

School Administrators' Roles and Practices in Enhancing Teachers' Instructional Leadership Capacity

Bernildo A. Orellana

Student, Medina College – Ozamiz City

Abstract— Instructional leadership is pivotal in enhancing teaching quality and student outcomes. School administrators influence this capacity by shaping professional environments through transformational roles and instructional practices such as mentoring, coaching, and collaborative decision-making. Understanding the extent of their influence is vital in fostering empowered and effective teacher-leaders. This study employed a quantitative correlational research design to examine the influence of school administrators' roles and practices on teachers' instructional leadership capacity. A total of 168 public school teachers from selected schools in the Division of Iligan City participated. Data were gathered using a structured survey questionnaire measuring administrators' roles, practices, and teachers' leadership capacity using a five-point Likert scale. The data were analyzed using mean, standard deviation, Spearman rho, and Pearson r. Findings revealed that school administrators demonstrate a high level of transformational leadership and instructional practices. Likewise, teachers exhibited a high level of instructional leadership capacity in shared decision-making, collaboration, empowerment, and leadership distribution. However, no significant relationship was found between administrators' roles and practices and teachers' instructional leadership capacity, suggesting that other factors may be at play. The study concludes that while both school administrators and teachers are performing well individually, leadership strategies of administrators may not directly influence the instructional leadership growth of teachers. This indicates the need for alternative engagement strategies, policy enhancements, and further investigation into other influencing factors such as school culture or professional development systems.

Keywords— instructional leadership, school administrators, teacher leadership, transformational leadership, educational leadership, Iligan City schools.

I. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Instructional leadership is an important leverage point in enhancing teaching quality and students' learning outcomes, and the role of school administrators is crucial to developing this potential among teachers. Beyond administrative duties, they directly impact teachers' professional development, curriculum enactment, and instructional practices. Through activities like mentoring, coaching, performance assessment, and offering instructional resources, administrators shape a facilitative school climate that promotes instructionally excellent practice. When school leaders embrace best leadership practices—such as collaborative decision-making, transparent communication, and ongoing professional learning—they empower educators to drive instruction improvement in their own classrooms and among colleagues. Knowledge about school administrators' roles and practices in supporting instructional leadership is hence critical to the development of stronger, more collaborative learning communities.

School leaders are important in building teachers' instructional leadership capacity through enabling

leadership approaches and focused development strategies. Principal supervisors have a major impact on school leaders' instructional functions by coaching and responding to context-related issues, thus strengthening leadership quality at multiple levels (Ali, 2019). At the district level, leadership support systems also influence instructional focus, since developing instructional leadership demands continuous efforts at different organizational levels, particularly in harmonizing professional learning and student outcomes (LaDue, 2021). In the Philippine setting, master teachers as instructional leaders promote collaborative teaching cultures and affirm the instructional vision of schools, hence supporting overall capacity building (Laude, Ralar, & Arcenal, 2018). Also, elementary school principals who are actively involved in instructional supervision, mentoring, and performance assessment contribute notably to teacher leader development (Basañes, 2020). Overall, these studies confirm that practices and roles performed by administrators are central enablers for enhancing teachers' instructional leadership in dynamic educational environments.

Notwithstanding increased awareness of instructional leadership as a central engine of education reform, there

is an intervening gap in knowledge about how school administrators' particular roles and everyday leadership routines directly affect teachers' instructional leadership capacity, especially in schools at the local level. Literature tends to emphasize overall leadership models or stand-alone dimensions of administrative action, with few empirical studies connecting transformational leadership dimensions—idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration—to actual teacher empowerment and leadership actions. In addition, the distinct practices that administrators perform, including shaping the school's mission, overseeing instruction, and cultivating a positive climate, are often examined in isolation of their effect on teacher leadership capacity. This research fills the gap of contextualized information by investigating the dynamics in one particular educational context, and thus provides localized knowledge that can be used to achieve more successful school leadership development and policy implementation.

The purpose of this research is to investigate the impact of school administrators' practices and roles on teachers' instructional leadership capacity building. Attesting to the importance of school leaders in influencing the instruction climate, the research will establish how administrators' transformational leadership styles—idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration—are associated with teacher leadership development. In addition, it examines the degree to which the practices of school administrators in articulating the school's purpose, directing instructional programs, and developing a positive school culture contribute to the empowerment of teachers, collaboration, shared decision-making, and leadership distribution. The results intend to offer empirical evidence that can inform training and professional development plans for building strong instructional leadership within schools.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This research utilized a quantitative correlational design to investigate school administrators' practice and role impacts on teachers' instructional leadership capability. The correlational strategy was used to determine the association between the variables without manipulating them. It enabled the researcher to establish whether and the extent to which the administrators' transformational

leadership practices (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) and leadership roles (defining the mission, managing the instructional program, and encouraging a healthy school climate) were associated with the teachers' instructional leadership capacity in terms of shared decision-making, collaboration, empowerment, and leadership distribution. Data were collected through standardized survey questionnaires answered by both administrators and teachers, and statistical methods like the mean, standard deviation, and Pearson's correlation coefficient to analyze data and establish significance and strength of relationships.

Research Setting

The research was carried out in the Division of Iligan City, a high urbanized zone in Northern Mindanao, Philippines. The division has a combination of public elementary and secondary schools, both urban and semi-urban barangays, under the DepEd's supervision. Being an education center for the region, the Iligan City Division has several school administrators and a heterogeneous teaching population, providing a fitting context for examining the roles and routines of school leaders and their impact on teachers' instructional leadership capability. The schools chosen constituted a representative sample of teachers and administrators from which to make an informed assessment of instructional development and leadership dynamics within the division.

Research Respondents

The study respondents were 168 public school teachers from sample schools in the Division of Iligan City. The teacher respondents were selected according to the following inclusion criteria: (1) employed full-time as public-school teachers; (2) teaching experience for at least one year; and (3) regularly engaged in instructional work and school development activities. The research used the purposive sampling method to choose teachers who were deemed capable of offering pertinent and enlightening information on their instructional leadership ability and their views regarding school administrators' roles and practices. This method was used to ensure that only individuals with adequate teaching experience and background played a part in contributing to the outcomes, thus increasing the validity and reliability of the findings.

Research Instrument

The primary data collection tool employed in this research was a structured survey questionnaire meant to measure three key elements: school administrators' roles, school administrators' practices, and teachers' instructional leadership capacity. The tool consisted of three sections, each employing the five-point Likert scale ranging from 5 – Always, 4 – Often, 3 – Sometimes, 2 – Seldom, to 1 – Never.

Part I addressed school administrators' roles, in particular, measuring their transformational leadership behaviors. It had four dimensions: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Items under idealized influence measured to what extent administrators provide a positive example, maintain moral principles, and illustrate integrity. Inspirational motivation measured to what extent administrators express a vision, motivate teachers, and foster optimism. Intellectual stimulation assessed the support for innovative instruction, appreciation of teacher suggestions, and facilitation of reflective thought. Individualized consideration assessed the degree to which administrators respond to individual teacher needs, offer mentoring, and provide personalized feedback.

Part II evaluated school administrators' practices in instructional leadership by three dimensions: establishing the school's mission, overseeing the instructional program, and fostering a positive school climate. The items under establishing the mission dealt with communication of objectives, coherence of daily activities to the school vision, and engaging teachers in setting mission. Managing the instructional program addressed classroom supervision, feedback, resource facilitation, and curriculum alignment. Encouraging a good climate included items concerned with staff respect for each other, working together, conflict resolution, and staff motivation.

Part III assessed teachers' instructional leadership capability, also made up of four dimensions: shared decision-making, collaboration, empowerment, and distribution of leadership. Shared decision-making consisted of teacher participation in planning and policy-making. Collaboration assessed team effort, exchange of teaching strategy, and administrator support for collaborative endeavors. Empowerment addressed autonomy in the classroom, leadership role participation, and support of professional growth.

Distribution of leadership mentioned the equitable delegation of leadership task and opportunity to impact school-level efforts.

Instruments Validation

To ensure the reliability and validity of the Validation of the research tool was carried out in a rigorous manner in order to establish the content validity, clarity, and reliability of the tool prior to its full deployment. The initial draft questionnaire was subjected to validation by an expert panel made up of educational supervisors, veteran school administrators, and research experts. These validators evaluated every item on the basis of its relevance, clarity, and consistency with the study's purpose and conceptual framework.

With a Content Validity Index (CVI) method, the validators rated each item on a 4-point scale: 1 – irrelevant, 2 – somewhat relevant, 3 – very relevant, and 4 – extremely relevant. The CVI per item (I-CVI) was calculated by dividing the number of experts rating the item as 3 or 4 by the number of experts. A minimum I-CVI of 0.78 was deemed acceptable. Those items that were below threshold were revised or eliminated according to the validators' suggestions.

Following content validation, the tool was pilot tested using a small number of teachers (not part of the actual study) from the same division to detect ambiguities, vague language, and areas of possible administrative problems. Feedback obtained during the pilot test was utilized to further strengthen the items.

To establish reliability, Cronbach's alpha test was carried out for every section of the instrument. The resultant alpha values were compared to evaluate internal consistency, where a coefficient of 0.70 and above would signify acceptable reliability.

Data Gathering Procedure

The data collection process employed a systematic and structured approach to ensure accuracy, efficiency, and responsiveness. Prior to implementation, formal approval to conduct the study was secured from the Schools Division Superintendent of Iligan City. Upon receiving clearance, the researcher coordinated with the principals of the identified public schools to communicate the objectives of the study and request their assistance in facilitating the data-gathering process.

Validated survey questionnaires were personally distributed to the selected teacher-respondents. Before the distribution, a brief orientation was conducted by the researcher to explain the purpose of the study, emphasize the confidentiality of all responses, and highlight the voluntary nature of participation. Respondents were given ample time to accomplish the questionnaires during non-instructional hours to avoid any disruption to their teaching responsibilities.

Upon completion, the questionnaires were promptly retrieved by the researcher. Each response was reviewed for completeness and accuracy before being encoded and organized for statistical analysis

Ethical Considerations

Guided by Bryman's (2007) principles on research ethics, the study prioritized the rights, safety, and dignity of all participants. Informed consent was obtained from all respondents, clearly stating the voluntary nature of their involvement, the purpose of the research, and their right to withdraw at any time without consequence.

Confidentiality was strictly maintained by anonymizing all survey responses and ensuring that no identifying information was disclosed in the reporting of results.

The study also ensured that no physical, psychological, or professional harm would come to participants by minimizing disruption to their work routines and protecting their data privacy. Ethical approval was secured, and all procedures were carried out with transparency and adherence to accepted ethical research standards.

Data Analysis

To analyze the data gathered from the respondents, the study employed several statistical tools appropriate to the nature of the variables and the research questions.

The Mean was used to determine the average responses of the teachers regarding school administrators' roles and practices, as well as their own instructional leadership capacity. This provided a general overview of the level or extent to which each indicator was perceived.

The Standard Deviation was computed to measure the variability or dispersion of responses from the mean. It indicated how consistent or varied the respondents' perceptions were across the different indicators of leadership roles, practices, and instructional capacity.

For the inferential analysis, two correlation techniques were applied. The Spearman Rho was used to test the significant relationship between ordinal data or data that did not meet the assumptions of normality. This non-parametric test determined the strength and direction of the monotonic relationship between school administrators' roles and teachers' instructional leadership capacity.

Meanwhile, the Pearson r was employed to test the significant relationship between school administrators' practices and teachers' instructional leadership capacity. Since the variables under this test were continuous and assumed to be normally distributed, Pearson's correlation coefficient was appropriate for assessing the linear relationship between the two variables.

III. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Table 1.1 Extent do School Administrators' Roles Manifest in Terms of Idealized Influence

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. My school administrator sets a good example for teachers to follow.	0.670	3.560
2. My administrator consistently upholds ethical standards in decision-making.	0.638	3.905
3. My administrator demonstrates strong commitment to school values.	0.645	3.768
4. My administrator gains respect through their integrity and character.	0.659	3.887
5. My administrator serves as a role model for instructional leadership.	0.689	3.964
Average Mean		3.817 High

Scale: 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”

Table 1.1 shows the degree to which idealized influence is expressed by school administrators' roles. The total mean is 3.817, and this is translated as "High" using the provided scale. This would mean that school

administrators are typically seen as exercising strong leadership traits, specifically in maintaining integrity, exemplifying ethical conduct, and showing a commitment to school values. Their leadership by

example plays a role towards a positive and influential school environment that fosters instructional leadership for teachers.

Among the indicators, the highest mean score of 3.964 was observed in the statement, “My administrator serves as a role model for instructional leadership,” highlighting that administrators are viewed as influential figures who exemplify effective leadership practices. On the other hand, the lowest mean of 3.560 was recorded for the item, “My school administrator sets a good example for teachers to follow.” Despite being the lowest, this indicator still falls within the “High” category, indicating that all aspects of idealized

influence are positively manifested, although some areas may need slight reinforcement to ensure consistency in role modeling across all levels.

These findings are in line with the arguments of Ahmad and Rochimah (2021), who highlighted that school leaders who practice idealized influence command respect and trust from teachers. When principals model professionalism and behave with integrity, they influence the instructional attitudes and practices of their teaching staff. This affirms that leading by example is a strong catalyst for improving teachers' instructional leadership capacity.

Table 1.2 Extent do School Administrators' Roles Manifest in Terms of Inspirational Motivation

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. My administrator motivates us with a clear vision for the school.	0.647	3.875
2. My administrator encourages teachers to strive for excellence.	2.398	4.107
3. My administrator expresses confidence in teachers' abilities.	0.728	3.982
4. My administrator promotes optimism even during challenges.	0.629	3.804
5. My administrator inspires a shared sense of purpose among staff.	0.638	3.875
Average Mean		3.929 High

Scale: 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”

Table 1.2 indicates the degree to which school administrators' function appears in inspirational motivation terms. The general mean of 3.929 is being interpreted as High. This indicates that school administrators are being perceived as effective in motivating teachers through offering a clear vision, having faith in their capacities, and creating a collective sense of purpose. Their leadership style stimulates the teaching staff and enables a collective school culture focused on ongoing instructional improvement. The highest mean score of 4.107 was noted in the item, “My administrator encourages teachers to strive for excellence,” which is interpreted as Very High, indicating that administrators are especially strong in inspiring teachers to perform beyond expectations. The

lowest mean, 3.804, was recorded for the item, “My administrator promotes optimism even during challenges,” and is interpreted as High. Although it is the lowest among the indicators, it still reflects a strong degree of inspirational motivation, showing that all areas are positively demonstrated by the administrators and suggesting a need for continuous encouragement and emotional support, particularly during challenging times. Leithwood et al. (2019) stressed that inspirational motivation by school leaders promotes commitment and goal alignment for teachers. When leaders make a compelling vision statement and give confidence, the teacher motivation is boosted, and there is better instructional performance and a more purposeful learning environment.

Table 1.3 Extent do School Administrators' Roles Manifest in Terms of Intellectual Stimulation

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. My administrator encourages innovative teaching strategies.	0.631	3.780
2. My administrator challenges teachers to think critically.	0.620	3.821
3. My administrator values teachers' ideas and suggestions.	0.548	3.875
4. My administrator supports professional dialogue about instructional improvement.	0.558	3.935
5. My administrator promotes inquiry and reflective thinking.	0.697	3.881
Average Mean		3.858 High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High”, 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 1.3 investigates the degree to which school administrators' roles express themselves in intellectual stimulation. The composite mean is 3.858, described as High. This suggests that administrators are seen to encourage creative thinking, professional dialogue, and the sharing of ideas among teachers. Their direction creates an intellectually stimulating setting where teachers are challenged to critique practices, exchange views, and improve instructional strategies.

The highest mean score of 3.935 was recorded in the item, "My administrator supports professional dialogue about instructional improvement," which is interpreted as High. This shows that administrators are actively involved in cultivating meaningful conversations around teaching enhancement. The lowest mean, 3.780,

appeared in the statement, "My administrator encourages innovative teaching strategies," and is likewise interpreted as High. Although slightly lower, it still signifies a favorable perception and highlights the need to further strengthen the encouragement of creative instructional practices across teaching teams.

These are corroborated by Sholeh (2021), who observed that intellectual stimulation in leadership induces reflection, creativity, and engagement in the learning process. When teachers are challenged to think critically by school administrators and when their work is appreciated, they contribute to the development of an innovatory pedagogical culture that fosters pedagogical development and professional growth.

Table 1.4 Extent do School Administrators' Roles Manifest in Terms of Individualized Consideration

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. My administrator recognizes individual teacher needs.	0.661	3.833
2. My administrator provides opportunities for personal growth.	0.675	3.857
3. My administrator gives constructive feedback tailored to each teacher.	0.651	3.815
4. My administrator shows concern for teachers' well-being.	0.590	3.804
5. My administrator mentors or coaches teachers based on their strengths and needs.	3.810	0.449
Average Mean		3.824 High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41 – 4.20 "High", 4.21 – 5.00 "Very High"

Table 1.4 looks at the degree to which school administrators' roles are evidenced in terms of individualized consideration. The mean is 3.824, which is interpreted as High. This implies that administrators are seen to respond to teachers' unique needs by providing support, guidance, and individualized opportunities for growth. Through their capacity to identify individual strengths and respond with valuable mentorship, a friendly and encompassing professional climate is facilitated.

The highest mean score of 3.857 was observed in the item, "My administrator provides opportunities for personal growth," interpreted as High, indicating that teachers feel supported in pursuing their professional advancement. The lowest mean, 3.804, corresponds to the item, "My administrator shows concern for teachers'

well-being," which is also interpreted as High. Although slightly lower, it still reflects a strong sense of care and attention from administrators, while suggesting the value of further strengthening emotional and personal support among faculty.

These results are corroborated by the research of Killion and Harrison (2020), which highlighted that individualized consideration increases teacher motivation and job satisfaction as administrators provide personalized feedback, mentoring, and emotional support. By respecting variations among people and attending to the unique needs of their teaching staff, administrators create a supportive environment that promotes professional satisfaction and successful instructional performance.

Table 1.5 Summary of the Extent do School Administrators' Roles Manifest

Components	Mean	Interpretation
Idealized Influence	3.817	High
Inspirational Motivation	3.929	High
Intellectual Stimulation	3.858	High

Individualized Consideration	3.824	High
Average Mean	3.857	High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 1.5 shows a summary of the degree to which school administrators' roles are expressed across the four dimensions of transformational leadership. The total average mean is 3.857, or "High", showing that administrators exhibit consistently leadership behaviors that positively influence instructional leadership among teachers.

Among the components, “Inspirational Motivation” registered the highest mean of 3.929, suggesting that administrators are particularly effective in inspiring teachers through a clear vision, encouragement, and a shared sense of purpose. This is followed by “Intellectual Stimulation” with a mean of 3.858, reflecting strong support for innovation, critical thinking, and reflective practice. “Individualized

Consideration” posted a mean of 3.824, showing that administrators recognize and address individual teacher needs through mentorship, constructive feedback, and personal support. Lastly, “Idealized Influence” recorded a mean of 3.817, highlighting how administrators serve as role models by demonstrating integrity, professionalism, and ethical leadership.

These findings suggest that school leaders are seen as continually doing well in all four domains of transformational leadership. Their capacity to inspire, challenge, support, and lead by example forms a professional school climate that fosters teacher development, stimulates collaboration, and enhances overall instructional leadership (Leithwood et al., 2019).

Table 2.1 Extent do School Administrators' Practices Reflect in Terms of Defining the School's Mission

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. The administrator clearly communicates the school's goals and objectives.	0.626	3.536
2. Teachers are involved in crafting the school's vision and mission.	0.616	3.964
3. The school's mission aligns with day-to-day classroom activities.	0.619	3.786
4. The administrator consistently refers to the mission in school plans.	0.697	3.911
5. Teachers understand how their work contributes to the school's mission.	0.672	3.976
Average Mean		3.835 High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 2.1 shows the degree to which school administrators' practice translates in the context of delineating the mission of the school. Overall mean is 3.835, and it translates to "High."

This typically means that administrators are successful in making sure the school mission is conveyed, recognized, and incorporated into strategic planning and classroom practice. Teachers perceive a high degree of link between their role and general goals of the organization.

The highest mean score of 3.976 was recorded for the item “Teachers understand how their work contributes to the school's mission,” interpreted as High.

This indicates that teachers clearly recognize how their individual responsibilities align with the school's direction. The lowest mean, 3.536, was observed in the

item “The administrator clearly communicates the school's goals and objectives,” which is also interpreted as High. Although it ranked the lowest, it still reflects a positive perception, suggesting that communication is generally effective.

While all indicators were rated High, this calls for sustained innovation and reinforcement to maintain clarity, collaboration, and alignment between school leadership and classroom practices.

This is consistent with Fullan (2016), which states that if administrators regularly communicate and emphasize the mission of the school, this boosts teacher motivation and organizational coherence.

Mission-inspired leadership makes for a shared sense of purpose that results in a more targeted, collaborative, and cohesive learning environment.

Table 2.2 Extent do School Administrators' Practices Reflect in Terms of Managing the Instructional Program

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. The administrator monitors classroom instruction regularly.	0.711	3.982
2. My administrator provides feedback to improve teaching practices.	0.612	3.982
3. My administrator facilitates access to teaching and learning resources.	0.685	4.030
4. The administrator ensures alignment of curriculum and instruction.	0.571	3.887
5. Instructional supervision is conducted in a supportive manner.	0.570	3.946
Average Mean		3.965 High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 2.2 shows the degree to which school leaders' practices translate in terms of controlling the instructional program. The general mean is 3.965 and is categorized as "High." This implies that administrators are seen to be always involved in facilitating instructional improvement by frequent supervision, constructive criticism, access to learning materials, and attempts to bring instruction in line. Such practices show that they care about enhancing the quality of teaching and creating a productive learning environment.

The highest mean score of 4.030 was recorded in the item “My administrator facilitates access to teaching and learning resources,” interpreted as High. This indicates that administrators are highly effective in providing teachers with adequate instructional materials and tools. On the other hand, the lowest mean of 3.887 was noted

in the item “The administrator ensures alignment of curriculum and instruction,” which is also interpreted as High. Although this aspect remains positively perceived, it suggests the need to further strengthen the integration between what is taught and how it aligns with curricular goals. While all indicators were rated High, this points to the importance of enhancing coordination and support across all components of instructional leadership to maintain relevance, coherence, and effectiveness.

These results are echoed by Day-Heggie (2021), who determined that regular instructional support and exposure to suitable teaching resources are key responsibilities of school administrators in reinforcing instructional delivery and general teacher performance.

Table 2.3 Extent do School Administrators' Practices Reflect in Terms of Promoting a Positive Climate

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. The administrator fosters a culture of mutual respect in school.	0.644	3.792
2. The work environment encourages collaboration among staff.	0.660	3.815
3. Teachers feel valued and supported by leadership.	0.508	3.899
4. The administrator addresses conflicts in a fair and timely manner.	0.549	3.958
5. The school climate promotes teacher morale and motivation.	0.699	3.893
Average Mean		3.871 High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 2.3 describes how far school administrators' practices are in creating a positive climate as per dimensions. The mean is 3.871, which is "High." The implication is that the school leaders are, by and large, successful in creating an atmosphere that is marked by mutual respect, cooperation, and support. This kind of climate is responsible for making relationships among staff more cohesive and boosting teacher commitment and morale. The highest mean score of 3.958 was recorded in the item “The administrator addresses conflicts in a fair and timely manner,” interpreted as High. This shows that administrators are perceived to

handle interpersonal issues with impartiality and responsiveness, fostering trust and professionalism. The lowest mean, 3.792, was observed in the item “The administrator fosters a culture of mutual respect in school,” which, while still interpreted as High, signals a need for continued emphasis on respectful interactions among all school stakeholders. Although all indicators were rated High, maintaining a positive school climate calls for continuous reinforcement of inclusive practices, emotional sensitivity, and shared values to ensure a supportive working atmosphere.

Fullan (2016) highlighted that strong leadership in resolving staff concerns and encouraging cooperation greatly enhances morale and improves overall school performance. A school climate rooted in fairness and acknowledgment results in better teacher retention and

elevated instruction quality. By continually fostering a positive environment, administrators establish the conditions for sustainable improvement, teacher well-being, and long-term organizational success.

Table 2.4 Summary of the Extent do School Administrators' Practices Reflect

Components	Mean	Interpretation
Defining the School's Mission	3.835	High
Managing the Instructional Program	3.965	High
Promoting a Positive Climate	3.871	High
Average Mean	3.890	High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 2.4 illustrates the degree to which school administrators' practices are mirrored on three key areas of instructional leadership. The total average mean of 3.890, which translates to High, suggests that administrators routinely apply successful leadership practices to strengthen school operations, instruction quality, and institutional guidance. This demonstrates high dedication to teaching excellence as well as a highly organized, mission-focused school climate.

Among the components, "Managing the Instructional Program" recorded the highest mean of 3.965, highlighting administrators' focused efforts in supervising teaching practices, guiding instructional strategies, and improving curriculum delivery. This is followed by "Promoting a Positive Climate" with a mean of 3.871, showing success in building a respectful,

collaborative, and supportive school environment. Meanwhile, "Defining the School's Mission" received a mean of 3.835, confirming that administrators clearly communicate the school's goals and ensure shared understanding among stakeholders. The consistently high scores across all indicators suggest that administrators are fulfilling their leadership roles effectively, fostering a culture that supports both instructional excellence and student achievement.

Overall, these findings depict a strong and cohesive leadership practice that synthesizes clear vision, instructional monitoring, and positive climate. With ongoing professional development, innovation, and active stakeholder involvement, these practices can contribute to enduring school improvement and an enhanced learning experience.

Table 3.1 Level of Teachers' Instructional Leadership Capacity in Terms of Shared Decision-Making

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. I am involved in decisions that affect the instructional program.	0.723	3.464
2. My opinions are considered in school planning and policy-making.	0.606	3.964
3. Teachers participate in developing school improvement plans.	0.632	3.798
4. Leadership encourages input from teachers during meetings.	0.722	3.881
5. I feel empowered to influence decisions beyond my classroom.	0.683	3.935
Average Mean		3.808 High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 3.1 shows the teachers' instructional leadership capacity for shared decision-making. The mean is 3.808 and is interpreted as "High." This means that teachers as a group tend to see themselves as playing an active role in the school decision-making, particularly in issues affecting instructional quality and school building. Their involvement is characteristic of a leadership culture that emphasizes collaboration and collective participation.

The highest mean score of 3.964 was recorded in the item “My opinions are considered in school planning and policy-making,” interpreted as High. This highlights that teachers feel their perspectives are respected and incorporated into broader institutional decisions.

The lowest mean, 3.464, was found in the item “I am involved in decisions that affect the instructional

program,” which is also interpreted as High. While still positive, this suggests a relatively lower perception of involvement in direct instructional matters. Even though all indicators received High ratings, there remains a need to strengthen structures and practices that encourage broader teacher participation in shaping instructional priorities and reforms.

These are echoed by Hargreaves (2019), who established that where teachers are truly involved in school governance, this results in heightened ownership, initiative, and motivation. Teacher empowerment in the decision-making process strengthens their leadership identity and leads to more responsive and dynamic school development strategies.

Table 3.2 *Level of Teachers' Instructional Leadership Capacity in Terms of Collaboration*

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. I regularly collaborate with colleagues on teaching strategies.	0.660	3.929
2. I engage in team planning and problem-solving.	0.616	3.964
3. I share instructional materials and practices with other teachers.	0.672	3.988
4. My administrator supports collaborative teaching initiatives.	0.577	3.863
5. There is a strong culture of teamwork in our school.	0.621	3.917
Average Mean		3.932 High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 3.2 illustrates teachers' instructional leadership capacity for collaboration. The total mean is 3.932, or "High." It shows that collaboration is highly practiced among the teachers, with strong support for shared planning, peer interaction, and exchanging strategies with each other. Such collaborative effort supports a professional culture of continuous improvement and collective accountability for instructional quality.

The highest mean score of 3.988 was recorded in the item “I share instructional materials and practices with

other teachers,” interpreted as High. This reflects a high level of openness and collegiality, where educators willingly contribute to one another's success. The lowest mean, 3.863, was found in the item “My administrator supports collaborative teaching initiatives,” which is also interpreted as High. While this remains a strong indicator, it suggests that administrative facilitation of collaboration could be further enhanced to sustain its momentum. Although all indicators were rated High, maintaining and deepening collaboration requires continued.

Table 3.3 *Level of Teachers' Instructional Leadership Capacity in Terms of Empowerment*

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. I feel trusted to make decisions in my instructional area.	0.678	3.702
2. I am given opportunities to lead initiatives or committees.	0.631	3.756
3. I have autonomy in designing classroom instruction.	0.534	3.845
4. I feel encouraged to take on leadership roles.	0.577	3.893
5. I am supported in pursuing professional development.	0.710	3.821
Average Mean		3.819 High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 3.3 analyzes the degree of empowerment of teachers' instructional leadership capacity. The total mean is 3.819, which means "High."

This indicates that teachers feel empowered in their professional work, especially in such aspects as decision-making, instructional autonomy, and involvement in leadership opportunities. Teacher empowerment develops teacher confidence and a higher level of engagement in school leadership roles.

The highest mean score of 3.893 was recorded in the item “I feel encouraged to take on leadership roles,” interpreted as High. This suggests that school environments are generally supportive of teachers who seek to expand their influence beyond the classroom.

The lowest mean, 3.702, was noted in the item “I feel trusted to make decisions in my instructional area,” which is also interpreted as High. Although still positive, this may point to a slightly more cautious

perception of autonomy and trust within instructional decision-making. While all indicators were rated High, reinforcing empowerment calls for sustained efforts in building trust, expanding leadership opportunities, and recognizing teacher agency across all instructional dimensions.

These results concur with the findings of Tennett and Jr (2019), who established that when teachers have chances to lead and operate in autonomy, they are likely to engage constructively in school improvement. Fostering teacher empowerment enhances mutual leadership, enriches school creativity, and constructs a more active professional learning community.

Table 3.4 Level of Teachers' Instructional Leadership Capacity in Terms of Leadership Distribution

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. Leadership responsibilities are shared among teachers.	0.604	3.899
2. I am part of a team where leadership is distributed fairly.	0.617	3.988
3. My administrator delegates leadership tasks to teachers.	0.636	3.845
4. I am given the opportunity to influence school-wide initiatives.	0.624	3.833
5. There is a clear system for shared leadership in our school.	0.427	3.821
Average Mean		3.877 High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 3.4 illustrates the degree of teachers' instructional leadership capacity through leadership distribution. The mean overall is 3.877, which translates to "High." This shows that leadership positions are widely distributed among teachers and therefore foster a team leadership culture that celebrates collaboration and shared responsibility. The distribution, in this case, welcomes greater participation and stimulates teachers to give more than their specific classrooms.

The highest mean score of 3.988 was recorded in the item “I am part of a team where leadership is distributed fairly,” interpreted as High. This reflects a positive perception of fairness and equity in sharing leadership roles within teams. The lowest mean, 3.821, was noted in the item “There is a clear system for shared leadership

in our school,” which is also interpreted as High. Although this remains favorable, it suggests that clarity and formalization of shared leadership systems may still need further development. While all indicators were rated High, sustaining and enhancing leadership distribution requires ongoing communication, capacity-building, and clear frameworks that support teacher involvement at all levels.

This trend is consistent with Lin's (2022) work, which noted that equitable and organized allocation of leadership responsibilities maximizes teacher collaboration and consolidates school governance. Their work points out that shared leadership promotes professional development and leads to more active and sensitive school communities.

Table 3.5 Summary of the Level of Teachers' Instructional Leadership Capacity

Components	Mean	Interpretation
Shared Decision-Making	3.808	High
Collaboration	3.932	High
Empowerment	3.819	High
Leadership Distribution	3.877	High
Average Mean	3.859 High	

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 3.5 below presents the extent of teachers' instructional leadership capacity in four major dimensions. The overall average mean of 3.859 as High shows that the teachers clearly exhibit effective instructional leadership capabilities that positively affect school governance as well as instruction enhancement.

Among the components, "Collaboration" achieved the highest mean of 3.932, reflecting teachers' effective teamwork and cooperative efforts in enhancing teaching and learning. This is followed by "Leadership Distribution" with a mean of 3.877, indicating a well-balanced sharing of leadership roles among teachers.

"Empowerment" recorded a mean of 3.819, showing that teachers feel supported and confident to take initiative in leadership activities. Lastly, "Shared Decision-Making" received a mean of 3.808, suggesting active teacher involvement in key decisions affecting instruction and school policies.

The consistently high ratings on all aspects indicate a strong culture of collective leadership and shared responsibility among teachers. Maintaining such strengths with continuous professional development and collaborative approaches will continue to reinforce instructional leadership capacity and overall school performance (Fullan, 2016).

Table 4. *Test of Significant Relationship Between School Administrators' Roles and Teachers' Instructional Leadership Capacity*

Test Variables	Spearman rho	P value	Decision
School Administrators' Roles and Teachers' Instructional Leadership Capacity	-0.141	0.593	retain the Ho

Note: If $p \leq 0.05$, with a significant relationship

Table 4 indicates the test of significant relationship between teachers' instructional leadership capacity and school administrators' roles using Spearman's rho correlation. The calculated correlation coefficient is -0.141 and p-value is 0.593. Owing to the fact that the p-value is larger than the significance value of 0.05, the null hypothesis is retained and thus there is no

significant relationship between school administrators' roles and teachers' instructional leadership capacity in this research. This implies that how administrators conduct their duties does not impact teachers' instructional leadership capability in a statistically quantifiable manner according to the data obtained.

Table 5. *Test of Significant Relationship Between School Administrators' Practices and Teachers' Instructional Leadership Capacity*

Test Variables	Correlation Coefficient	P value	Decision
School Administrators' Practices and Teachers' Instructional Leadership Capacity	-0.054	0.487	retain the Ho

Note: If $p \leq 0.05$, with a significant relationship

Table 5 shows the significant relationship between administrators' practice and teachers' instructional leadership capacity tested through a correlation analysis. The correlation coefficient is -0.054 with a p-value of 0.487. Because the p-value is greater than the 0.05 level, the null hypothesis is maintained, and no significant relationship is shown between administrators' practice and teachers' instructional leadership capacity. This means that differences in administrators' practice do not significantly contribute to teachers' instructional leadership capacity in this study

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATION

Summary of Findings

1. The findings showed that school administrators' roles manifest to a high extent in all measured dimensions. Specifically, idealized influence obtained a mean score of 3.817, inspirational

motivation received the highest mean of 3.929, intellectual stimulation was rated at 3.858, and individualized consideration scored 3.824. The overall average mean of 3.857 indicates that administrators consistently demonstrate high levels of transformational leadership traits in their roles.

2. Regarding the extent to which school administrators' practices reflect, the results also revealed a high level across all components. The mean score for defining the school's mission was 3.835, managing the instructional program was rated highest at 3.965, and promoting a positive climate had a mean of 3.871. With an overall average mean of 3.890, these findings suggest that administrators perform their leadership practices effectively and consistently.
3. As to the level of teachers' instructional leadership capacity, results indicate a high level of capacity in all aspects. Shared decision-making received a

mean score of 3.808, collaboration was rated highest at 3.932, empowerment obtained a score of 3.819, and leadership distribution was 3.877. The overall average mean of 3.859 shows that teachers are actively engaged in leadership functions and collaborative school improvement efforts.

4. The test for a significant relationship between school administrators' roles and teachers' instructional leadership capacity showed a Spearman rho of -0.141 and a p-value of 0.593. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis was retained. This implies that there is no significant relationship between the perceived roles of school administrators and the instructional leadership capacity of teachers.
5. Similarly, the test of the relationship between school administrators' practices and teachers' instructional leadership capacity resulted in a correlation coefficient of -0.054 and a p-value of 0.487. As the p-value also exceeds 0.05, the null hypothesis was again retained, indicating that there is no significant relationship between the administrators' practices and the instructional leadership capacity of teachers.

Conclusions

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that school administrators in the study demonstrate a high level of transformational leadership across all dimensions—idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration—indicating strong personal and professional qualities that contribute positively to school leadership. Likewise, their leadership practices in defining the school's mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive school climate are also highly evident, suggesting that these administrators are effectively performing their responsibilities to support teaching and learning. Teachers, on the other hand, also exhibit a high level of instructional leadership capacity, particularly in the areas of shared decision-making, collaboration, empowerment, and leadership distribution, showing that they are engaged and capable of contributing to school improvement efforts. However, despite the high levels of both administrators' leadership and teachers' instructional leadership capacity, the study found no significant relationship between the two. This suggests that while both administrators and teachers are individually performing well in their respective roles, administrators' leadership styles and practices may not

be the primary influencing factors on teachers' instructional leadership capacity. It implies the possibility that other variables—such as school culture, individual teacher characteristics, professional development opportunities, or organizational structures—may play a more significant role in shaping teachers' instructional leadership.

Recommendations

School Administrators. While school administrators demonstrated high levels of transformational leadership and effective instructional practices, the absence of a significant relationship with teachers' instructional leadership capacity suggests a need for deeper engagement strategies. It is recommended that administrators move beyond traditional leadership approaches and actively involve teachers in leadership development initiatives. This includes creating structured mentorship programs, establishing professional learning communities, and fostering an environment of shared leadership where teachers are not only supported but strategically empowered to lead instructional improvements. Continuous reflection and feedback mechanisms should also be institutionalized to ensure alignment between leadership efforts and actual teacher development outcomes.

Teachers. Given their high levels of instructional leadership capacity, teachers are encouraged to sustain and expand their roles as instructional leaders. They should take initiative in leading collaborative projects, engaging in data-informed decision-making, and mentoring peers. Teachers should also seek out and participate in professional development opportunities focused on leadership, not just instructional content. Furthermore, they are encouraged to maintain open lines of communication with administrators to co-create leadership strategies that reflect their needs and realities in the classroom.

Students. Although indirect beneficiaries, students can benefit from the establishment of school environments that promote distributed and empowered leadership. It is recommended that schools adopt student-centered approaches that are supported by strong instructional leadership, where students' voices are heard and their learning needs are prioritized through responsive teaching methods. Schools should regularly assess student engagement and performance as indicators of the effectiveness of teacher leadership and administrative support.

Department of Education (DepEd). The Department is encouraged to strengthen its leadership development programs by integrating modules on distributed and instructional leadership into existing principal and teacher training curricula. Policies should also support school-based innovations that promote shared leadership models. Furthermore, DepEd should consider investing in research-based leadership frameworks and school culture enhancement programs that foster authentic collaboration between administrators and teachers. Monitoring and evaluation tools should also be improved to assess not only compliance but the actual impact of leadership practices on teaching and learning.

Educational Leaders and Researchers. This study opens opportunities for further research into the nuances of leadership influence on teacher behavior. It is recommended that future researchers explore mediating and moderating variables—such as organizational culture, teacher motivation, and school governance structures—that may bridge the gap between administrators' leadership and teacher capacity. Educational leaders, on the other hand, are encouraged to pilot innovative leadership models that emphasize partnership, empowerment, and teacher-led initiatives, and to document best practices for replication across different educational contexts.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ahmad, M., & Rochimah, H. (2021). Improving teaching effectiveness through transformational leadership and integrity. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 10(4), 1316–1324. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i4.21801>
- [35] Ali, S. Q. (2019). The principal supervisor's role, practices, and challenges in developing principals' instructional leadership capacity [Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas]. Texas ScholarWorks. <https://doi.org/10.26153/tsw/5466>
- [36] Basañes, R. A. (2020). Instructional leadership capacity of elementary school administrators. *GATR Global Journal of Business and Social Science Review*, 8(2), 113–123. https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/63573582/5.Runato_A_Basanes20200609-14320-14b8gdp-libre.pdf
- [37] Bell, E., & Bryman, A. (2007). The ethics of management research: an exploratory content analysis. *British journal of management*, 18(1), 63–77.
- [38] Day-Heggie, C. (2021). Elementary school administrators as instructional leaders for improving student reading (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University). Walden University ScholarWorks. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=12331&context=dissertations>
- [39] Fullan, M. (2016). The new meaning of educational change (5th ed.). Teachers College Press.
- [40] Hargreaves, A. (2019). Teacher collaboration: 30 years of research on its nature, forms, limitations and effects. *Teachers and Teaching*, 25(5), 603–621. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2019.1639499>
- [41] Killion, J., & Harrison, C. (2020). Leadership for teacher learning: Creating a culture where all teachers improve so that all students succeed. ASCD. <https://www.ascd.org/books/leadership-for-teacher-learning>
- [42] LaDue, A. R. (2021). Building capacity for instructional leadership focused on learning: The role of the district [Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/61637c22f25bb23a540c243c2f2ab33b/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- [43] Laude, T. M., Ralar, T. J. T., & Arcenal, J. T. (2018). Master teachers as instructional leaders: An exploration of school leadership capacity in the Division of Biliran. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research*, 40(1), 50–74. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/249336371.pdf>
- [44] Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2019). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
- [45] Lin, Q. (2022). The relationship between distributed leadership and teacher innovativeness: Mediating roles of teacher autonomy and professional collaboration. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 948152. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.948152>
- [46] Sholeh, M. (2021). Transformational leadership: Principal intellectual stimulation in improving teacher competences. *Al-Ta'lim Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i4.21801>
- [47] Tennett, J. T., Jr. (2019). Teachers as leaders: Empowering teachers to lead instructional change (Doctoral dissertation, Northeastern University). Northeastern University Repository. <https://repository.library.northeastern.edu/files/neu:m044ww75h/fulltext.pdf>