WJSAM | World Journal of Sustainable Advances in Multidisciplinarity
RESEARCH | INNOVATION | INTERDISCIPLINARITY | SUSTAINABILITY
Volume 1, Issue 2 | ISSN: 3155-783X
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65339/wjsam.V1.I2.25

# The Influence of the Operational Leadership Practices of the School Heads in Enhancing the Teaching Performance of the Teachers in the Public Elementary Schools in Bacacay East, West and South Districts, Division of Albay

**Salvacion B. Bea**
Master of Arts in Education Major in Administration and Supervision, University of Northeastern Philippines, Iriga City, Camarines Sur, Philippines

Email: salvacion.bea@deped.gov.ph

**ABSTRACT**

This study examined the operational leadership practices of school heads and their perceived influence on teachers' teaching performance in public elementary schools across Bacacay East, West, and South Districts, Division of Albay. Using a descriptive-evaluative-correlational design, the study gathered responses from 41 school heads during school year 2025–2026 through a validated, 111-item researcher-made questionnaire and structured interview guide. Instrument reliability was 0.94, and responses were analyzed using mean ratings and Kendall's coefficient of concordance with chi-square tests. Operational leadership practices were rated Very Much Employed (overall mean = 4.85), with Create Clear Standards ranking highest (4.90) and Remove Work Friction lowest (4.76). Their perceived influence on teaching performance was rated Very Much Influential (overall mean = 4.87), led by Professional Responsibility (4.90), while Classroom Management ranked lowest (4.81). No statistically significant agreement emerged in the rank orders of either leadership practices or perceived influence ($p > .05$). The findings indicated consistently favorable leadership assessments without an established common hierarchy of priorities. School leaders should sustain clear operational standards and supportive supervision while strengthening workflow coordination, personnel consultation, and performance monitoring. The study was limited to school heads' assessments within three districts, restricting broader generalization and conclusions about actual teaching performance. These findings provide a context-specific foundation for improving school operations, strengthening instructional support, and developing responsive district-level leadership policies.

**Keywords:** *Elementary Education, Leadership Practices, Operational Leadership, School Heads, Teaching Performance, Teacher Support*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### *1.1. Background and Context of the Study*

The effectiveness of basic education depends not only on teachers' instructional competence but also on the leadership arrangements that support their daily work. In public elementary schools, school heads coordinate personnel, instructional priorities, institutional resources, and professional responsibilities. Their operational decisions can shape the conditions under which teachers prepare lessons, manage classrooms, collaborate with colleagues, and fulfill school obligations. Operational leadership therefore concerns the practical translation of school priorities into clear expectations, accessible support, monitored activities, and consistent professional conduct. Philippine research has emphasized the importance of these managerial functions. Acera and Tan (2023) linked school heads' competencies and leadership practices, including teamwork, planning, organizing, and controlling, with their leadership performance. Devanadera and Ching (2023) reported positive relationships between school heads' managerial roles and organizational and teacher performance in public elementary schools. Evidence from other educational settings likewise identifies relevant leadership conditions: Msigwa et al. (2024) emphasized motivation, communication, and guidance, while Nyaibuli and Mwila (2024) described the value of clear goals, supportive environments, recognition, and adequate resources. Within the Philippines, Castillo (2025) identified managerial competencies and professional development as considerations in improving teachers' work performance. These findings suggest that leadership effectiveness must be examined through observable practices rather than general descriptions of a school head's position. In the public elementary schools of Bacacay East, West, and South Districts, Division of Albay, the present study focuses on how school heads establish standards, reduce obstacles to work, remain engaged with frontline activities, monitor performance, and model expected conduct. Examining these practices in relation to specific dimensions of teaching performance provides a more focused basis for understanding school operations and identifying appropriate policy recommendations.

### *1.2. Research Problem*

School heads are expected to provide the organizational direction and practical assistance needed for effective teaching. However, leadership is a multidimensional responsibility, and favorable assessments of leadership do not necessarily establish how particular operational practices relate to teachers' performance. Different dimensions of teaching performance may require different forms of leadership support. Previous studies have examined related, but not identical, relationships. Fababier and Apostol (2024) reported a significant association between transformational leadership and teachers' individual work performance, partly mediated by organizational commitment. Grande et al. (2024) linked school heads' instructional management and emotional intelligence with teachers' work values, while Baroman and Quirap (2024) documented high leadership-practice ratings alongside positive teacher work behavior. In contrast, Precioso and Chua (2025) found that overall school-head leadership performance did not significantly predict teaching performance in their setting. These findings cannot be treated as interchangeable because the leadership dimensions, outcomes, and school contexts differ. For Bacacay East, West, and South Districts, the specific concern is to establish how defined operational leadership practices are assessed and how their perceived influence relates to distinct teaching-performance dimensions. Their rankings and agreement among respondent groups also warrant examination. This more differentiated operational question remains insufficiently addressed by the cited studies.

### *1.3. Research Gap*

Existing scholarship establishes useful connections between school leadership and teacher-related outcomes, but its emphases vary. Devanadera and Ching (2023) examined interpersonal,

informational, and decisional managerial roles; Fababier and Apostol (2024) focused on transformational leadership and organizational commitment; and Precioso and Chua (2025) evaluated overall leadership and teaching performance. These approaches offer important findings, yet they do not directly address the combined operational dimensions and teaching-performance indicators identified for the Bacacay districts. The present research addresses a more specific conceptual and contextual gap: the extent to which five operational practices—creating clear standards, removing work friction, staying close to the front line, tracking performance metrics, and leading by example—are associated, in respondents' assessments, with five distinct areas of teaching performance. It also examines agreement in the rank ordering of these assessments. By concentrating on public elementary schools in Bacacay East, West, and South Districts, the study provides locally grounded evidence for formulating school-leadership policy recommendations.

### *1.4. Purpose and Objectives of the Study*

This study aimed to determine the influence of school heads' operational leadership practices on the teaching performance of teachers in public elementary schools in Bacacay East, West, and South Districts, Division of Albay. Specifically, it assessed practices involving Create Clear Standards, Remove Work Friction, Stay Close to the Front Line, Track Performance Metrics, and Lead by Example, and tested significant agreement in their rank orders. It also examined their perceived influence on instructional competence, classroom management, professional responsibility, work efficiency and productivity, and collaboration and teamwork; tested significant agreement in the rank orders of this influence among respondent groups; and formulated policy recommendations based on the study findings.

### *1.5. Significance and Practical Contribution of the Study*

The study contributes a practice-oriented perspective to discussions of educational leadership by examining operational behaviors alongside distinct dimensions of teaching performance. For school heads and district administrators, the findings can help identify leadership practices that merit attention in supervision, professional learning, resource coordination, and routine school management. Teachers may benefit from clearer recognition of the institutional support relevant to their instructional and professional responsibilities. The comparison of rank orders also provides a way to identify common and differing assessments among respondent groups. The intended policy recommendations are grounded in the local findings and may inform district-level leadership improvement initiatives. For researchers, the study offers a context-specific basis for further examination of operational leadership in elementary education.

### *1.6. Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Alignment*

The study aligns directly with Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4: Quality Education, which seeks inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning opportunities for all (United Nations, n.d.). Its emphasis on school heads' operational leadership connects particularly with Target 4.1, concerning effective primary education, and Target 4.a, concerning supportive and effective learning environments. By examining the leadership conditions associated with instructional competence, classroom management, professional responsibility, productivity, and teamwork, the research informs institutional practices that may support teaching quality. The policy recommendations are intended to strengthen school-level management in the three Bacacay districts. This contribution concerns the conditions for quality education; the study does not directly measure progress toward SDG indicators or student learning outcomes.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### *2.1. Research Design*

The study employed a descriptive-evaluative research design to examine school heads' operational leadership practices and their perceived influence on teachers' teaching performance. Rank-concordance analysis was used to assess agreement in the ordering of the evaluated dimensions. It examined operational leadership practices of school heads and their reported influence on teachers' teaching performance in public elementary schools. The descriptive component addressed the extent to which leadership practices were employed, while the evaluative component focused on their perceived influence on teaching performance. The correlational orientation reflected the study's stated interest in relationships between these variables. This approach suited the investigation within the selected districts.

### *2.2. Research Locale, Population, and Participants or Respondents*

The study was conducted in public elementary schools in the Bacacay East, West, and South Districts, Division of Albay, during school year 2025–2026. The respondents were 41 school heads from public elementary schools in these districts. The inquiry examined their operational leadership practices and their perceived influence on teachers' teaching performance. The three named districts defined the geographic scope of the research. This setting framed the interpretation of reported practices and influence. Although teaching performance was central to the inquiry, the identified respondents were school heads rather than teachers.

### *2.3. Sampling Technique and Sample Determination*

The respondent group comprised 41 school heads from the Bacacay East, West, and South Districts. The study included 41 school heads from public elementary schools across Bacacay East, West, and South Districts, Division of Albay, during school year 2025–2026. The respondent count and district coverage were therefore retained without assigning random, purposive, or census sampling. This preserved the stated scope without implying broader representation. The coverage thus reflected school heads within the specified Albay districts.

### *2.4. Research Instrument and Validation*

Data were collected using a structured, researcher-made questionnaire checklist and a structured interview guide. The questionnaire contained 111 questions organized into two parts. Part I examined the extent to which school heads employed operational leadership practices, whereas Part II addressed the perceived influence of those practices on teachers' teaching performance. The questionnaire was reviewed by jurors composed of professors, the adviser, and the Dean of the Graduate School. They provided recommendations concerning the addition, deletion, and modification of items. Reliability testing was conducted after validation and yielded a coefficient of 0.94. Their comments were solicited to improve the instrument.

### *2.5. Data Gathering Procedure*

A letter requesting permission to conduct the study was sent to the Schools Division Superintendent of SDO Albay for endorsement. The study used the researcher-made questionnaire checklist and structured interview guide to gather information regarding school heads' operational leadership practices and their perceived influence on teaching performance. The questionnaire underwent validation followed by reliability testing. The two questionnaire parts addressed practices and their influence. The collected responses supported the reported analysis.

### *2.6. Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment*

The mean was used to describe operational leadership practices and their perceived influence on teachers' teaching performance. The five-point interpretation scale assigned the following numerical ranges and ratings: 4.50–5.00, Very Much Employed or Very Much Influential; 3.50–4.49, Much Employed or Much Influential; 2.50–3.49, Employed or Influential; 1.50–2.49, Fairly Employed or Fairly Influential; and 1.00–1.49, Not at All. The employment labels applied to leadership practices, while the influence labels applied to perceived influence on teaching performance. Mean ratings were used to summarize the extent of operational leadership practices and their perceived influence on teaching performance. Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W), together with chi-square significance testing, was used to examine agreement in the reported rankings.

### *2.7. Ethical Considerations*

The documented institutional procedure involved sending a letter requesting permission to conduct the study to the Schools Division Superintendent of SDO Albay for endorsement. This addressed institutional authorization. The methodological account did not state whether the endorsement was granted or describe informed consent, confidentiality arrangements, data security measures, or ethics committee review. The ethical account was therefore confined to the documented permission request.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### *3.1. Extent of Operational Leadership Practices Employed by School Heads*

The first area of investigation examined the extent to which school heads employed five operational leadership practices. The overall mean was 4.85, and all five dimensions were interpreted as "Very Much Employed" (VME). Ranked from highest to lowest, the practices were Create Clear Standards (mean = 4.90; rank 1), Lead by Example (mean = 4.89; rank 2), Track Performance Metrics (mean = 4.85; rank 3), Stay Close to the Front Line (mean = 4.84; rank 4), and Remove Work Friction (mean = 4.76; rank 5). The consistently high ratings describe respondents' favorable assessments of school heads' operational leadership; they do not establish that implementation was uniform across schools. Create Clear Standards obtained the highest mean (4.90; rank 1), indicating that clear expectations and standards were the most highly rated operational leadership practice. In the school setting, communicated expectations can provide a common reference for responsibilities, school targets, and procedural consistency. Feyisa and Edosa (2023) likewise emphasized defining and communicating school goals within instructional leadership. The convergence suggests that clarity of direction is a salient aspect of leadership in the present respondents' assessments. For practice, school heads can maintain accessible written standards and review them with personnel, while teachers can align their duties with agreed expectations. Lead by Example followed closely (mean = 4.89; rank 2), showing that respondents also placed considerable emphasis on leadership conduct. Observable fairness, professionalism, and accountability provide practical ways for school heads to demonstrate the standards expected of teachers. Cansoy et al. (2021) reported a positive relationship among principals' ethical leadership, school ethical climate, and teacher job satisfaction. Although the current study did not test those relationships, the high rating reinforces the relevance of consistent professional conduct. Transparent decisions, respectful communication, and responsible resource use are therefore pertinent areas for continued leadership attention. Track Performance Metrics ranked third (mean = 4.85), while Stay Close to the Front Line ranked fourth (mean = 4.84). Their nearly identical ratings indicate that performance monitoring and direct engagement with everyday school conditions were both

highly recognized. Song et al. (2021) reported favorable effects of performance feedback on aspects of teaching and school leadership, supporting the practical value of using monitoring information for feedback rather than merely compliance. Bellibaş (2023) also associated principals' classroom observation feedback with teachers' instructional practices. These studies contextualize the present ratings, but they do not establish that monitoring or school visits produced particular teaching outcomes in the schools studied. Regular reviews of records, classroom walkthroughs, and responsive feedback remain relevant ways to enact the two practices. Remove Work Friction received the lowest mean (4.76; rank 5), yet it retained the VME interpretation. Its position is therefore a relative priority rather than evidence of poor performance. This dimension concerns work processes, overlapping tasks, scheduling, communication, and administrative coordination that can interfere with instructional attention. Patrick (2022) linked leadership-shaped organizational conditions, including collaborative planning time, with teachers' collaborative learning. In the present setting, reviewing avoidable procedural burdens and clarifying assignments may complement the highly rated standard-setting and monitoring practices. Taken together, the results depict strongly rated operational leadership, with the comparatively lower work-friction rating identifying an area for focused operational refinement.

### *3.2. Agreement in Rankings of Operational Leadership Practices*

The second area examined whether respondents demonstrated statistically significant agreement in the rank ordering of operational leadership practices. Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W) and computed chi-square ($\chi^2$) statistics were used, with decisions based on the reported critical values. All five tests were classified as not significant (NS; $p > .05$). All five tests yielded statistically nonsignificant results ($p > .05$); consequently, the null hypotheses were not rejected at the .05 significance level. Across the five dimensions, W ranged from 0.27 to 0.43, while computed $\chi^2$ ranged from 6.48 to 11.61. Create Clear Standards showed the highest descriptive concordance ($W = 0.43$; $\chi^2 = 11.61$), followed by Stay Close to the Front Line ($W = 0.40$; $\chi^2 = 10.80$), Track Performance Metrics ($W = 0.39$; $\chi^2 = 9.36$), Lead by Example ($W = 0.30$; $\chi^2 = 8.10$), and Remove Work Friction ($W = 0.27$; $\chi^2 = 6.48$). In every case, the computed $\chi^2$ was lower than the reported critical $\chi^2$ at $\alpha = .05$, and the manuscript classified the results as $p > .05$. Accordingly, statistically significant concordance in respondents' rank orders was not established for any of the five practices. This result does not prove that respondents disagreed or establish the causes of variation in their rankings. The tabular $\chi^2$ critical values at significance levels of .05, .025, .01, .005, and .001, respectively, were 16.92, 19.68, 21.67, 23.59, and 27.88 for Create Clear Standards, Stay Close to the Front Line, and Lead by Example. For Remove Work Friction and Track Performance Metrics, the corresponding critical values were 15.51, 18.17, 20.09, 21.95, and 26.12. Thus, none of the reported computed $\chi^2$ values reached the threshold for significance at the stated levels. For Create Clear Standards, the absence of a statistically significant concordance result indicates that the rankings did not demonstrate the level of common ordering required by the selected test. Feyisa and Edosa (2023) described variation in the definition and communication of school goals, offering a relevant context for why perceptions of standard-setting may differ. Differences in communicated priorities or expectations are possible explanations, but these were not separately tested in the present results. Schools can therefore use shared discussions and reviews of standards to promote clearer interpretation of expectations. Remove Work Friction showed the lowest W (0.27), making work-related barriers the least concordant in descriptive terms among the five dimensions. The source manuscript discussed issues such as workload, scheduling, repeated requirements, and coordination as

relevant operational concerns. Patrick (2022) emphasized the role of organizational arrangements in teachers' opportunities to collaborate. These considerations support reviewing procedures with personnel rather than assuming that a single administrative adjustment would meet every teacher's needs. Stay Close to the Front Line (W = 0.40) and Track Performance Metrics (W = 0.39) occupied the middle-to-upper portion of the reported concordance range, but neither test was significant. Bellibaş (2023) highlighted the relationship between observation feedback and instructional practices, whereas Song et al. (2021) examined performance feedback and improvement outcomes. In relation to the present findings, their work underscores the importance of making observations and performance reviews understandable, relevant, and responsive. It does not establish that differences in classroom visits or data systems explain the rankings in the present study. Lead by Example also lacked significant concordance (W = 0.30; $\chi^2$ = 8.10). Cansoy et al. (2021) linked ethical leadership with school ethical climate and teacher job satisfaction, suggesting that the everyday visibility and consistency of professional conduct matter. The current study, however, measured concordance of rankings rather than the causes of perceptions of ethical behavior. Overall, the rankings warrant attention to shared leadership expectations, routine consultation, and consistent operational processes, while the uniformly high mean ratings discussed in Section 3.1 remain a separate descriptive finding.

### *3.3. Perceived Influence of Operational Leadership on Teaching Performance*

The third area examined respondents' ratings of the influence of school heads' operational leadership practices on five aspects of teaching performance. All dimensions were classified as "Very Much Influential" (VMI), with an overall mean of 4.87. Professional Responsibility ranked first (mean = 4.90), Instructional Competence and Collaborative and Teamwork shared second place (mean = 4.89 each; tied rank 2.5), Work Efficiency and Productivity ranked fourth (mean = 4.86), and Classroom Management ranked fifth (mean = 4.81). These results describe high perceived influence across the assessed areas. As ratings of influence rather than experimental estimates of change, they do not establish that the leadership practices caused improvements in teaching performance. Professional Responsibility received the highest mean (4.90; rank 1). Respondents therefore rated leadership influence most strongly in relation to teachers' accountability, ethical conduct, punctuality, record-keeping, reflection, and continuing professional growth. Zakaria (2020) emphasized reflective practice in teachers' professional development and classroom improvement. This provides a conceptual parallel to the present finding: responsible professional conduct can be reinforced through expectations, reflection, and feedback. School heads can sustain fair monitoring and constructive professional guidance, while teachers remain accountable for the quality and timeliness of their assigned responsibilities. Instructional Competence and Collaborative and Teamwork were tied in second place (both means = 4.89; ranks = 2.5). The instructional-competence result indicates favorable assessments of leadership influence on curriculum guidance, lesson planning, coaching, classroom observation, and teaching strategies. Walsh et al. (2020) associated instructional coaching with stronger teacher efficacy in instruction, classroom management, and learner engagement. The teamwork result highlights the perceived value of shared planning, mentoring, professional exchange, and coordinated responsibilities. Wullschleger et al. (2025) reported links between high-quality teacher collaboration, instructional quality, and learner achievement. Together, these two ratings suggest that respondents perceived individual instructional support and collective professional work as comparably important aspects of leadership influence, although the study did not measure how one produced the other. Work Efficiency and Productivity received a mean of 4.86 (rank 4), also classified as VMI. This finding reflects

respondents' favorable ratings of leadership influence on task organization, completion of records and reports, workload coordination, and the balance between instructional and administrative responsibilities. Tarraya (2023) discussed the effects of excessive workload on Philippine public school teachers' effectiveness and efficiency. In the present setting, clear work assignments and practical support are relevant to protecting instructional time. Because the rating does not isolate specific interventions, the implication is to review workflow and reporting requirements systematically rather than presume that one approach has already generated measurable productivity gains. Classroom Management ranked fifth (mean = 4.81) but remained VMI. The difference from higher-ranked dimensions should be read as a relative ordering within a tightly clustered set of high ratings, not as evidence of weak classroom leadership. Walker et al. (2023) discussed positive behavioral interventions and supports as means of fostering safe and orderly learning environments. This literature supports continued attention to classroom routines, learner behavior, safety, and constructive guidance. The overall pattern therefore indicates very high perceived leadership influence on teaching performance, led by professional responsibility and followed closely by instructional competence and collaborative work; classroom management remains an appropriate focus for sustained support.

### *3.4. Agreement in Rankings of Leadership Influence on Teaching Performance*

The fourth area tested whether respondents' rankings of the perceived influence of operational leadership on teaching performance showed statistically significant concordance. Kendall's W, computed $\chi^2$, and the corresponding tabular critical values were examined for all five dimensions. All five rank-concordance tests yielded statistically nonsignificant results ($p > .05$), indicating insufficient statistical grounds to reject the corresponding null hypotheses at the .05 significance level. The statistical interpretation was therefore a failure to reject the null hypothesis at $\alpha = .05$. The reported W values ranged from 0.09 to 0.38, and the computed $\chi^2$ statistics ranged from 2.70 to 11.40. Instructional Competence ($W = 0.38$; $\chi^2 = 10.26$) and Collaborative and Teamwork ($W = 0.38$; $\chi^2 = 11.40$) shared the highest reported W, followed by Classroom Management ($W = 0.37$; $\chi^2 = 8.88$), Work Efficiency and Productivity ($W = 0.19$; $\chi^2 = 6.27$), and Professional Responsibility ($W = 0.09$; $\chi^2 = 2.70$). Every computed $\chi^2$ was below its reported $\alpha = .05$ critical value, and all five outcomes were marked not significant ($p > .05$). Thus, significant agreement in respondents' rank orders of perceived leadership influence was not established. This finding does not contradict the high mean ratings discussed in Section 3.3: average ratings and agreement about rank order address different questions. For Instructional Competence, the reported tabular $\chi^2$ critical values at significance levels of .05, .025, .01, .005, and .001 were 16.92, 19.68, 21.67, 23.59, and 27.88, respectively. For Classroom Management they were 15.51, 18.17, 20.09, 21.95, and 26.12; for Professional Responsibility and Collaborative and Teamwork, 18.31, 21.16, 23.21, 25.19, and 29.59; and for Work Efficiency and Productivity, 19.68, 22.62, 24.72, 26.76, and 31.26. All reported computed $\chi^2$ statistics were lower than their corresponding critical values at $\alpha = .05$. For Instructional Competence, the non-significant concordance result concerns the relative ordering of leadership support activities rather than the absolute level of instructional influence. He et al. (2024) reported that principals' instructional leadership significantly predicted teachers' professional development. This suggests a relevant focus on differentiated coaching, classroom feedback, and needs-based professional learning, but the present rankings do not identify which element accounted for the absence of significant concordance. Classroom Management also showed no significant agreement ($W = 0.37$). Classroom routines, learner behavior, discipline, and school-wide support were considered relevant aspects of classroom management in interpreting the findings. Duan

et al. (2024) identified principal leadership and school culture among factors associated with teachers' classroom-management self-efficacy. The implication is to maintain coherent classroom-support and discipline procedures while recognizing that the present analysis did not examine class-level conditions or test their effects on individual rankings. Professional Responsibility had the lowest W (0.09), despite recording the highest mean influence rating (4.90). This contrast is analytically important: a dimension can receive a very favorable average rating while its component rankings do not show significant concordance. Roncesvalles and Gaerlan (2021) associated authentic leadership with teachers' organizational commitment and citizenship behavior. Their findings provide a framework for viewing fairness and accountability as relevant professional conditions, but the current results cannot determine why respondents differed in ordering aspects of responsibility. Work Efficiency and Productivity yielded W = 0.19 and $\chi^2$ = 6.27, while Collaborative and Teamwork yielded W = 0.38 and $\chi^2$ = 11.40; neither was significant at $\alpha$ = .05. Baidi et al. (2020) identified leadership style and work motivation as relevant to teacher productivity, and Meyer et al. (2023) discussed principals' roles in enabling collaboration through time, resources, shared goals, and participation. These studies suggest useful points of attention for workflow coordination and collaborative planning, rather than causal explanations established by the present rank tests. In synthesis, the findings support consistent yet responsive leadership practices, alongside careful distinction between high perceptions of influence and unconfirmed agreement in relative rankings.

### *3.5. Policy Implications for School Operations and Teacher Support*

The final area of the manuscript translated the findings into five operational policy recommendations. The high ratings for clear standards and professional responsibility support maintaining explicit expectations, while the comparatively lower rating for removing work friction points to practical coordination and workflow concerns. The two sets of non-significant ranking tests further support using consultation and transparent procedures to identify common priorities without assuming that teachers' experiences are identical across schools. First, the School Head and Grade-Level Chairpersons should set realistic timelines and define expected outputs through an agreed implementation calendar. Second, the School Head and School Coordinators should maintain clear channels of communication and conduct regular personnel coordination meetings. Third, the Assistant School Principal and Designated Coordinators should establish a simple schedule for monitoring routine school activities and operations. These measures directly address the standards, coordination, and monitoring dimensions considered in the study. Fourth, Master Teachers and Class Advisers should regularly review learners' academic performance records and assessment results to inform instructional monitoring. Fifth, Program Coordinators and the School Head should maintain updated monitoring records on the implementation of school programs and activities. These recommendations are proposed organizational responses to the observed rating patterns; the study did not evaluate their implementation or effectiveness. Collectively, they offer a practical framework for preserving strongly rated leadership practices while attending to work processes, shared understanding, and structured support for teaching performance.

## 4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study concluded that the operational leadership practices employed by school heads were assessed as "Very Much Employed," reflecting the strong presence of the leadership practices examined in the participating schools. These practices were also rated "Very Much Influential" in enhancing teachers' teaching performance, emphasizing their perceived importance in

supporting instructional effectiveness. However, the findings revealed no significant agreement in the rank orders of either the extent to which operational leadership practices were employed or their influence on teaching performance. This indicated that, despite favorable overall assessments, no common ranking of specific leadership practices or their perceived contributions was established. Collectively, the findings highlighted the importance of sustaining operational leadership practices while recognizing differences in how particular leadership responsibilities were prioritized. The study provided a basis for developing policy recommendations aimed at strengthening school leadership, operational coordination, instructional supervision, and institutional support for teachers.

School heads and master teachers should sustain clear operational standards, visible leadership, regular monitoring, frontline engagement, and streamlined work procedures through consistent implementation and periodic evaluation. Public Schools District Supervisors and school heads should conduct regular coordination and alignment sessions to strengthen consistency in operational leadership practices across schools. School heads and department heads should enhance instructional supervision, resource provision, collaborative planning, and constructive performance feedback to support teachers' professional responsibilities. Furthermore, Public Schools District Supervisors and School Governance and Operations Division personnel should undertake comparative school assessments and provide targeted technical assistance based on identified institutional needs. The policy recommendations formulated from the study findings should also be considered for implementation. Future research may examine school heads' support in addressing learners' academic gaps, the relationship between operational leadership and assessment-tool quality, timely preparation of instructional materials, recognition and reward practices, and teachers' goal-setting practices in relation to teaching performance.

The study's conclusions were confined to the operational leadership practices and their reported influence on teachers' teaching performance within the areas examined. Although the overall assessments were favorable, the absence of significant agreement in the rank orders of both leadership practice employment and perceived influence limited the identification of a common hierarchy of operational priorities. Consequently, the findings should be interpreted as overall assessments rather than evidence that particular practices were consistently considered more influential than others. Future investigations may examine specific operational leadership dimensions and teaching-performance concerns more closely to clarify differences in leadership priorities and their perceived contributions to instructional effectiveness.

## 5. REFERENCES

Acera, J. G., & Tan, M. R. S. (2023). The influence of the school head's competencies and leadership practices towards their performance. International Journal of Social Science and Human Research, 6(5), 2975–2983. https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v6-i5-60

Baidi, Heldy Ramadhan Putra, P., & Junaidah. (2020). The effect of leadership style and work motivation on work productivity for teachers in all state junior high schools of Surakarta. Universal Journal of Educational Research, 8(3D), 67–72. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.081710

Baroman, J. C., & Quirap, E. A. (2024). School heads' leadership practices on teachers' work behavior: Basis for professional development plan. Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research, 11(7), f475–f481. https://www.jetir.org/view?paper=JETIR2407564

Bellibaş, M. Ş. (2023). Empowering principals to conduct classroom observations in a centralized education system: Does it make a difference for teacher self-efficacy and instructional

practices? International Journal of Educational Management, 37(2), 378–398. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-02-2022-0086

Cansoy, R., Parlar, H., & Türkoğlu, M. E. (2021). The effect of school principals' ethical leadership on teacher job satisfaction: The mediating role of school ethical climate. International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies, 8(4), 210–222. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/pes/article/1020738

Castillo, R. G. (2025). Managerial skills of school heads and teachers' work performance in Capul District, Northern Samar Division. International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies, 5(7), 99–119. https://www.ijams-bbp.net/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/7-IJAMS-JULY-2025-99-119.pdf

Devanadera, C., & Ching, D. (2023). School head's managerial roles as correlates of organizational performance. International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies, 4(3), 110–133. https://doi.org/10.53378/353015

Duan, S., Bissaker, K., & Xu, Z. (2024). Correlates of teachers' classroom management self-efficacy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Educational Psychology Review, 36, Article 43. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09881-2

Fababier, D. J. G., & Apostol, R. L. (2024). Transformational leadership of school heads and individual work performance of teachers: The mediating effect of organizational commitment. European Journal of Education Studies, 11(5), 107–130. https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v11i5.5283

Feyisa, L. B., & Edosa, K. C. (2023). Instructional leadership practices and challenges: The case of primary school principals in Liban Jawi Woreda of West Shoa Zone. Education Research International, 2023, Article 3439653. https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/3439653

Grande, H. R., Pore, N. O., Jr., Tangapa, B. J. A., Maiz, D. H., & Bauyot, M. (2024). Exploring the impact of school heads' instructional management, emotional intelligence, and leadership skills on the teachers' work values. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 8(6), 2821–2835. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.806215

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

Meyer, A., Hartung-Beck, V., Gronostaj, A., Krüger, S., & Richter, D. (2023). How can principal leadership practices promote teacher collaboration and organizational change? A longitudinal multiple case study of three school improvement initiatives. Journal of Educational Change, 24, 425–455. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-022-09451-9

Msigwa, O. F., Amos, O., & Mushi, P. S. D. (2024). Influence of heads of schools' leadership practices on teachers job performance in public secondary schools in Kigoma District Council, Tanzania. British Journal of Education, 12(9), 25–42. https://doi.org/10.37745/bje.2013/vol12n92542

Nyaibuli, B., & Mwila, P. M. (2024). Impact of school head leadership style in enhancing teachers' work performance in public secondary schools: A case of Ilala City, Tanzania. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 8(3S), 4931–4937. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.803365S

Patrick, S. K. (2022). Organizing schools for collaborative learning: School leadership and teachers' engagement in collaboration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 58(4), 638–673. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X221107628

Precioso, J. T., & Chua, M. D. (2025). Performance of school heads and teachers in public elementary schools. International Journal of Social Science and Human Research, 8(5), 2772–2784. https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v8-i5-18

Roncesvalles, M. C. T., & Gaerlan, A. A. (2021). The role of authentic leadership and teachers' organizational commitment on organizational citizenship behavior in higher education.

International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management, 9(2), 92–121. https://doi.org/10.17583/ijelm.2021.7194

Song, M., Wayne, A. J., Garet, M. S., Brown, S., & Rickles, J. (2021). Impact of providing teachers and principals with performance feedback on their practice and student achievement: Evidence from a large-scale randomized experiment. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 14(2), 353–378. https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2020.1868030

Tarraya, H. O. (2023). Teachers' workload policy: Its impact on Philippine public school teachers. Puissant, 4. https://puissant.stepacademic.net/puissant/article/view/246

Walker, V. L., Conradi, L. A., Strickland-Cohen, M. K., & Johnson, H. N. (2023). School-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports and students with extensive support needs: A scoping review. International Journal of Developmental Disabilities, 69(1), 13–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/20473869.2022.2116232

Walsh, N. R., Ginger, K., & Akhavan, N. (2020). Benefits of instructional coaching for teacher efficacy: A mixed methods study with PreK–6 teachers in California. Issues in Educational Research, 30(3), 1143–1161. https://www.iier.org.au/iier30/walsh.pdf

Wullschleger, A., Maag Merki, K., Grob, U., Rechsteiner, B., Compagnoni, M., & Vörös, A. (2025). Teacher collaboration to elevate student achievement? Learning and Instruction, 97, Article 102104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2025.102104

Zakaria, Z. (2020). Teachers who reflect, teach better: Reflective practice at the heart of teachers' professional development programs. Idealogy Journal, 5(2). https://doi.org/10.24191/idealogy.v5i2.243