). <https://www.oecd.org/education/school/School-Leadership-Policy-Reforms.pdf>
- Reimers, F. M., & Schleicher, A. (2020). *Schooling disrupted, schooling rethought: How the COVID-19 pandemic is changing education*. OECD.
- Republic of the Philippines. (2001). Republic Act No. 9155: Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001.
- Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2021). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 57(4), 635–674.
- Rodulfa, L. (2022). School heads' instructional leadership and teachers' sense of efficacy in the implementation of blended teaching modality in Sarangani Province. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 2(1).
- Silad, S., & Zainudin, R. (2024). School heads managerial skills in teaching core subjects among senior high schools in Maguindanao Province. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 27(5).
- Smith, T. E., Reinke, W. M., Herman, K. C., & Sebastian, J. (2021). Exploring the link between principal leadership and family engagement across elementary and middle school. *Journal of School Psychology*, 84, 49–62.

- Stanley, D. A., & Gilzene, A. (2023). Listening, engaging, advocating and partnering (L.E.A.P): A model for responsible community engagement for educational leaders. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 18(2), 253–276.
- Sun, J., Day, C., Zhang, R., Zhang, H., Huang, T., & Lin, J. (2024). Successful school principalship: A meta-synthesis of 20 years of international case studies. *Education Sciences*, 14(9), 929.
- Sun, J., Day, C., Zhang, R., Zhang, H., Huang, T., & Lin, J. (2024). Successful school principalship: A meta-synthesis of 20 years of international case studies. *Education Sciences*, 14(9), 929.
- Tablate, G. (2022). Administrative skills and work ethics of school heads: Basis for effective management. *International Social Science Review*, 5(1).
- Tan, C. Y., Gao, L., & Shi, M. (2022). Second-order meta-analysis synthesizing the evidence on associations between school leadership and different school outcomes. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(3), 469–490.
- Tatoy, A. M. T. (2024). School heads' instructional leadership, collaboration and performance. *IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 6(4).
- Thapa, A., & Cohen, J. (2022). *School climate improvement: Theory, research, and practice*. Teachers College Press.
- Timperley, H. (2021). Professional conversations and improvement-focused feedback: A review of the research literature and the impact on practice. Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership.
- Trongco, G. P., & Benolirao, E. C. (2023). Interpersonal, leadership, and supervisory skills of public school heads. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(9), 3211–3222.
- Ubongen, M. C., & Revuelta, S. P. (2022). Teachers' instructional competences as influenced by school-based management practices of school heads. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 1(1), 26–35.
- Ulandari, W., & Rustan, E. (2021). Pengaruh pendidikan dan pelatihan serta kompetensi manajerial terhadap kinerja kepala sekolah. *MIX: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen*, 11(3), 364–378.
- Ultra, X. M. (2021). Relationship between the adherence to national competency-based standards and the professional profile of school heads in Northern Samar, Philippines. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 24(1), 13–25.
- United Nations Children's Fund. (2021). *Strategic education plan 2022–2025*. UNICEF.
- United Nations Children's Fund. (2022). *Transforming education through strengthened school leadership*. UNICEF.
- United Nations Children's Fund. (2024). *The state of the world's children 2024: The future of childhood in a changing world*. UNICEF. <https://www.unicef.org/reports/state-of-worldschildren-2024>
- United Nations Children's Fund. (2025). *Women in learning leadership (WiLL): Increasing women's representation and strengthening school leadership*. UNICEF Innocenti – Global Office of Research and Foresight.
- Wang, M. T., & Degol, J. L. (2021). School climate: A review of the construct, measurement, and impact on student outcomes. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33(2), 425–456.
- World Bank. (2023). *The Philippines basic education public expenditure review: Improving the quality of basic education*. World Bank.
- Wu, H., & Shen, J. (2022). The association between principal leadership and student achievement: A multivariate meta-meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 35, 100423.