

Instructional Leadership Support and Professional Growth Among TVL Teachers

Edmar E. Raagas

Student, Medina College – Ozamiz City

Abstract— This study examined the relationship between instructional leadership support and the professional growth of Technical-Vocational-Livelihood (TVL) teachers in a selected Schools Division. Specifically, it determined the level of instructional leadership support in terms of defining the school mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive learning climate. It also assessed the level of professional growth of TVL teachers in terms of participation in training and development, acquisition and upgrading of competencies, and teaching self-efficacy and confidence. Furthermore, the study investigated whether a significant relationship exists between instructional leadership support and the professional growth of TVL teachers. A descriptive-correlational quantitative research design was employed, involving TVL teachers who were selected through purposive sampling. Data were collected using an adapted-modified survey questionnaire and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical tools. The findings revealed that instructional leadership support was consistently perceived at a very high level across its identified dimensions. Likewise, the professional growth of TVL teachers was found to be at a very high level in all measured aspects. Moreover, the study established a significant positive relationship between instructional leadership support and the professional growth of TVL teachers, indicating that effective instructional leadership contributes substantially to teachers' continuous professional development, enhanced competencies, and increased confidence in instructional practice. These findings underscore the vital role of school leaders in fostering supportive learning environments that promote teacher growth and instructional excellence. The study recommends strengthening instructional leadership practices and sustaining professional development initiatives to further enhance the quality of teaching and learning in Technical-Vocational-Livelihood education.

Keywords— instructional leadership support, professional growth, TVL teachers, instructional leadership, teaching self-efficacy, professional development.

I. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Technical-Vocational-Livelihood (TVL) teachers occupy a distinct place in the Philippine senior high school curriculum because their work spans two demanding tasks at once: mastering industry-based, hands-on competencies and delivering these competencies through sound classroom pedagogy. TVL teachers are not only expected to be abreast of the changes in the tools, equipment, and latest industry developments, but are also expected to prepare students for the assessments taken by the Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA) for the National Certificate. This double responsibility compels TVL teachers to constantly update their own skills and knowledge to stay relevant and effective in their profession. The way the school head determines and implements instructional

objectives, oversees the instructional program, and fosters a positive learning environment can either benefit or hinder the professional development of the TVL teacher in terms of how quickly he or she can advance. It is within this context that the present study is situated: it looks at how the instructional leadership support that TVL teachers experience relates to the professional growth they are able to attain.

Instructional leadership support is the constellation of practices that the school leader utilizes to direct teaching and learning, and the research continues to show its central role in teacher development. When looking at the essential elements of instructional leadership, Kilag and Sasan (2023) discovered that professional development was a recurring theme, and school leaders who demonstrate discipline, offer targeted support, and maintain contextual learning

programs make significant contributions to teacher performance. In a related large-scale study, He, Guo, and Abazie (2024) found that principals' instructional leadership was a significant, statistical predictor of teacher PD, further supporting the notion that instructional leadership and teacher growth are empirically connected (and not just assumed). Teachers of Technology and Livelihood Education (TLE) and TVL in the Philippines are continually challenged to update their competencies in their teacher training to stay current with the changing content of the subject, as well as the lack of access to relevant teacher training, according to Basal (2022). Abdul and Silor (2024) also found that teachers of TVL and TLE at Northern Samar were experiencing human resource problems especially on the part of teachers, pedagogical problems, and lack of instructional materials, which hinder their progress even if they are interested to learn.

Comparatively, fewer studies have investigated the professional development of TVL teachers as a group of teachers whose professional development is influenced by specific demands like industry certification requirements, specialized equipment, and training aligned to TESDA. Instructional leadership and general teacher professional development have been studied extensively in other countries, and increasingly in the Philippines; but comparatively fewer studies have investigated the professional development of TVL teachers as a unique set of teachers for whom a unique set of demands exists, like industry certification requirements, specific equipment, and training aligned to TESDA. Previous research in the Philippines focuses on documenting the gaps and challenges of TVL teachers (Basal, 2022; Abdul & Silor, 2024), which is not an objective measure of how much struggle can be attributed to the extent of instructional leadership support received from their school heads. This leaves a gap: there is a need for a study that statistically relates the construct of instructional leadership support to the professional growth of the TVL teachers individually and not the teachers in general.

This study, therefore, aims to determine the level of instructional leadership support extended to TVL

teachers, the level of their professional growth, and whether a significant relationship exists between these two variables. The overall aim is to create evidence for the use of school heads, division supervisors and TVL teachers themselves to enhance the current support systems and to shape a more responsive professional development approach for TVL teachers.

Theoretical/Conceptual Framework

The relationship between instructional leadership support and TVL teacher professional development is grounded in three interrelated theories, which are presented herein.

The first theory is the Instructional Leadership Model (IM) of Hallinger and Murphy (1985), extended by Hallinger (2025), which posits three broad dimensions of instructional leadership: Instructional Leadership in defining the school mission, Instructional Leadership in managing the school's instructional program, and Instructional Leadership in promoting a positive school learning climate. As Bush (2025) asserts, the dimensions encompass the structural and relational dimensions of school leadership support, making this the most popular model of understanding the impact of school leadership on teaching and learning, more than 30 years after its inception. Principals' involvement in the facilitation and support of professional learning opportunities, as identified in a recent meta-analytic review by Hallinger (2025), is also linked to teachers' sense of being more competent to handle classroom challenges. This model provides a structure of the independent variable in this study.

The second theory on which this study is anchored is Bandura's (1997) Self-Efficacy Theory. His social cognitive theory states that a person's self-efficacy, or belief that he/she can organize and execute a course of action, strongly influences whether he/she will attempt and maintain that course of action. Self-efficacy, when applied to teachers, relates to whether the TVL teacher will actively pursue training, attempt new teaching methods, or persevere with training when faced with challenge of new industry-specific skills. Recently, Lawrent (2024) has found that social persuasion from leaders and mastery experiences from supported activities are two of the most influential sources of

teacher efficacy, indicating that supportive instructional leadership can directly impact teachers' confidence in their own professional development. This is a theory that illustrates the psychological process bridging leadership support and professional development.

The third theory is Knowles' Andragogy (Adult Learning Theory), which denotes that adult learners are self-directed, tend to rely on their own experience, and are most motivated to learn when the topic of instruction is relevant to their everyday responsibilities.

When instructional leaders design or approve practical, autonomy-respecting, and specialized professional development activities that are aligned with teachers' particular specializations, rather than generic, one-size-fits-all activities, TVL teachers with prior industry or teaching experience are more likely to actively participate in meaningful professional development activities.

The theory is the one that provides a rationale for the importance of quality and relevance of leadership support and not just the quantity of it, for professional growth.

Taken together, these three theories suggest a coherent pathway: instructional leadership support (Hallinger & Murphy) creates the structural and relational conditions for teacher growth; self-efficacy (Bandura) is the psychological mechanism through which that support is internalized; and andragogical relevance (Knowles) determines how effectively adult TVL teachers respond to the support they are given.

Guided by the theories above, this study conceptualizes instructional leadership support as the independent variable, operationalized through the three Hallinger and Murphy dimensions, and professional growth of TVL teachers as the dependent variable, operationalized through participation in training and development, acquisition or upgrading of competencies, and teaching self-efficacy and confidence.

Statement of the Problem

This study aims to determine the relationship between instructional leadership support and the professional growth of TVL teachers. Specifically, it seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of instructional leadership support extended to TVL teachers in terms of:
 - a. defining the school mission;
 - b. managing the instructional program; and
 - c. promoting a positive learning climate?
2. What is the level of professional growth of TVL teachers in terms of:
 - a. participation in training and development;
 - b. acquisition/upgrading of competencies; and
 - c. teaching self-efficacy and confidence?

Is there a significant relationship between instructional leadership support and the professional growth of TVL teachers?

Hypothesis

H₀: No significant relationship exists between instructional leadership support and the professional growth of TVL teachers.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study employed a descriptive-correlational quantitative research design to determine the level of instructional leadership support, the professional growth of TVL teachers, and the relationship between these variables. It involved 87 TVL teachers from ten public senior high schools in the Schools Division of Ozamiz City, selected through purposive sampling. Data were gathered using an adapted-modified and validated survey questionnaire measuring instructional leadership support and professional growth. The data were analyzed using weighted mean and standard deviation, Pearson product-moment correlation, and simple linear regression, with the hypothesis tested at the 0.05 level of significance. Ethical standards, including informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, and proper authorization, were observed throughout the study.

III. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Table 1. Level of Instructional Leadership Support

Variables	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Defining the School Mission	3.54	0.57	Very High
Managing the Instructional Program	3.56	0.56	Very High
Promoting a Positive Learning Climate	3.56	0.56	Very High
Grand Mean	3.55	0.56	Very High

Table 1 presents the overall level of instructional leadership support extended by school heads to TVL teachers across the three leadership domains of defining the school mission with grand mean 3.55 SD = 0.56, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive learning climate. All three domains, as well as the grand mean, were rated Very High, with Managing the Instructional Program and Promoting a Positive Learning Climate tying for the highest mean ($M = 3.56$) while Defining the School Mission registered the lowest, though still Very High, mean ($M = 3.54$). This suggests that the school leaders are seen as best at monitoring teaching and maintaining a positive school environment, and that mission-building is the area where there is still a strong practice, but one that perhaps could be further developed.

One of the interesting aspects of the results is the small difference between the mean scores of the three domains (only 0.02 difference between highest and lowest scores). This uniformity indicates that instructional leadership support in the schools studied is carried out fairly holistically, with support not

focused on one type of instructional leadership. The suggestion is that school leaders don't just respond to individual issues of teaching but maintain a comprehensive leadership strategy that addresses vision, supervision and climate in a way that underpins a unified school culture that supports teaching and learning.

Several recent studies confirm this. The study aligns with Shava et al. (2021) who noted that school leaders' direction of institutions is not solely determined by mission-setting but rather through a blend of reflection, routine checks in the classroom and intentional action to maintain social cohesion within school staff. In a similar vein, David et al. (2021) found that teachers feel more empowered and accountable when the school leaders actively support teacher development in addition to providing instructional supervision, further emphasizing the need for a comprehensive leadership strategy. However, despite this high level of leadership support, UNESCO (2021) reported that some classrooms lack leadership support and professional development, meaning this level of support needs to be maintained.

Table 1.1 Level of Instructional Support in terms of Defining the School Mission

Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. School head clearly communicates the school's vision and mission.	3.63	0.53	Very High
2. School mission provides clear direction for teaching responsibilities.	3.56	0.57	Very High
3. Teachers are involved in developing/reviewing the mission.	3.22	0.66	High
4. School head aligns instructional activities with the mission.	3.59	0.55	Very High
5. School mission inspires improvement of student learning.	3.61	0.54	Very High
Aggregated Mean	3.54	0.57	Very High

Table 1.1 shows the instructional support in terms of defining the school mission on five indicators. The results are aggregated with a mean of 3.54, which is interpreted as Very High, with the school head's clear

communication of the school's vision and mission getting the highest mean ($M = 3.63$), and the involvement of the teachers in developing and

reviewing the mission getting the lowest mean ($M = 3.22$), which is interpreted as High.

This means that although school leaders are good at articulating and communicating the mission, there is a less developed process of creating the mission in collaboration with teachers.

The striking gap of 0.41 between the top-rated and lowest-rated indicators is noteworthy because it points to a largely one-directional flow of mission-setting — from the school head to the teachers — rather than a genuinely participatory process.

This means that teachers have a grasp on the mission and are directed by the mission, but they have yet to feel a sense of ownership of the mission, which may reduce over time their commitment to mission-driven initiatives.

Table 1.2 *Level of Instructional Support in terms of Managing the Instructional Program*

Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Regular monitoring of classroom instruction.	3.58	0.58	Very High
2. Constructive feedback improves teaching.	3.62	0.51	Very High
3. Instructional resources are available.	3.43	0.63	High
4. Instructional supervision improves performance.	3.55	0.56	Very High
5. Collaboration among teachers is encouraged.	3.60	0.54	Very High
Aggregated Mean	3.56	0.56	Very High

Table 1.2 shows the level of instructional support in terms of managing the instructional program. The aggregated mean of 3.56 is at the Very High level, with constructive feedback that enhances teaching the highest mean ($M = 3.62$), and the availability of instructional resources the lowest mean ($M = 3.43$), interpreted as High. This means that, school leaders are particularly effective in giving developmental feedback to teachers, while the provision of adequate instructional materials and resources are comparatively an area that needs closer attention.

Remarkably, the lowest-rated indicator is about resource availability and not a leadership practice, which implies that the limitation may not be due to the school head's leadership practice but due to systemic or logistic resource limitations. This implies that even highly engaged instructional leadership can be constrained by material shortages, and that addressing

This is consistent with previous studies. In order to make a school's vision and mission a reality, deliberate and participatory approaches are essential, because when a vision and mission are owned by the stakeholders the implementation of the mission becomes more robust, as Sulastri et al. (2021) stated. Similarly, Aquino et al. (2021) highlighted that leadership for sustainable school improvement must ensure that the vision-building becomes an organizational capacity that is held by the entire school community, not the sole responsibility of administrators. Moreover, Shava et al. (2021) found that those school leaders who involve teachers in reflective and vision-supporting sessions like meetings and retreats, further foster collective ownership of the direction of the school, meaning additional engagement of teachers may enhance this indicator.

this gap may require support beyond the school head's direct control, such as division- or district-level resource allocation.

This is confirmed by more recent studies. Despite the fact that instructional supervision is undertaken to improve teaching and learning, it is not always conclusively proven especially when there is insufficient support for instructions in the supervision process. (Maisyaroh et al., 2021). The high ratings in this table for teachers' feedback practices also noted that inconsistencies in supervisory feedback practices can impact teachers' sense of support and their instructional efficacy (Caratiquit & Pablo, 2021). Meanwhile, Llego (2021) pointed out that the effectiveness and fairness of supervision, including the identification of the needs of resources, must be maintained by school heads who have prepared themselves well before observing the classroom.

Table 1.3 Level of Instructional Support in terms of Promoting a Positive Learning Climate

Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Respectful and supportive work environment.	3.68	0.49	Very High
2. Teachers are recognized for accomplishments.	3.24	0.62	High
3. Innovation and creativity are encouraged.	3.19	0.60	High
4. Open communication is encouraged.	3.60	0.52	Very High
5. Safe and conducive learning environment.	3.71	0.46	Very High
Aggregated Mean	3.59	0.54	Very High

Table 1.3 presents the level of instructional support in terms of promoting a positive learning climate. The five indicators yielded an aggregated mean of 3.59, interpreted as Very High, with the presence of a safe and conducive learning environment obtaining the highest mean ($M = 3.71$), while encouragement of innovation and creativity registered the lowest mean ($M = 3.19$), interpreted as High. It means that school leaders have a very effective track record in creating physical and emotional climates of safety in the school, yet they are less effective in cultivating an environment that promotes innovative and creative teaching strategies.

What is especially notable, however, is that the affective and relational dimensions of climate (innovation and creativity, $M = 3.19$; recognition of accomplishments, $M = 3.24$) are significantly lower than safety and communication dimensions. An interesting pattern is that affective and relational dimensions of climate are strongly supported while growth and recognition dimensions are not. This means that school leaders might be keen to ensure a

peaceful and balanced school rather than one that fosters and encourages teachers' diversity and creativity in teaching, and this may, in the longer term, reduce the chances for school pedagogical innovation.

This is a finding congruent with current research on school climate. Collaborative relationships and emotional support within the school directly decreases antisocial behaviors and enhances socio-emotional skills (Jiménez et al., 2021), further highlighting the impact of the safety and communication strengths in this table. The Aspen Institute (2021) also noted that a positive and healthy school climate will allow for learning to happen mostly through trusting relationships, high expectations and a feeling of belonging for staff and students. Nevertheless, Nordgren et al. (2021) highlighted that the greatest impact on improving teaching conditions and innovation is collegial collaboration in planning and instructional activities and that enhancing structured, collaborative opportunities for teacher creativity could be an effective way for increasing the relatively low innovation-related indicator.

Table 2. Level of Professional Growth of Teachers

Variables	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Participation in Training and Development	3.44	0.56	Very High
Acquisition/Upgrading of Competencies	3.55	0.54	Very High
Teaching Self-Efficacy and Confidence	3.64	0.50	Very High
Grand Mean	3.54	0.53	Very High

Table 2 shows the overall professional growth level of TVL teachers in three domains. All three domains and the grand mean were rated Very High, with Teaching Self-Efficacy and Confidence obtaining the highest mean ($M = 3.64$), while Participation in Training and Development registered the lowest, though still Very High, mean ($M = 3.44$). This suggests that TVL

teachers have high levels of confidence and competence in classroom teaching but lack in formal training and development activities compared to others.

It is noteworthy that the highest ratings are given to self-efficacy and confidence, which are expected to be

developed through a process of sustained training and experience, and that participation in the kinds of training activities expected to develop these competencies receives the lowest rating. This indicates that teachers' confidence may be significantly rooted in their own learning experiences in classrooms and not on formal professional learning programs, and thus presents an untapped chance to further advance teacher growth by increasing access to and participation in structured professional learning.

This trend is reflected in recent literature. The correlation between growth activities and instructional confidence was confirmed by Padillo et al. (2021), who found that professional development activities

had a strong influence on the teachers' instructional planning, delivery, subject-matter competence, and classroom management skills.

Brown et al. (2021) noted that some teachers were in and out of structured training, and that the pandemic caused institutions to move toward more flexible and accessible approaches to teaching and training, which may have contributed to the variations in teacher participation in structured training. Moreover, continuous and sustained professional development is still crucial for teaching and learning quality, emphasizing on further increasing teachers' participation despite their high levels of self-efficacy, as stated by Ancho and Arrieta (2021).

Table 2.1. Level of Professional Growth of Teachers in terms of Participation in Training and Development

Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Regular participation in seminars and workshops.	3.20	0.59	High
2. School provides sufficient professional development opportunities.	3.21	0.61	High
3. Participation in school-based L&D activities.	3.55	0.55	Very High
4. Programs are relevant to teaching needs.	3.58	0.54	Very High
5. Knowledge gained is applied in instruction.	3.66	0.49	Very High
Aggregated Mean	3.44	0.56	Very High

Table 2.1 shows the degree of professional development of teachers based on their involvement in training and development. The aggregated mean of 3.44 is interpreted as Very High, with knowledge gained being applied in instruction obtaining the highest mean ($M = 3.66$), while regular participation in seminars and workshops registered the lowest mean ($M = 3.20$), interpreted as High.

This suggests that teachers are very effective in implementing the training they receive, despite comparatively low attendance at seminars and workshops.

One of the most salient conclusions of this result is that the benefit that teachers gain from training, in terms of learning application, is greater than how much teachers are able to access to training. This indicates that the constraint is not necessarily the teachers' willingness or ability to gain from training, but also due to structural issues, including limited slots, scheduling conflicts or resource constraints, which can

limit the number of seminars and workshops that TVL teachers can attend.

This is confirmed by related studies. Professional development programs in which teachers engage with new teaching methods are more likely to be applied meaningfully in the classroom, which is reflected in the high application-of-knowledge rating found here, as reported by Sims et al. (2021).

Jocius et al. (2021) found that delivery of training in face-to-face or virtual formats can achieve same learning outcomes without affecting the quality of the training, highlighting the possibility of alternative delivery methods as a solution to the problem of limited attendance in seminars and workshops.

Xue et al. (2021) also noted that flexible, technologically supported professional learning opportunities increase teachers' opportunities to participate in professional learning activities beyond the traditional face-to-face format.

Table 2.2. Level of Professional Growth of Teachers in terms of Acquisition/Upgrading of Competencies

Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Continuously improves technical competencies.	3.60	0.51	Very High
2. Updates teaching strategies.	3.57	0.53	Very High
3. Enhances skills through certifications/training.	3.23	0.60	High
4. Integrates new technologies.	3.19	0.58	High
5. Seeks opportunities for professional improvement.	3.64	0.50	Very High
Aggregated Mean	3.55	0.54	Very High

Table 2.2 presents the level of professional growth of teachers in terms of acquisition and upgrading of competencies. The aggregated mean of 3.55 is interpreted as Very High, with teachers' seeking of opportunities for professional improvement obtaining the highest mean ($M = 3.64$), while integration of new technologies registered the lowest mean ($M = 3.19$), interpreted as High. This means that there is high motivation for TVL teachers to seek professional development, while their ability to incorporate new technology into their teaching is relatively limited.

Technology integration is the only low rating indicator in this domain, yet teachers are keenly interested in their own professional growth, suggesting that there might be a particular skill deficit. This means that a capacity building intervention based on the specific need and using technology instead of a general professional development program might be required to address this specific gap and support teachers to be able to realize their desire for development in this area in the form of technology-enhanced teaching.

This result is consistent with the more recent research on teacher technology competence. Wang and Zhao (2021) reported that high levels of teachers' technological pedagogical content knowledge is possible when they are confident in their use of technology, suggesting that improving technology self-efficacy would significantly increase technology teachers' technological pedagogical content knowledge.

Similar findings were reported by Ogodo, Simon, Morris, and Akubo (2021) that many K–12 teachers faced significant limitations in digital competency and technology self-efficacy, especially when there was limited structured training in technology.

Researchers Rubach and Lazarides (2021) used the expectancy-value theory of motivation (EWTM) to explain that bolstering teachers' competence-based beliefs and self-efficacy is essential to support their confidence in using technology in their teaching practice.

Table 2.3 Level of Professional Growth of Teachers in terms of Teaching Self-Efficacy and Confidence

Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Confident in delivering TVL lessons.	3.69	0.47	Very High
2. Can manage classroom challenges.	3.60	0.53	Very High
3. Capable of motivating students.	3.58	0.54	Very High
4. Can adapt teaching strategies.	3.64	0.49	Very High
5. Positively influences student learning.	3.70	0.46	Very High
Aggregated Mean	3.64	0.50	Very High

Table 2.3 presents the level of professional growth of teachers in terms of teaching self-efficacy and confidence. The aggregated mean of 3.64 is interpreted as Very High, with teachers' belief that they positively influence student learning obtaining

the highest mean ($M = 3.70$), while their capability to motivate students registered the lowest, though still Very High, mean ($M = 3.58$). This suggests a high overall perception of teachers' instructional competence, with a corresponding increase in

confidence in influencing learning outcomes compared to actively motivating students.

One of the most remarkable findings here is that all five indicators are in the Very High range and that there is only a difference of 0.12 between the indicators. This means that the self-efficacy of the teachers in this study is not variable and high for the competencies but rather a very high and stable personality characteristic implying a broadly confident and resilient TVL teaching force that can adapt to a range of classroom needs.

This is consistent with recent research on teacher self-efficacy. The level of teachers' self-efficacy in their ability to directly impact student learning and behavior directly affects their instructional strategies and student motivation and success (Chapagain, 2021).

Table 3. Test of Significant Relationship between Instructional Leadership Support and Professional Growth of Teachers

Variables	r-value	p-value	df	Interpretation	Decision
Instructional Leadership Support and Professional Growth of TVL Teachers	0.71	< .001	85	Significant	Reject H_0

Table 3 presents the test of the significant relationship between instructional leadership support and the professional growth of TVL teachers. The findings revealed a strong positive and statistically significant relationship between the two variables ($r = 0.71$, $p < .001$), leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. From the results, it is observed that higher level of instructional leadership support is correlated with higher level of professional growth of TVL teachers. The implication is that school leaders who actively provide instructional guidance, mentoring, and professional support contribute substantially to enhancing teachers' competencies, instructional practices, and continuous professional development.

One of the interesting points in the table is that the correlation between instructional leadership support and teachers' professional growth is very high ($r = 0.71$). This indicates that instructional leadership plays an important role in promoting teachers' lifelong learning and professional growth. When school

The finding on the relationship between high self-efficacy and effective classroom management as observed in this table is consistent with the findings of Alasmari and Althaqafi (2021), which indicates that the use of proactive and reactive classroom management is related to teachers' self-efficacy beliefs.

Meanwhile, Wettstein, Ramseier, and Scherzinger (2021) reported that teachers' self-efficacy and emotional stability are strongly related to the quality of the teacher-student relationship and to lower levels of classroom disruption, reinforcing the value of sustaining the high self-efficacy levels reflected among TVL teachers in this study.

leaders focus on coaching, engaging in positive feedback, providing opportunities to learn together, and developing capacity, teachers are encouraged to become more effective and meet the changing needs of education. Thus, enhancing instructional leadership practices can be expected to result in better teacher performance, increased instructional quality and greater learning outcomes for pupils.

Recent studies have emphasized the critical importance of instructional leadership in improving teachers' professional development which supports the present finding. Hallinger and Walker (2021) noted that instructional leadership is vital to teacher learning by providing instructional and school environments that encourage collaboration, reflection, and continuous improvement practices. Similarly, Liu and Hallinger (2021) identified effective instructional leadership as a source of strengthening the professional development of teachers through structured supervision, mentoring, coaching and

professional development that is linked to shared instructional goals. In addition, Printy and Liu (2021) reported that instructional leadership encourages professional collaboration, reflective teaching, and continuous learning opportunities, leading to improved instructional competence, teaching quality, and overall school effectiveness. The findings of these studies are all consistent with the present finding that effective instructional leadership plays a crucial role in the enhancement of teachers' professional capacity and in maintaining a culture of continuous improvement in schools.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Conclusions

Given the Very High levels obtained by both instructional leadership support and professional growth, together with the strong positive and statistically significant correlation between them, instructional leadership emerges as a substantial contributor to how far TVL teachers advance professionally. The consistency of the Very High ratings across all six sub-domains suggests that the school heads' practices in defining direction, supervising instruction, and sustaining a supportive climate operate as an integrated system rather than isolated interventions, and that this system meaningfully reinforces teachers' training engagement, competency development, and self-efficacy. At the same time, the recurring pattern of comparatively lower indicators, such as teacher involvement in mission-building, availability of instructional resources, encouragement of innovation, and participation in seminars and workshops, points to specific structural and collaborative gaps that persist even within an overall strongly supportive environment. Ultimately, the study affirms that sustaining and refining instructional leadership practices, particularly in the areas identified as comparatively weaker, offers a concrete pathway for strengthening the professional growth of TVL teachers and, by extension, the quality of technical-vocational education they deliver.

Recommendation

Based on the findings and conclusion, it is recommended that school heads sustain effective

instructional leadership while strengthening teacher involvement in school mission development, ensuring adequate instructional resources, and promoting innovation among TVL teachers. TVL teachers should actively communicate their professional development needs, particularly in technology integration and skills-related training, and participate in collaborative school activities. Students should remain actively engaged in TVL learning and skills development to maximize the benefits of quality instruction. The Schools Division Office/Department of Education should strengthen TVL-focused professional development, expand access to relevant trainings and seminars, and improve the provision of instructional resources. Future researchers may conduct similar studies in other divisions or educational tracks, explore additional factors influencing teachers' professional growth, and employ qualitative or mixed-method approaches for deeper investigation.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abdul, A. M., & Silor, A. C. (2024). Exploring the teachers' challenges in the delivery of the TLE curriculum in Northern Samar, Philippines. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*.
- [2] Alasmari, N. J., & Althaqafi, A. S. A. (2021). Teachers' practices of proactive and reactive classroom management strategies and the relationship to their self-efficacy. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211046351>
- [3] Ancho, I. V., & Arrieta, G. S. (2021). Filipino teacher professional development in the new normal. *Education and Self Development*, 16(3), 25–43. <https://doi.org/10.26907/esd.16.3.04>
- [4] Aquino, C. J. C., Afalla, B. T., & Fabelico, F. L. (2021). Managing educational institutions: School heads' leadership practices and teachers' performance. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 10(4), 1325–1333. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i4.21518>
- [5] Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W. H. Freeman.

- [6] Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. In F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (Vol. 5, pp. 307–337). Information Age Publishing.
- [7] Basal, D. V. (2022). Instructional competencies of Technology and Livelihood Education (TLE) teachers: Basis for a competency-based module. [Journal article].
- [8] Brown, C., Correll, P., & Stormer, K. J. (2021). The “new” normal: Re-imagining professional development amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. *Middle School Journal*, 52(5), 5–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00940771.2021.1978787>
- [9] Caratiquit, K., & Pablo, R. (2021). Exploring the practices of secondary school teachers in preparing for classroom observation amidst the new normal of education. *Journal of Social, Humanity, and Education*, 1(4), 281–296. <https://doi.org/10.35912/jshe.v1i4.721>
- [10] Gómez-Hurtado, I., Valdés, R., González-Falcón, I., & Jiménez Vargas, F. (2021). Inclusive leadership: Good managerial practices to address cultural diversity in schools. *Social Inclusion*, 9(4). <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v9i4.4611>
- [11] Hallinger, P. (2025). Principal instructional leadership and teacher attitudes: A meta-analytic review, 1989–2024. *European Journal of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70199>
- [12] Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–247.
- [13] He, P., Guo, F., & Abazie, G. A. (2024). School principals' instructional leadership as a predictor of teacher's professional development. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 9, 63. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00290-0>
- [14] Kilag, O. K. T., & Sasan, J. M. (2023). Unpacking the role of instructional leadership in teacher professional development. *Advanced Qualitative Research*, 1(1), 63–73.
- [15] Lawrent, G. (2024). Sources of teacher efficacy related attributes alongside Bandura's perspectives. [Journal article].
- [16] Liu, S., & Hallinger, P. (2021). Unpacking the effects of culture on school leadership and teacher learning in China. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(2), 214–233. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219896042>
- [17] Llego, M. A. (2021, October 31). DepEd basic information on plantilla positions FY 2021. TeacherPH.
- [18] Maisyaroh, Wiyono, B. B., Hardika, Valdez, A. V., Mangorsi, S. B., & Canapi, S. P. T. (2021). The implementation of instructional supervision in Indonesia and the Philippines, and its effect on the variation of teacher learning models and materials. *Cogent Education*, 8(1), 1962232. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.1962232>
- [19] Nordgren, K., Kristiansson, M., Liljekvist, Y., & Bergh, D. (2021). Collegial collaboration when planning and preparing lessons: A large-scale study exploring the conditions and infrastructure for teachers' professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 108, 103513. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103513>
- [20] Ogoto, J. A., Simon, M., Morris, D., & Akubo, M. (2021). Examining K-12 teachers' digital competency and technology self-efficacy during COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 21(11), 13–27. <https://doi.org/10.33423/jhetp.v21i11.4660>
- [21] Padillo, G. G., Manguilimotan, R. P., Capuno, R. G., & Espina, R. C. (2021). Professional development activities and teacher performance. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 9(3), 497–506. <https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.61.2021.93.497.506>
- [22] Printy, S., & Liu, Y. (2021). Distributed leadership globally: The interactive nature of principal and teacher leadership in 32 countries. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 57(2), 290–325. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X20926548>
- [23] Shava, G. N., Heystek, J., & Chasara, T. (2021). Instructional leadership: Its role in sustaining school improvement in South African schools. *International Journal of Social Learning*, 1(2), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.47134/ijsl.v1i2.51>

- [24] Sims, S., & Fletcher-Wood, H. (2021). Identifying the characteristics of effective teacher professional development: A critical review. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 32(1), 47–63.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2020.1772841>
- [25] Sims, S., Fletcher-Wood, H., O'Mara-Eves, A., Cottingham, S., Stansfield, C., Van Herwegen, J., & Anders, J. (2021). What are the characteristics of effective teacher professional development? A systematic review and meta-analysis. Education Endowment Foundation.
- [26] Sulastri, S., Syahril, S., & Adi, N. (2021). Optimizing the vision and mission of schools in learning leadership based on action learning schools. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Progress in Social Science, Humanities and Education Research Symposium (PSSHRS 2020)* (pp. 363–368). Atlantis Press.
<https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210618.068>
- [27] The Aspen Institute. (2021). Impact report 2021.
- [28] UNESCO. (2021). No teacher, no class: State of the education report for India 2021. UNESCO New Delhi.
- [29] Walker, A., & Hallinger, P. (2021, June). Leading schools in Eastern Asia: What we need to know. Paper presented at the School Leadership Roundtable 2021, Chongqing, China.
- [30] Wang, Q., & Zhao, G. (2021). ICT self-efficacy mediates most effects of university ICT support on preservice teachers' TPACK: Evidence from three normal universities in China. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 52(6), 2319–2339.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13141>
- [31] Wettstein, A., Ramseier, E., & Scherzinger, M. (2021). Class- and subject teachers' self-efficacy and emotional stability and students' perceptions of the teacher–student relationship, classroom management, and classroom disruptions. *BMC Psychology*, 9, 103.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-021-00606-6>
- [32] Xue, S., Hu, X., Chi, X., & Zhang, J. (2021). Building an online community of practice through WeChat for teacher professional learning. *Professional Development in Education*, 47(4), 613–637.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2019.1647273>