



School Heads' Instructional Leadership Styles and Administrative Challenges as Perceived by School Heads and Teachers in The Philippines

Article History:

Received: 12 February 2025

Accepted: 15 February 2025

Published: 22 March 2025

Oliver E. Ortiz Jr.¹

Hermie M. Blancia²

Mirasol Pamittan-Gabaran³

Vincent Lee Corpin-Garcia⁴

John Michael M. Dela Cruz⁵

¹Teacher III, Ciudad Nuevo De Naic National High School, Sabang, Naic, Cavite, Philippines

²Master Teacher I, Northern Antique Vocational School, Centro Poblacion, Culasi, Antique, Philippines

³Teacher III, SHS Officer-in-Charge, Pitogo High School, Negros Street, Barangay Pitogo, Taguig City, Philippines

⁴Teacher II, Cabucgayan National High School, Esperanza, Cabucgayan, Biliran, Philippines

⁵Professor, Graduate School, Holy Trinity University, Puerto Princesa City, Palawan, Philippines

Abstract

Instructional Leadership is one of the most critical fibers to weave with all other aspects of leadership and governance among public schools in the Philippines. This study described and examined the instructional leadership styles of school heads and the administrative challenges they encountered relative to the delivery of instruction among the selected secondary schools in the Philippines. It utilized descriptive-correlational design where 100 randomly selected school heads and 100 randomly selected teachers from selected public schools participated as respondents of the study. Survey-questionnaire was utilized as instrument to gather data. Results showed that among the different instructional leadership styles, distributed instructional leadership was highly utilized by school heads to engage their teachers in delivering effective and efficient instruction. Thus, an increased in distributed instructional leadership influences the greater challenges encountered in resource management. School heads heavily experienced administrative challenges when they pervasively utilized distributed instructional leadership styles.

Keywords: instructional leadership styles, administrative challenges, school heads, teachers, transformational, transactional



Copyright © 2025. The Author/s. Published by VMC Analytiks Multidisciplinary Journal News Publishing Services. School Heads' Instructional Leadership Styles and Administrative Challenges as Perceived by School Heads and Teachers in The Philippines © 2025 by Oliver E. Ortiz Jr., Hermie M. Blancia², Mirasol Pamittan-Gabaran, Vincent Lee Corpin-Garcia and John Michael M. Dela Cruz is licensed under [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

INTRODUCTION

Education in its traditional notion is the great weaponry for success of the nation where individuals are taught with the fundamental skills, drawing until they reach maximum development. In the Philippines, education is treated as an outright necessity of Filipinos where they viewed education as their primary advantage to succeed in life. In this regard, educational system, policies and orders are ought to be implemented with fullest responsibilities and accountabilities that aims to provide quality education. Quality education in this sense, encompasses the effective and efficient leadership and governance of the school heads who are the managers and

supervisors of their respective schools. They are the steward and compass for the greater success of his/her subordinates and also their main clientele – the learners.

School heads are expected to perform with greater responsibilities and accountabilities as they implement all orders, policies and education laws which are primary governed by the Department of Education (DepEd). They are also tasked to create impactful instruction and meaningful school programs and activities that enable their learners to obtain growth and development.

While it is true that school heads hold greater responsibilities and accountabilities in the

implementation, management and supervision of all educational policies of the country, they commonly employ different styles in leadership. As such, in line with their capacities, primarily, they are mandated to ensure the effective and efficient delivery of instruction in which they are to impose diverse leadership styles in order to create and establish meaningful instruction among their learners. School heads, as they embody differences in styles, commonly encountered difficulty in managing and supervising the instructional policies imposed by DepEd such as the selection of relevant and impactful teaching strategies and methods across subjects, formulation and use of creative and innovative instructional materials, imposition of democratic classroom environment and teachers' continuing professional development and skills.

Part and parcel of leadership which embodies responsibilities and accountabilities of school leaders are the challenges they encounter on their respective institutions. Transformational leadership has direct effects on school management and supervision (Yulianti et al., 2020). The role of creativity in principal's leadership to their schools include mediated school practices and school climate (Keetanjaly, 2019). School leaders within the capacities of school principals establish core developments arising from instructional leadership which put premium emphasis on quality and significance of teaching and learning process as the central image of education (Hallinger, 2015).

School heads and teachers share similar degree of difficulty as school heads manage and supervise teachers on effective and efficient delivery of instruction while teachers' shoulder and ensure that instruction across subjects are delivered with quality and meaning to their learners.

Current studies only examined the effects of school leadership to the quality of instruction delivered by the teachers. There exists a strong knowledge gap in understanding instructional leadership styles of school heads as perceived by themselves and by their teachers. In addition,

current studies present the roles and functions of school leaders in leading and managing their teachers as they deliver instructions across subjects but failed to comprehensively examine other administrative challenges faced by school heads and their teachers in the delivery of instruction in the basic education program. Practitioners agree that instructional leadership can be one of the most useful tools for creating an effective teaching and learning environment.

This paper contributes to the development of understanding relative to instructional leadership styles of school heads which are substantial to deliver quality-based education among public schools in the Philippines. By understanding school heads' instructional leadership styles and identifying current administrative challenges encountered by school heads and teachers, they can be able to strategically plan for more effective and efficient programs and activities in the delivery of quality-based instruction.

Theoretical Framework




Figure 1
Instructional Leadership Theory

Instructional Leadership Theory emanates from an increasing emphasis in managing teaching and learning as core activities of educational institutions. The theory is proposed by Hallinger (2019; as cited in Bush, 2023) who asserted that effective instructional leadership results when leaders align both instructional and managerial roles with their personal values. In this paper,

Instructional Leadership Theory is utilized in order to examine the personal values and skills of school heads in managing and leading teachers in providing effective and retentive teaching and learning process.

Statement of the Problem. This study described and examined the instructional leadership styles of school heads and the administrative challenges they encountered relative to the delivery of instruction among selected secondary schools in the Philippines. Specifically, it answered the following questions:

1. How may the instructional leadership styles of school heads be described by themselves and their teachers in terms of:
 - 1.1 Transformational instructional leadership;
 - 1.2 Transactional instructional leadership; and,
 - 1.3 Distributed instructional leadership?
2. How may administrative challenges in the delivery of instruction be described by the respondents in terms of:
 - 2.1 communication;
 - 2.2 collaboration; and,
 - 2.3 resource management?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the instructional leadership styles of school heads and the administrative challenges they encountered in the delivery of instruction?
4. Is there a significant difference in the description of instructional leadership styles and administrative challenges between school heads and teachers?

METHODOLOGY

This study utilized a descriptive-correlational research design in order to describe and examine the relationship between the instructional leadership styles of school heads and the administrative challenges they encountered relative to the delivery of instruction.

The study employed the participation of one hundred (100) school heads across the country through random sampling technique. Selection of school heads across the country provided different views and perceptions as schools are geographically distant which are contextualized by different socio-demographic orientations. In addition, one hundred (100) teachers were also randomly selected to participate in the study. The school heads and teachers from selected secondary schools in the Philippines shared similar characteristics such as: (1) both were exposed to the present educational system of the country, (2) both performed instructional duties and responsibilities and, (3) both are public servants in the field of education. Further, majority of the school heads' age ranges from 36 to 45 years old and most are female while for teacher-respondents, majority of them ranges from 41-55 years old and most of are female. The school heads and teachers who are serving among the secondary schools identified by the researchers were selected and subjected as the respondents of the study.

For the study's instrument, the study utilized a researcher-made-survey questionnaire with 4-point Likert Scale. It undergone validation by experts in the field consisting of graduate school professors under the Doctor of Education program. The instrument was also subjected to validation and reliability testing. Items under the instructional leadership styles obtained a Cronbach alpha result of 0.721 which signified that the items were acceptable while items under the administrative challenges obtained a Cronbach alpha result of 0.874 which signified also that the items were acceptable.

In the actual data collection, the researchers sent a letter of requests among the respondents informing them about the survey. The researchers also conducted a short orientation before the respondents to inform them about the nature and purpose of the study. Zoom application was utilized during the online orientation and briefing. They were asked for their preferred time and date in conducting the short orientation. They were also provided with zoom links. Thus, informed consent was distributed and collected. Upon completion of

the orientation, survey proper followed. The researchers utilized Google Forms for the actual administration of the survey-questionnaire. Anonymity of the responses was also utilized. Further, data were stored on a digital facility in the form of MS Excel through the personal digital storage of the researchers' laptops. Thus, permanent deletion of data was made upon completion and finality of this study.

Data were initially treated using weighted mean in order to describe the instructional leadership styles and administrative challenges of the respondents while Pearson r was used to determine the degree of relationship between the two above variables. Lastly, analysis of variance was employed to yield any significant difference between the three domains of instructional leadership and the administrative challenges encountered.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Instructional Leadership Styles of School Heads. Delivery of instruction is one of the most critical components in the education system of the country. The manner and means of instructional delivery strongly dictate the quality of education across subjects.

Table 1
Mean distribution of instructional leadership styles of school heads and teachers, (n=200)

Items	WM		Verbal Description	
Transformational Instructional Leadership	Shs	Tchs	Shs	Tchs
1.employ creative approaches to initiate change	3.09	3.15	Agree	Agree
2.develop compelling vision to articulate instructional delivery directions	3.23	3.28	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree
3.foster positive environment to formulate new forms of instructional methods	3.33	3.28	Agree	Agree
4.communicate change properly	3.56	3.45	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree
5.establish trainings and workshops exclusive for meaningful delivery of instruction	3.45	3.42	Agree	Agree
Overall Mean	3.33	3.31	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree
Transactional Instructional Leadership				
1.establish strong school-based instructional delivery guidelines	3.28	3.32	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree
2.create rewards and penalties	3.21	3.25	Agree	Agree
3.provides general direction to what must be done	3.45	3.33	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree
4.creates school-based instructional delivery model	3.38	3.23	Agree	Agree
5.develop strict routines for instructional delivery and assessment	3.62	3.71	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	3.38	3.36	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree
Distributed Instructional Leadership				
1.taps teachers and stakeholders to provide suggestions and input	3.78	3.62	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree
2.delegate tasks and responsibilities	3.72	3.75	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree
3.encourage teachers to actively participate in development and implementation of instructions	3.63	3.56	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree
4.let teachers decide as they implement and deliver instruction	3.82	3.72	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree
5.teachers are given strong independence to create and implement their instructions	3.82	3.72	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	3.75	3.67	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree

*Legend: Shs (School Heads), Tcs (Teachers)

As shown in Table 1, school heads instructional leadership was assessed by themselves and by their teachers. As shown in Table 1, in terms of transformational leadership, for school heads, an overall mean of 3.33 which is verbally described as "Strongly Agree" while an overall mean for teachers obtained a mean score of 3.31 which is verbally described as "Strongly Agree." This shows that both school heads and teachers embrace creative approaches and styles, vision development and foster positive environment for instructional methods. Meanwhile, instructional leadership styles of school heads in terms of transactional instructional leadership, the mean scores are 3.38 for school heads and 3.36 for teachers which are both verbally described as "Strongly Agree." This implies that strong preference for structured instructional delivery is provided by school heads which encourage teachers to comprehensively plot and design their instruction as to obtain meaningful learning experiences. Interestingly, the results also showed that different views on the effectiveness of rewards and penalties imposed by school heads enabled teachers to create and innovatively establish innovative instructional designs hence, positively instituting effective instructional practices. In addition, instructional leadership styles of school heads in terms of distributed instructional leadership obtain mean scores of 3.75 for school heads and 3.67 for teachers which are both verbally described as "Strongly Agree." The result implies that school heads' strong emphasis on teachers' autonomy and deeper sense of involvement in matters relating instructional decisions. Along with this instructional leadership styles, it emphasizes collaboration and input from teachers and stakeholders which potentially established more effective instructional practices highlighting greater sense of good public servants in the field of education.

The findings supported the study of Hallinger (2005) which revealed that the characteristics and approaches to school leadership and management is based upon the conceptual development and empirical investigation as to the effects of good leadership to instructional delivery. As substantiated by the study of Horng

and Loeb (2010) showed that in view of instructional leadership, it emphasized organizational management for instructional improvement rather than day-to-day teaching and learning.

School heads' instructional leadership was considered as a core part of their professional development initiatives which emphasized effective communication and vision development. Teachers on one hand, took significant responsibilities as influenced by the instructional leadership styles of their school heads to advance more effective and efficient instructional practices. The necessity of clear and definitive structure and routines in instructional delivery, guides both the school heads and teachers in providing effective and efficient teaching and learning process. Thus, it was viewed that school heads took initiatory steps to develop a more relevant and impactful training pertaining to the progressive instructional models and assessment routines. In addition, along with the different perceptions with regards on rewards and penalties, it led to a more effective motivational strategies where school leaders engaged in formal dialogues that significantly provided their teachers concrete views on motivation and comprehensive alignment of styles and approaches in the dispense of instruction across subjects.

Administrative Challenges in the Delivery of Instruction Encountered by School Heads and Teachers. Administrative challenges are common part of any established formal institution like the schools. The occurrence of hindrances and struggles made school leaders responsive and keen to the goals and objectives of the schools.

As shown in Table 2, school heads and teachers described and examined the challenges they encountered relative to the delivery of instruction. Based on the results, in terms of communication challenges, school heads and teachers expressed their disagreements with the identified challenges in which overall mean of 2.28 for school heads and 2.42 for teachers are obtained. This shows that school heads and

teachers may experience conflicting directives which can implicate their instructional practices. Moreover, the respondents negated that they experienced difficulty in interpreting department orders, difficulty in reaching channels of communication, received unclear content proposed instructional design and inconsistent postings of updates. In other words, the respondents disagreed that they experienced communication-related challenges as part and parcel of their functions and responsibilities in dispensing quality-based instruction.

Table 2
Mean distribution of administrative challenges in the delivery of instruction encountered by school heads and teachers, (n=200)

Items	wm		Verbal Description	
	Shs	Tchs	Shs	Tchs
Communication				
1.difficulty in interpreting department orders	2.34	2.36	Disagree	Disagree
2.too many channels of communication used	2.21	2.18	Disagree	Disagree
3. unclear content of proposed instructional design	2.32	2.26	Disagree	Disagree
4.inconsistency in dispensing instructional updates	2.33	2.17	Disagree	Disagree
5.overlapping rules and orders	2.21	3.15	Disagree	Agree
Overall Mean	2.28	2.42	Disagree	Disagree
Collaboration				
1.failure to engage all teachers	3.21	2.56	Agree	Agree
2.failure to create teamwork for instructional design	3.56	2.87	Strongly Agree	Agree
3.difficulty in inviting teachers to design and create new instructional styles	3.29	2.50	Agree	Agree
4.difficulty to harmonize diverse ideas and preferences	3.18	3.22	Agree	Agree
5.failure to establish functional instructional development committee	3.28	3.67	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	3.30	2.96	Agree	Agree
Resource management				
1.limited materials for instructional development	2.56	3.15	Agree	Agree
2.insufficient funding support for the development of instructional materials	3.43	3.72	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree
3.insufficient support for the development of creative instructional approaches	3.21	3.33	Agree	Agree
4.multiple tasks assigned to teachers	2.18	2.33	Agree	Agree
5.failure to create contextualized materials	2.67	2.18	Agree	Agree
Overall Mean	2.81	2.96	Agree	Agree

**Legend: Shs (School Heads), Tcs (Teachers)*

Meanwhile, in terms of collaboration challenges, the overall mean of 3.30 for school heads and 2.96 for teachers expressed agreements on the challenges they encountered in terms of collaboration. This implies that insufficient engagement and teamwork potentially hinder the development of effective instructional strategies. In addition, based on the results, it shows that lack of structured collaborative framework among

members of the schools is lacking which defeats the enhancement of instructional delivery. Further, in terms of resource management, overall mean scores of 2.81 for school heads and 2.96 for teachers which indicate that both school heads and teachers encountered challenges in terms of resource management. They find that there are limited materials for instructional development which directly hampers effective delivery of instruction. In addition, they also experienced insufficient funding support so as to develop instructional materials and multiple tasks were given which put additional workload for teachers.

Based on the findings, communication challenges are generally rated as less experienced in which diverse perceptions pertaining to the overlapping rules imply a need for clear and concise communication channels to align the instructional styles and methods to the needs and interests of the learners. Also, collaboration challenges particularly the failure to engage all teachers and establish strong collaborative efforts arising from collaborative practices paralyzed the efficient discharge of instruction. Added to these challenges, the presence of difficulty on resource allocation and resource management to support effective instructional delivery are also evident.

The findings supported the study of Usman (2016) which reveals that school administration and education resources, classification of resources, relevance of education resources in the school system are significant consideration to proceed with the effective and efficient delivery of instructional practices. Also, as shown in the study of Odundo and Oyier (2018) shows that policy guidelines on resource allocation and management bridged deficits and produced strong framework for implementation and monitoring and evaluation of effective instruction.

Relationship Between Instructional Leadership Styles of School Heads and Administrative Challenges Encountered. As shown in Table 3, the negative correlation coefficients indicate a weak inverse relationship between the

administrative challenges in terms of communication and collaboration. In addition, transactional leadership shows weak negative correlations with all the administrative challenges variables. Meanwhile, distributed instructional leadership shows a significant negative correlation with collaboration which indicates that as distributed leadership increases, the challenges in collaboration also increase significantly. Further, the correlation with resource management reveals significant relationships where an increased in distributed instructional leadership influences the greater challenges encountered in resource management. Thus, the correlation is also significant with resource management which suggests that as increased in distributed instructional leadership significantly affects the challenges in resource management. Distributed instructional leadership styles are essential in order to establish and promote effective and efficient instructional delivery.

Table 3
Relationship between the instructional leadership styles of school heads and the administrative challenges encountered

Instructional Leadership Style		Administrative Challenges		
		Communication	Collaboration	Resource Management
Transformational	Correlation Coefficient	-.193	-.228	.031
	Significance	.507	.433	.916
	N	200	200	200
Transactional	Correlation Coefficient	-.063	-.101	-.394
	Significance	.830	.730	.163
	N	200	200	200
Distributed	Correlation Coefficient	-.460	-.711**	-.578*
	Significance	.098	.004	.030
	N	200	200	200

*Legend: Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)
Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The findings supported the study of Göksoy (2015) which reveals that distributed leadership styles helped various organizations reduce complex tasked to be managed. Hence, the study also shows that efforts are best single leader's characteristics and behavior.

Practically, the results show that while transformational and transactional leadership styles have not significantly influenced administrative challenges encountered by school heads and teachers, school heads significantly employed distributed instructional leadership where they present strong leadership dynamics where teachers and other

members of the academic community are keen and careful to the effective and efficient delivery of instruction obtaining quality across subject areas.

Difference Between the Description of Respondents on Instructional Leadership Styles and Administrative Challenges. Based Table 4, both school heads and teachers have a similar perception of transformational, transactional and distributed instructional leadership styles. This suggests that both groups shared similar understanding and experiences among these instructional leadership styles. The result may also suggest that both groups value these instructional leadership styles as significant indicators for the delivery of effective and efficient instruction.

Table 4
Difference between the description on instructional leadership styles of the school heads as described by themselves and by their teachers

Instructional Leadership Styles	Average Weighted Means		Computed t-value	Critical Value at $\alpha=0.05$	p-value
	Shs	Tcs			
Transformational	3.33	3.31	0.283	1.972	>0.05
Transactional	3.38	3.36	0.283	1.972	>0.05
Distributed	3.75	3.67	1.131	1.972	>0.05

**Legend: Shs (School Heads), Tcs (Teachers)*

Administrative challenges between school heads and teachers reveal varying perceptions across three variables as shown in Table 5: communication, collaboration and resource management. For communication, the computed t-value of -1.977 is below the critical value of 1.972 which indicates that both groups have similar understanding of the communication challenges within the teaching and learning environment. In contrast, collaboration t-value of 4.81 significantly exceeded the critical threshold which underscores a notable difference in perception.

This suggests that school heads rated collaboration more favorable than teachers. This disparity also implies that school heads perceive collaborative efforts as more effective. Lastly, resource management t-value of -2.12 also indicate a significant difference with teachers rated resource management higher than school heads. This suggests that teachers

feel more positive in the manner and styles of resource management utilized within the school.

Table 5
Difference between the description on administrative challenges in the delivery of instruction of the school heads as described by themselves and by their teachers

Administrative Challenges	Average Weighted Means		Computed t-value	Critical Value at $\alpha=0.05$	p-value
	Shs	Tcs			
Communication	2.28	2.42	-1.977	1.972	>0.05
Collaboration	3.30	2.96	4.81	1.972	<0.001
Resource Management	2.81	2.96	-2.12	1.972	<0.05

**Legend: Shs (School Heads), Tcs (Teachers)*

The findings negated the study of Zembylas and Iasonos (2010) which shows that difference in stance of school leaders and teachers indicated varied perspectives as influenced by the critical multiculturalism embedded on diverse family orientations relating to the content and style of instructions that are dispensed in the schools.

Conclusion. Instructional leadership is one of the critical components for effective school administration and governance to be disposed of by the school heads as leaders. The study concluded that distributed instructional leadership was highly utilized by school heads to engage their teachers in delivering effective and efficient instruction. Also, transformational and transactional instructional leadership styles were also utilized. In addition, collaboration and resource management were the major administrative challenges experienced by school heads and teachers in the delivery of instruction. However, communication-related challenges were not experienced. Thus, an increased in distributed instructional leadership influences the greater challenges encountered in resource management. School heads heavily experienced administrative challenges when they pervasively utilized distributed instructional leadership styles. Apparently, school heads and teachers can formulate strategic instructional plans which may help them increase the quality of instructional leadership and management within their respective schools.

Recommendations. School heads should maximize the use of distributed instructional leadership style where they should primarily establish instructional framework which highlights creative and innovative instructional styles and methods. In addition, they should establish an efficient and resource-based instructional model containing detailed programs and activities which their teachers can follow. In addition, teachers and school heads should create strong school-based policies which may help increase their community-linkages to establish consistent support for the development and use of relevant learning resources.

REFERENCES

- Bush, T. (2023). Leadership practices and WHY THEY MATTER: Evolving leadership models. *International Encyclopedia of Education* (Fourth Edition), 44–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-818630-5.05020-x>
- Göksoy, S. (2015). Distributed leadership in educational institutions. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 3(4). <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v3i4.851>
- Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the School Principal: A Passing Fancy that refuses to Fade Away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 221–239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500244793>
- Horng, E., & Loeb, S. (2010). New thinking about instructional leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(3), 66–69. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171009200319>
- Keetanjaly, A. C. (2022). The Role of Creativity in Principals' Leadership Practices Towards Parental Involvement: The Mediating Role of School Practices and School Climate. *School Leadership & Management*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2022.2071863>
- Odundo, P. A., & Oyier, C. R. (2018). Prof. Burdgetary Allocation and utilization of instructional resources for science-based subjects in secondary schools in Kenya. *International Educational Research*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.30560/ier.v1n1p33>
- Usman, Y. D. (2016). Educational Resources: An Integral Component for Effective School Administration in Nigeria. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(4), 642–657. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00131619921968662>
- Yulianti, Roshed, D., Marks, Vil, S. & Suasi, Victoria L. (2020). School Instructional Policies and Practices. *International Journal on Education and Applied Science*. 16(2), 36. <https://doi.org/10.242191/ajue.v1wei2.10295>
- Zembylas, M., & Iasonos, S. (2010). Leadership styles and multicultural education approaches: An exploration of their relationship. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 13(2), 163–183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603120903386969>