Research Article

Instructional Leadership Skills of School Heads and Its Relation to the Self-Efficacy of Elementary Teachers in Castillejos District

Jovelle L. Battad*

Department of Education, Hanjin Integrated School, Zambales 2208 Philippines
President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Castillejos Campus 2208 Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study focused on the instructional leadership skills of School Heads and their relation to the self-efficacy of elementary teachers in all schools in Castillejos District, Division of Zambales. The data gathered were treated using Mean, Standard Deviation, One-Way ANOVA, and Pearson r. Overall, the teacher's perception of instructional leadership skills of the school heads in terms of being Resource Providers, Instructional Resources, Communicators, and Visible Leaders got a descriptive rating of "Always". Generally, teacher's perceived self-efficacy in terms of Encouraging Student Engagement, Instructional Strategies, and Classroom Management stipulated a descriptive rating of "A Great Deal". There is a significant difference in the school head's instructional leadership skills when grouped according to their age, number of years as school head, and number of seminars/trainings attended related to instructional leadership. There is no significant difference in the school head's instructional leadership skills when grouped according to their sex and highest educational attainment. Lastly, the school head's instructional leadership is significantly correlated to teachers' self-efficacy. Based on the findings and conclusions, the following are recommended: School heads should continue their professional growth and development by enrolling in Graduate School. Likewise, attend more training related to instructional leadership. School heads should strengthen their instructional leadership skills.

Keywords: *Elementary Teachers in Castillejos Zambales, Instructional Leadership, School Heads, Self-Efficacy*

Introduction

As a result of their significance in assisting the entire school in achieving its purpose, vision, and goals, the instructional leadership abilities of school heads continue to be a crucial issue in education on a worldwide scale. It is difficult to undertake instructional leadership due to the position's significant administrative obligations and duties (Prytula, et al., 2013).

Meanwhile, some demands made on school leaders by social forces and others by policy considerations have resulted in leadership issues, such as the addition of new responsibilities without corresponding authority, an imbalance between management and leadership despite the lengthening of the workweek, an increase in ambiguity and complexity, and a decline in morale and enthusiasm, all these demands have been brought on by social forces (Goodwin, et al., 2013).

In the Philippines, Daing (2015) stressed that instructional leadership typically concentrates on teachers' behaviors when they engage in activities that have a direct influence on students' growth. As a result, the instructional leadership skills of school heads have a substantial influence on the technical foundation and future of schools. On the other hand, teachers are also leaders in education because they are committed to the process of teaching and learning in the classroom (Suharsaputra, 2013).

It means that the effectiveness of the teacher plays a significant role in determining how well learning is synchronized with educational outcomes after completing your education. Thus, the purpose of this study was to help school heads assess the effectiveness of their instructional leadership and its relationship to teachers' self-efficacy toward improved school operations and organizations.

Statement of the Problem

This study determined the instructional leadership skills of School Heads and their relation to the self-efficacy of elementary teachers in the District of Castillejos, Division of Zambales.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the school heads in terms of:
   1.1 Age;
   1.2 Sex;
   1.3 Number of years as school head;
   1.4 Highest educational attainment; and
   1.5 Number of seminars in instructional leadership?

2. How may the instructional leadership skills of the school heads be described in terms of:
   2.1. Resource provider;
   2.2. Instructional resource;
   2.3. Communicator; and
   2.4. Visible leader?
3. How do the teachers assess their self-efficacy in terms of:
   3.1. student engagement,
   3.2. instructional strategies, and
   3.3. classroom management?
4. Is there a significant difference in the school heads' instructional leadership skills when they are grouped according to their profile?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the school heads' instructional leadership skills and the teachers' self-efficacy?

Methodology

This study utilized a descriptive correlational design to correlate the instructional leadership skills of school heads and teachers' self-efficacy. Moreover, it probed how the school heads' instructional leadership skills relate to the teachers' self-efficacy. As stated by Worth (2016), a descriptive correlational research design is an appropriate technique for studying specific concerns and as a precursor to bigger quantitative inquiries. Quantitative research is more concerned with how much, how well, or to whom a certain issue applies. Further, Bueno (2019), said that descriptive-correlational design entails gathering data to answer questions about the present condition of the issue. It is generally gathered by a questionnaire, documented examination of accessible data, and data validated by an interview or observation at a predetermined period. Researchers described the replies offered by respondents after they answered the questions. The questions must be appropriately written for the survey to be both trustworthy and valid. Correlations investigate the direction, size, and intensity of correlations or associations. Correlational research designs, according to Creswell (2013), are utilized by investigators to define and measure the degree of association between two or more variables or sets of scores. A process in which subjects' scores on two variables

are simply measured without any modification to see if there is a relationship.

Instruments

For the data gathering on school heads' profiles and assessment of the instructional leadership skills of the school heads, the researcher utilized an adopted and modified questionnaire from the study of Daing (2017), entitled "School Administrators' Instructional Leadership Skills and Teachers' Performance and Efficacy in Senior High Schools in the National Capital Region, Philippines". It consisted of four (4) parts namely, resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible leader. Each area has ten (10) items. The questionnaires employed a Likert scale in which the respondents indicated responses based on the following: Always (A), Sometimes (SO), Seldom (S), and Never (N). Part 2 is for the Teacher Sense of Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES) which was developed by Dr. Megan Tschannen-Moran and Dr. Anita Woolfolk Hoy. questionnaire is an adapted and modified instrument. The researcher had the pilot testing of the questionnaire (Appendix A). Next, the result of the pilot testing underwent Principal Component Analysis (Appendix B) to test whether the items of the questionnaire load to their respective components. Moreover, Pearson r (Appendix C) was utilized to determine the construct convergent validity of the items. Lastly, Cronbach's Alpha (Appendix D) was used to test the internal consistency and reliability of the items. The Cronbach's Alpha of 0.951 indicates excellent internal consistency and reliability of the questions.

Respondents and Location

The study included the total population of 281 elementary teachers and 16 school heads from the District of Castillejos, Schools Division of Office of Zambales Province, which includes: Balaybay Elementary School, Balaybay Resettlement Elementary School, Buenavista Elementary School, Castillejos Elementary School, Del Pilar Elementary School, Hanjin Integrated School, Kanaynayan Elementary School, Looc Integrated School, The The study included a population of 281 elementary teachers and 16 school heads from the District of Castillejos, Schools Division of Office of Zambales Province, which i n c l u d e s : Balaybay Elementary School, Balaybay Resettlement Elementary School, Buenavista Elementary School, Castillejos Elementary School, Del Pilar Elementary School, Hanjin Integrated School, Kanaynayan Elementary School, Looc Integrated School, Magsaysay Elementary School, Nagbayan Elementary School, President Ramon Magsaysay Elementary School, San Agustin Elementary School, San Isidro Elementary School, Sta. Maria Elementary School, San Nicolas Elementary School, and Villaflor Elementary School. The respondents were selected using the total population sampling method to have a more comprehensive coverage of the study.

The municipality of Castillejos was founded in 1743. It was established by Tagalog Families who migrated from Bataan Province and according to Agustin de la Cavada, in his Histories de Filipinas, Castillejos was recognized as pueblo 26 years ahead of Subic, the coastal town proceeding Castillejos from the south. The municipality of Castillejos is one of the thirteen municipalities that comprise the province of Zambales. It is bounded on the north by the municipality of San Marcelino and on the south by the municipality of Subic. It has a total land area of 17,744 hectares. It is subdivided into fourteen (14) barangays. Barangay Looc is the farthest barangay with a distance of 7.0 km from the town proper while Barangay San Juan lies within the heart of the Poblacion. The main tourist destination in the municipality is the Ramon Magsaysay Ancestral House at Barangay Sta. Maria. Other tourist destinations are Looc Lake and Carmelites Church and Monastery both situated at Barangay Looc.

Table 1 below shows the frequency distribution of respondents per school

Table 1. The respondents of the study

Schools	Teachers		School Head	
	f	%	f	%
Balaybay Elementary School	13	4.62	1	6.25
Balaybay Resettlement Elementary School	20	7.11	1	6.25
Buenavista Elementary School	11	3.91	1	6.25
Castillejos Elementary School	28	9.96	1	6.25
Del Pilar Elementary School	14	4.98	1	6.25
Hanjin Integrated School	28	9.96	1	6.25
Kanaynayan Elementary School	7	2.49	1	6.25
Looc Integrated School	24	8.54	1	6.25
Magsaysay Elementary School	14	4.98	1	6.25
Nagbayan Elementary School	14	4.98	1	6.25
President Ramon Magsaysay Elementary School	20	7.11	1	6.25
San Agustin Elementary School	22	7.82	1	6.25
San Isidro Elementary School	14	4.98	1	6.25
Sta. Maria Elementary School	21	7.47	1	6.25
San Nicolas Elementary School	7	2.49	1	6.25
Villaflor Elementary School	24	8.54	1	6.25
Total	**281**	**100**	**16**	**100**

Results and Discussion
1. Profile of the School Head
Table 2 shows the distribution of the respondents according to their age, sex, number of years as school head, highest educational attainment, and number of training related to instructional leadership.

Table 2. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents

N=16			
	Interval/Category	frequency	Percent
Age	36 - 40	2	12.5
	41 - 45	2	12.5
	46 - 50	4	25
	51 - 55	2	12.5
	56 - 60	5	31.25
	61 - 65	1	6.25
Sex	Female	11	68.75
	Male	5	31.25
Number of Years as School Head	1 – 5	5	31.25
	6 – 10	3	18.75
	11 – 15	3	18.75
	16 - 20	2	12.5
	21 - 25	2	12.5
	31 - 35	1	6.25
	36 - 40	0	0.00
Highest Educational Attainment	with Master's Degree Units	5	31.25
	Master's Graduate	4	25
	With a Doctor's Degree Units	4	25
	Doctorate Degree Graduate	3	18.75
Number of Trainings Related to Instructional Leadership	1 – 3		12.5
	4 – 5	2	12.5

Interval/Category	frequency	Percent
6 – 8	4	25
9 – 11	2	12.5
15 - 20	6	37.5

Age: Most of the school head – respondents' age falls in the interval of 56 – 60 as indicated by a frequency of five which is equivalent to 31.25 percent of the total sixteen school heads who serve as a respondent. A percentage of 25 equivalent to four respondents represents school heads whose age falls in the interval of 46 -50. This result is followed by a percent of 12.5 or two school heads whose ages fall in the interval of 36 to 40, 41 to 45, and 51 to 55 respectively. The least tally of the respondents falls at the age interval of 61 to 65 as indicated by a frequency of one and a percent of 6.25. The table shows that the age of school heads begins at 36, which is in accordance with DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2007 that candidates for the Principal I position must pass a qualifying exam under the "revised guidelines on selection, promotion, and designation of school heads". Likewise, school heads must have experience of at least five (5) years in the aggregate as Head Teacher, Teacher-In-Charge, Master Teacher, and Teacher III.

Sex: In terms of school heads' sex, the majority of the respondents are female as illustrated by a frequency of eleven and a percent of 68.75 while male school heads occupy only 31.25 percent of the total respondents which is equivalent to five school heads. General teaching is a female-dominated profession, which is tantamount to having more female school heads.

Number of Years as School Head: Table 2 also reveals that the majority of the respondents have been serving as a school head for more than one year but not more than five years as denoted by a percentage of 31.25. This is followed by an interval year of service of 6 to 10 and 11 to 15 representing 18.75 percent of the total school head – respondents. Two respondents implied by that a percent of 12.5 have served between 16 -20 and 21-25 years, respectively. While the remaining interval of 31 – 35 has a percent of 6.25 showing that the interval contained only one school head. Although most of the respondents are relatively

new school heads, the results imply that a considerable number have ample experience as school heads. This could mean many possibilities for learning and sharing best practices and experiences in instructional leadership.

Highest Educational Attainment: In terms of educational attainment, the table shows that the majority of the respondents have master's degree units as implied by a frequency of five and a percent of 31.25. There are four school heads with master's graduate and with doctorate degree unit representing 25.00 percent of the respondents and only 18.75 percent or three respondents have degrees.

Number of Units Related to Instructional Leadership: The majority of the respondents have 15 – 20 related seminars in instructional leadership as denoted by 37.5 percent followed of 25.00 who have at least six and at most eight related pieces of trainings which are equivalent to six and three respondents respectively. On the other hand, the table reveals that four school heads have at most 10 training courses which can be shown by an accumulated percentage of 25.00. Two respondents also represent 12.5 percent of the total respondents which is equal to two respondents who have at least nine but at most eleven related seminars/training in instructional leadership. The results imply that school heads are updating themselves with current trends in educational leadership, which is a higher possibility of implementing responsive leadership.

2. Teacher's Perceived Instructional Leadership Skills of the School Heads
Tables 3-6 present the teachers' perceived instructional leadership skills of the school heads in terms of being resource providers, instructional resources, communicators, and visible leaders.

Resource Provider. Table 3 shows the teacher's perceived instructional leadership skills of the school heads in terms of being a Resource Provider.

It can be gleaned in Table 3 that school heads always help teachers share their best practices in teaching and classroom instruction as implied by a weighted mean of 3.64. A weighted mean of 3.62 indicates that school heads always recommend, order,or authorize the purchase of instructional materials, supplies, equipment, and visual aids designed to meet student educational needs, and employ a variety of communication and dissemination skills to share information and resources including school-based- training to help improve the performance of teachers. Likewise, the respondents always ensure that teachers have the materials necessary for the successful execution of their jobs (WX=3.56) and assist teachers in accessing and using professional resources to select appropriate strategies to improve student learning (WX=3.54).

Moreover, teachers perceived that school heads always inspect instructional equipment to determine if repairs are needed (WX =3.52), keep themselves abreast of numerous changes and resources in education to provide opportunities for teachers to come up with (WX=3.51), and foster team building and collaboration to improve instruction (WX=3.50).

Table 3. Perceived Instructional Leadership of School Head as a Resource Provider

Resource Provider	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Descriptor
1. He/She updates teachers about the current research and practices through presentations or e-mails.	3.47	Sometimes
2. He/She helps find alternative teaching materials to provide additional practice with the particular skills.	3.42	Sometimes
3. He/She keeps herself abreast of numerous changes and resources in education to provide opportunities for teachers to come up with instructional innovations.	3.51	Always
4. He/She fosters team building and collaboration to improve instruction."	3.50	Always
5. He/She helps teachers share their best practices in teaching and classroom instruction.	3.64	Always
6. He/She assists teachers in accessing and using professional resources to select appropriate strategies to improve student learning.	3.54	Always
7. He/She recommends, orders, or authorizes the purchase of instructional materials, supplies, equipment, and visual aids designed to meet student educational needs.	3.62	Always
8. He/She ensures that teachers have the materials necessary for the successful execution of their jobs.	3.56	Always
9. He/She often employs a variety of communication and dissemination skills to share information and resources including school-based- training to help improve the performance of teachers	3.62	Always
10. He/She inspects instructional equipment to determine if repairs are needed	3.52	Always
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.540**	**Always**

On the other hand, teachers perceived school heads to sometimes update teachers about the current research and practices through presentations or e-mails and help find alternative teaching materials to provide additional practice with the particular skills as implied by a weighted mean of 3.47 and 3.42 respectively. A general weighted mean of 3.54 implies that teachers believed that school heads always have instructional leadership in terms of being a resource provider. Balena (2015) posited the "DepEd's National

Competency-Based Standards for School Heads- Training and Development Needs Assessment Guide and Tools" Domain 2 that highlights Instructional Leadership, the item "He/She recommends, orders or authorizes purchase of instructional materials, supplies, equipment, and visual aids designed to meet student educational needs" or its similar interpretation is not indicated in such domain. On the other side, Jenkins (2019) emphasized how crucial it is for school heads to recognize and value their role as a resource providers in improving instructional effectiveness, one of which is dispersing instructional tools and materials. Effective improvement is characterized by instructional leaders who act in the spirit of cooperation, collegiality, expertise, and teamwork, according to Sahin's (2014) study on the relationship between instructional leadership style and school culture. As a result, instructional leaders support the idea that cooperative practices should be used and should be an integral component of everyday activities at a school that uses flexible and diversified teaching techniques (Campo, 2013). The position of school heads as instructional leaders and resource providers is unique in the world of education due to its tight linkages to students, instructors, curricular alternatives, and learning-teaching processes and procedures.

Instructional Resource. Table 4 stipulates teachers perceived instructional leadership skills of the school heads in terms of being an instructional resource.

A weighted mean of 3.76 shown in Table 4 implies that teacher's perceived school heads to always observe the work of teaching staff to evaluate performance and recommend changes that could strengthen teaching skills. Moreover, school heads always conduct or participate in workshops, committees, and conferences designed to promote the intellectual, social, and physical welfare of students, and facilitate professional learning among colleagues for the improvement of instruction as illustrated by a weighted mean of 3.71 and 3.66 respectively.

Table 4. Perceived Instructional Leadership of School Head as an Instructional Resource

Instructional Resource	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Descriptor
1. He/She conducts or participates in workshops, committees, and conferences designed to promote the intellectual, social, and physical welfare of students.	3.71	Always
2. He/She evaluates the effectiveness of instructional programs of the school and applies remedial actions in areas requiring remediation.	3.60	Always
3. He/She facilitates professional learning among colleagues for the improvement of instruction.	3.66	Always
4. He/She works with colleagues to collect, analyze, and disseminate data related to the quality of professional learning and its effect on teaching and student learning.	3.64	Always
5. He/She develops tests and questionnaires conducts procedures that measure the effectiveness of curricula and uses these tools to determine whether program objectives are being met.	3.33	Sometimes
6. He/She plans or conducts teacher training programs and conferences dealing with new classroom procedures, instructional materials and equipment and, teaching aids.	3.50	Always
7. He/She observes the work of teaching staff to evaluate performance and recommend changes that could strengthen teaching skills.	3.76	Always
8. He/She assists teachers in classroom organization and management.	3.56	Always

Instructional Resource	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Descriptor
9. He/She helps teachers in interpret test results to assess each pupil's abilities and performance	3.46	Sometimes
10. He/She shares knowledge and skills professionally and helps identify powerful instructional strategies and effective elements of lesson plans for effective teaching and learning processes.	3.64	Always
Overall Total	**3.586**	**Always**

Likewise, a weighted mean of 3.64 and 3.60 indicates that school heads always share knowledge and skills professionally and help identify powerful instructional strategies and effective elements of lesson plans for effective teaching and learning processes, work with colleagues to collect, analyze and disseminate data related to the quality of professional learning and its effect on teaching and student learning, and evaluate the effectiveness of instructional programs of the school and applies remedial actions in areas requiring remediation. School heads as described by teachers always teachers in classroom organization and management (WX=3.56) and plan or conduct teacher training programs and conferences dealing with new classroom procedures, instructional materials and equipment, and teaching aids (WX = 3.50). On the other hand, school heads are viewed by teacher-respondents to sometimes help them in interpreting test results to assess each pupil's abilities and performance (WX=3.46) develop tests and questionnaires, and conduct procedures that measure the effectiveness of curricula, and use these tools to determine whether program objectives are being met (WX=3.33). A general weighted mean of 3.59 indicates that teachers believe that school heads always have instructional leadership in terms of instructional resources.

This just serves to highlight how carefully school heads fulfill their obligations by arranging for teachers to attend workshops, seminars, and conferences for the benefit of the pupils.,…

Communicator. Table 5 presents the teacher's perceived instructional leadership skills of the school heads in terms of being a communicator.

It can be gleaned from Table 5 that teachers view school heads as an instructional leader who always holds meetings to discuss instructional concerns of the school (WX=3.74), motivate teachers to work cooperatively to promote changes in instructional practices to improve student learning (WX=3.70), shows collegiality with teachers, non-teaching staff, and parents (WX=3.65), and leads formal and informal group discussions (WX=3.63). Moreover, teacher respondents perceive that school heads always organize information and ideas to be discussed during meetings (WX=3.59), provide constructive feedback to colleagues to strengthen teaching practice and improve student learning (WX=3.58), serve as team leader to harness the skills, expertise, and knowledge of colleagues to address curricular expectations and student learning needs and create a climate of trust and critical reflection to engage colleagues in challenging conversations about student learning and solutions to identified issues (WX =3.55).

Table 5. Perceived Instructional Leadership of School Head as a Communicator

Communicator	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Descriptor
1. He/She models effective skills in listening, presenting ideas, leading discussions, clarifying, and identifying the needs of self and others to advance shared goals and professional learning.	3.48	Sometimes
2. He/She provides constructive feedback to colleagues to strengthen teaching practice and improve student learning.	3.58	Always

Communicator	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Descriptor
3. He/She holds meetings to discuss instructional concerns of the school.	3.74	Always
4. He/She organizes information and ideas to be discussed during meetings	3.59	Always
5. He/She creates a climate of trust and critical reflection to engage colleagues in challenging conversations about student learning and solutions to identified issues.	3.55	Always
6. He/She motivates teachers to work cooperatively to promote changes in instructional practices to improve student learning.	3.70	Always
7. He/She collaborates with teachers in the design and formulation of instructional objectives to improve educational practice and student learning.	3.49	Sometimes
8. He/She leads formal and informal group discussions.	3.63	Always
9. He/She serves as a team leader to harness the skills, expertise, and knowledge of colleagues to address curricular expectations and student learning needs.	3.55	Always
10. He/She shows collegiality with teachers, non-teaching staff, and parents.	3.65	Always
Overall Total	**3.596**	**Always**

On the other hand, teachers view school heads to sometimes collaborate with teachers in the design and formulation of instructional objectives to improve educational practice and student learning (WX=3.49) and model effective skills in listening, presenting ideas, leading discussions, clarifying, and identifying the needs of self and others to advance shared goals and professional learning (WX=3.48). A general weighted mean of 3.60 indicates that teachers perceive school heads instructional leadership in terms of communication.

One of the implications that Bautista (2016) presented is that school administrators, such as principals, must maintain and improve their proficiency in goal setting and in communicating school goals. This is based on the assessment of the instructional leadership of school principals and school culture. Practically speaking, a clearly defined communication ability is present when the instructional leader knows how to successfully listen and convey ideas, lead conversations, clarify, and identify the requirements of self and of others for the achievement of the shared goals and professional learning. This unquestionably fosters a culture of trust and camaraderie.

Practically speaking, a clearly defined communication ability is present when the instructional leader knows how to successfully listen and convey ideas, lead conversations, clarify, and identify the requirements of self and others for the achievement of shared goals and professional learning. This unquestionably fosters a culture of trust and camaraderie.

Visible Leader. Table 6 shows teachers' perceived instructional leadership skills of the school heads in terms of being a visible leader.

Table 6 reveals that teacher-respondents view school heads as an instructional leader who always attends meetings with the teachers to share and discuss matters related to instructional concerns (WX=3.78), make himself/herself available for meetings and/or appointments with pupils, teachers, parents, and stakeholders (WX=3.72), and provide accessibility with teachers to discuss matters affecting curriculum and instruction (WX=3.69). Likewise, a weighted mean of 3.68 and 3.67 respectively indicates that school heads always arrive punctually to work, programs, and meetings and participate in in-service activities related to her/his duties and attend and/or participate in any activity organized by the pupils or teachers

and acknowledge the quality of output in teachers' and pupils' activities such as convocations, organizational meetings, and others. Moreover, a weighted mean of 3.65 and 3.61 respectively shows that teachers believe that school heads always participate in joint parent-teacher

meetings as agreed upon with the classroom/subject teacher give positive feedback to teachers regarding their behavior and performance, and mediate and interact in a parent conference when appropriate, especially if it involves a complaint about teachers.

Table 6. Perceived Instructional Leadership of School Head as a Visible Leader

Visible Leader	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Descriptor
1. He/She participates in in-service activities related to her/his duties.	3.68	Always
2. He/She arrives punctually to work, programs, and meetings.	3.68	Always
3. He/She attends meetings with the teachers to share and discuss matters related to instructional concerns.	3.78	Always
4. He/She participates in joint parent-teacher meetings as agreed upon with the classroom/subject teacher.	3.65	Always
5. He/She provides accessibility with teachers to discuss matters affecting curriculum and instruction.	3.69	Always
6. He/She attends and/or participates in any activity organized by the pupils or teachers.	3.67	Always
7. He/She gives positive feedback to teachers regarding their behavior and performance.	3.65	Always
8. He/She mediates and interacts in a parent conference when appropriate, especially if it involves a complaint about teachers.	3.61	Always
9. He/She acknowledges the quality of output in teachers' and pupils' activities such as convocations, organizational meetings, and others.	3.67	Always
10. He/She makes himself/herself available for meetings and/or appointments with pupils, teachers, parents, and stakeholders.	3.72	Always
Overall Total	**3.70**	**Always**

A general weighted mean of 3.70 indicates that teachers view school heads to have always instructional leadership in terms of being visible leaders. One of the four skills Jenkins (2014) listed as important for instructional leadership is evident. Effective instructional leaders must have a noticeable presence in the school, according to the report. Focusing on learning goals, emulating learning behaviors, and creating lesson plans and activities are all examples of being visibly present.

Teacher's Perceived Self-Efficacy

Tables 7-9 denote the teachers' perceived self-efficacy in terms of encouraging students' engagement, providing instructional strategies, and classroom management.

Students Engagement. Table 7 shows the teacher's perceived self-efficacy in terms of encouraging students' engagement.

Table 7. Teacher's Self–Efficacy in Encouraging Student Engagement

Student Engagement	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Descriptor
1. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?	3.57	A Great Deal

Student Engagement	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Descriptor
2. How much can you do to help your students think critically?	3.63	A Great Deal
3. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork?	3.66	A Great Deal
4. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork?	3.70	A Great Deal
5. How much can you do to help your students value learning?	3.73	A Great Deal
6. How much can you do to foster student creativity?	3.58	A Great Deal
7. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?	3.63	A Great Deal
8. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	3.49	Quite a Bit
Overall Total	**3.62**	**A Great Deal**

Table 7 shows a weighted mean of 3.73 which indicates that teachers have a great deal of self-efficacy in terms of how they help students value learning. Moreover, a weighted mean of 3.70 and 3.66 respectively indicates that teachers have a great deal of self-efficacy in terms of how much they get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork, and how they motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork. Likewise, teachers have a great deal of self–efficacy in how they help their students think critically how they improve the understanding of a student who is failing (WX=3.63), and how they foster student creativity (WX=3.58). In addition, teachers show a great deal of self–efficacy in getting through the most difficult students (WX=3.57) and assisting families in helping their children do well in school (WX =3.49). A general weighted mean of 3.62 reveals that teachers have a great deal of

self–efficacy in terms of encouraging student engagement.

Instructional Strategies. Table 8 shows the teacher's perceived self-efficacy in terms of providing instructional strategies.

Table 8 reveals a weighted mean of 3.66 and 3.63 respectively which implies that teachers have a great deal of self-efficacy in responding to difficult questions of students, and in providing alternative explanations for example when students are confused and adjusting lessons to the proper level of individual students. Likewise, a weighted mean of 3.61 shows that teachers have a great deal of self-efficacy in gauging students' comprehension of what they have taught, and in good crafting questions for students. In addition, a weighted mean of 3.57 denotes that teachers have a great deal of self-efficacy in using a variety of assessment strategies

Table 8. Teacher's Self–Efficacy in Providing Instructional Strategies

Instructional Strategies	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Descriptor
1. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?	3.66	A Great Deal
2. How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?	3.61	A Great Deal
3. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?"	3.61	A Great Deal
4. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?	3.63	A Great Deal
5. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?"	3.57	A Great Deal
6. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	3.63	A Great Deal

Instructional Strategies	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Descriptor
7. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?	3.52	A Great Deal
8. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?	3.53	A Great Deal
Overall Total	**3.60**	**A Great Deal**

Moreover, a weighted mean of 3.53 and 3.52 shows that teachers have a great deal of self–efficacy in providing appropriate challenges for very capable students and implanting alternative strategies in the classroom. A general weighted mean of 3.60 shows that teachers have a great deal of self–efficacy in terms of providing instructional strategies. This provides a compelling justification for the fact that teachers themselves offer options for explanation or provide adequate examples to help students grasp a concept or notion.

Classroom Management. Table 8 presents the teacher's perceived self-efficacy in terms of providing classroom management.

It can be gleaned from Table 9 that a weighted mean of 3.65 and 3.64 shows that teachers have a great deal of self–efficacy in controlling disruptive behavior in the classroom, and in getting students to follow classroom rules. Moreover, they show a great deal of self–efficacy in establishing routines to keep activities running smoothly and a classroom management system with each group of students as implied by a weighted mean of 3.59.

Table 9. Teacher's Self–Efficacy in Classroom Management

Classroom Management	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Descriptor
1. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	3.65	A Great Deal
2. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?	3.57	A Great Deal
3. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	3.59	A Great Deal
4. How much can you do to get students to follow classroom rules?	3.64	A Great Deal
5. How much can you do to calm a disruptive student or noisy?	3.57	A Great Deal
6. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	3.59	A Great Deal
7. How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?	3.53	A Great Deal
8. How well can you respond to defiant students?	3.50	Quite a Bit
Overall Total	**3.58**	**A Great Deal**

There's a great deal of self-efficacy as illustrated by teachers in terms of calming disruptive students and making expectations clear about students' behavior (WX = 3.57). Likewise, teachers show a great deal of self–efficacy in keeping a few problem students from ruining the entire lesson (WX=3.50), and quite a bit of self-efficacy in responding to defiant students (WX = 3.50). A general weighted mean of 3.58 means that teachers have a great deal of self–efficacy in terms of their classroom management skills. The results postulate a positive outcome that teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management is of great deal, which is tantamount to higher tolerance in managing their classroom that is needed in the new normal of education where students demonstrate different attitudes. **Difference in the school heads' instructional leadership skills when they are grouped according to their profile.**

Table 10 shows the result of the F-test for examining the difference in school head instructional leadership skills across their profile at a level of significance of 0.01.

Based on the table below, school head instructional leadership is significantly different in terms of their age ($F = 2.732$), number of years as school head ($F = 3.711$), and the number of seminars/trainings attended related to instructional leadership ($F = 2.981$) as implied by $p-values$ less than 0.01. These results denote that the null hypothesis for age, number of years as school head, and related trainings/seminar attended are rejected. The results imply that the school heads instructional leadership is different depending on their age, the number of years as school head, and related training/seminars attended. Moreover, their age is a factor as it is connected with their experience as school head and learning gained in attending trainings and seminars related to instructional leadership.

On the other hand, there are no significant differences in the instructional leadership of school heads across their sex ($F = 1.97$), and highest educational attainment ($F = 1.537$) as implied by a $p-value$ greater than 0.01. These imply that the null hypothesis for school heads profile in terms of sex, and educational attainment is accepted. The findings denote that the school heads instructional leadership skills are not different in terms of their sex and highest educational attainment. This could mean that male and female school heads regardless of their educational attainment share similar instructional leadership skills.

Table 10. Result of F – test on School Heads' Instructional Leadership Skills across their Profile

School Head Instructional Leadership				
Age	F - Value	P - Value	Decision	
	2.732	0.000	Reject Ho	Significant
Sex	1.97	0.253	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Number of years as School Head	3.711	0.001	Reject Ho	Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	1.537	0.651	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Number of Seminar/Training attended Related to Instructional Leadership	2.981	0.000	Reject Ho	Significant

Relationship between the school heads' instructional leadership skills and the teachers' self-efficacy.

Table 11 shows the result of Pearson r Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation for school heads' instructional leadership and teachers' self-efficacy at 0.01 level of significance. The table reveals that school heads' instructional leadership is significantly correlated to teachers' self-efficacy as denoted by a $p-value$ less than 0.01. This result means that the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between school heads' instructional leadership and teachers' self-efficacy is rejected.

Table 11. Result of Pearson r Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation School Heads' Instructional Leadership Skills and the Teachers' Self-efficacy

School Head's Instructional Leadership				
Teacher's Self-Efficacy	r-value	p-value	Decision	
	0.599	0.000	Reject Ho	Positive Moderate Correlation

Moreover, an $r-value$ of 0.599 implies that school heads' instructional leadership has a significant positive and moderate relation to teachers' self-efficacy, which may indicate that a positive change in school heads' instructional leadership may indicate a moderate positive change to teachers' self-efficacy. Hence, school heads must always adhere to giving outstanding instructional leadership skills to positively influence teacher's self-efficacy.

Conclusions.

Based on the findings, the researcher concluded the following:

Most of the school heads are from the age group of 56-60, female, have been school heads for 1-5 years, with master's degree units, and have attended 15-20 seminars related to instructional leadership.

Second, overall, the teacher's perception of instructional leadership skills of the school heads stipulated the following general results: Resource Provider with an overall weighted mean of 3.540 (Always); Instructional Resource with an overall weighted mean of 3.586 (Always); Communicator with an overall weighted mean of 3. 596 (Always); and Visible Leader with an overall weighted mean of 3.70 (Always).

There is a significant difference in the school head's instructional leadership skills when grouped according to their age, number of years as school head, and number of seminars/trainings attended related to instructional leadership. While, there is no significant difference in the school head's instructional leadership skills when grouped according to their sex and highest educational attainment.

Lastly, the school head's instructional leadership is significantly correlated to teachers' self-efficacy.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following are recommended:

School heads should continue their professional growth and development by enrolling in Graduate and Post-Graduate Schools. Likewise, attend more training related to instructional leadership.

Second, school heads should strengthen their instructional leadership skills by updating teachers about the current research and practices through presentations or e-mails; finding alternative teaching materials to provide additional practice with the particular skills; developing tests and questionnaires and conducting procedures that measure the effectiveness of curricula and use these tools to determine whether program objectives are being met; helping teachers in interpreting test results to assess each pupils' abilities and performance;

modeling effective skills in listening, presenting ideas, leading discussions, clarifying, and identifying the needs of self and others to advance shared goals and professional learning; and collaborating with teachers in the design and formulation of instructional objectives to improve educational practice and student learning.

Third, teachers should improve their self-efficacy in assisting families in helping their children do well in school; implementing alternative strategies in a classroom; and responding well to defiant students.

Other researchers may conduct a study focusing on the perception of students and parents regarding the self-efficacy of teachers, and other related variables on a more comprehensive scale.

References

Adejumobi, F.T. and Ojikutu, K. (2013). School climate and teacher job performance in Lagos Stae Nigeria. *Discourse Journal of Educational Research.*

Aggarwal, J. C. (2018). Psychology of learning and development. Delhi: Shipra Publications.p.142-144.

Almario, R. (2016). Teachers' self-efficacy and the school heads' nature of leadership: Input for Enhancement Program, MAEd. Thesis, Quezon City.

Artino, Jr., A.R. (2012). Academic self-efficacy from educational theory to instructional practice.

Bandura, A. (2012). Self-Efficacy in the Encyclopedia of Psychology, Fourth Edition.

Bautista, J. (2016). Instructional leadership of school principals vis-à-vis school culture among public elementary schools in Western Part of Region III, Ed.D. Dissertation, Bataan Peninsula State University - Dinalupihan Campus.

Best, J. W. and Kahn, J. V. (2017). Research in education. 11th Edition. New Jersey, USA: Prentice Hall.

Blankstein, A. M., Houston, P. D., & Cole, R. W. (2010). Data Enhanced Leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Blase, J., Blase, J., & Phillips, D. Y. (2010). Handbook of School Improvement: How High-Performing Principals Create High

Performing Schools. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Bueno, D. C. (2016). Practical qualitative research writing. Quezon City, Philippines: Great Books Trading.

Bulach, C, Lunenberg, F. & Potter, L. (2011). Creating a Culture of High-Performing School: A Comprehensive Approach to School Reform and Dropout Prevention Paperback. Rowman and Littlefield Education, Maryland, USA.

Daing, C. (2015). Harmonization of instructional leadership skills of department heads and teachers' rating of a public school based on results-based performance management system, MAEd. Thesis, Quezon City.

Department of Education (DepEd) Order No. 8, series of 2015. Policy Guidelines on Assessment in the K to 12 Basic Education Program.

DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016 also known as The Learning Action Cell as a K to 12 Basic Education Program School-Based Continuing Professional Development Strategy for the Improvement of Teaching and Learning. Pasig City, Metro Manila.

DepEd Order No. 42 (2017). National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers. Pasig City, Metro Manila.

Department of Education. (2018). National Teachers' Month celebration survey. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/NTM-Survey-Results.pdf

DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & Karhanek, G. (2010). Raising the bar and closing the gap: Whatever It Takes. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

Dwyer, C., & Hopwood, N. (2019). Feedback that works: How to build and deliver your feedback loop. International Journal of Management Education, 17(3), 347-361.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2012). How to design and evaluate research in education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fruto, M.C. (2014). Leadership styles of principals and the national achievement test of selected public secondary schools in the National Capital Region", Ed.D., Diss., Quezon City.

Ghanizadeh, A., & Jahedizadeh, S. (2021). The relationship between work engagement, occupational stress, and burnout among novice and experienced EFL teachers in Iran. Current Psychology, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-01722-5

Ghanizadeh, A., & Jahedizadeh, S. (2021). The relationship between workload and job burnout among Iranian EFL teachers: The moderating role of perceived organizational support. Journal of Education and Practice, 12(2), 45-55.

Ghanizadeh, A., & Jahedizadeh, S. (2021). Time management and job burnout in teachers: The mediating role of work engagement. Journal of Psychologists and Counsellors in Schools, 31(1), 23-33. https://doi.org/10.1017/jgc.2020.1

Hallinger, P. (2015). Leadership for learning: lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125–142.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (2014). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–247.

Han, Y., & Yin, H. (2020). The impact of school culture on teachers' workload and job satisfaction: The mediating role of work engagement. Sustainability, 12(14), 5718. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12145718

Han, Y., & Yin, H. (2020). Transformational leadership, school organizational culture, and teachers' burnout: Evidence from Chinese secondary schools. International Journal of Educational Development, 79, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2020.102219

Hassan, A., & Sharif, S. P. (2015). Relationship between work overload and job satisfaction among teachers: A study of private schools in Lahore, Pakistan. Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences, 9(3), 888-900.

Kim, D., & Lee, H. (2019). Impact of technology use on time management and productivity

of school teachers. Educational Technology & Society, 22(3), 41-54.

Lee, S. Y., & Choi, K. H. (2019). A study on the relationship between teacher's work engagement and intention to stay in teaching: Focused on the moderating effects of motivation for teaching. Journal of Curriculum and Evaluation, 22(2), 21-39. https://doi.org/10.29221/ jcue.2019.22.2.21

Lee, H. J., & Choi, J. (2019). Exploring factors influencing teacher commitment: Focused on the mediating effect of job satisfaction. Journal of Curriculum and Evaluation, 22(2), 147-167. https://doi.org/10.29221/jce.2019.22.2. 147

Lunenberg, F. & Ornstein, A.(2011). Educational Administration: Concepts and Practices. Cengage Learning. San Francisco, CA.

McMillan, J. H., & Pate, P. E. (2013). Effect of teacher workload on stress, job satisfaction, and teaching efficacy. Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 3(1), 38-46.

National Education Association. (2020). Time management for teachers: 10 tips to manage your time. https://www.nea.org/advocating-for-change/new-from-nea/time-management-teachers-10-tips-manage-your-time

Navarro-Beltrá, M., González-Romá, V., & Peiró, J. M. (2021). The bright and dark sides of job resources: Examining the role of workload in shaping employee attitudes and behaviors. International Journal of Stress Management, 28(1), 25-38. https://doi.org/10.1037/str0000184

Navarro-Beltrá, M., López-Gómez, E., & Navarro-Asencio, E. (2021). Time management among teachers: A cross-sectional study in Spain. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18(2), 545. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph1802054 5

Philippine Statistics Authority. (2019). Highlights of the 2019 survey on teacher's salary. https://psa.gov.ph/content/highlights-2019-survey-teachers-salary

Prytula, M., Noonan B., Hellsten, L. (2013). Toward instructional leadership: principals' perceptions of large-scale assessment in schools. Canadian *Journal of Educational Administration and Policy.*

Reynolds, C. R., et al., (2015). Measurement and assessment in education. Upper Saddle River New Jersey: Pearson

Romano, M.C. (2014). Leadership styles of coordinators and performance of teachers in technical-vocational institutions in Valenzuela City.

Sahin, S. (2011). The relationship between instructional leadership skills and school culture. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri • Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice.

Wang, Q., & Wang, L. (2017). The effect of task prioritization on task performance: Evidence from a classroom experiment. International Journal of Educational Development, 54, 1-10.

Waters, L. (2017). Preparing to thrive: Teachers' thriving as an essential ingredient in successful schools. In M. J. Furlong & R. Gilman (Eds.), Handbook of positive psychology in schools (2nd ed., pp. 91-102). Routledge.

Wilkerson, K. L. (2016). Surviving or thriving: Teacher stress in urban schools. Educational Leadership Review, 17(1), 43-54

Yılmaz, K., & Yılmaz, B. (2017). Determining the relationship between time management skills and job satisfaction of the teachers: A research on the teachers working in elementary schools. Educational Research and Reviews, 12(2), 96-105.

Zhang, L., Tao, S., Fan, X., & Zhang, L. (2019). Workload and work pressure of Chinese primary and secondary school teachers: A quantitative study. Frontiers in Psychology, 10, 216. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.002 16