

School Heads Instructional Leadership Style to the School-Based Management and Performance: Basis for School Improvement Plan

Kimberly Rose Tope Lopez

kimberlyrosetlopez@gmail.com

Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES

Abstract

This study aims to determine the relationship between Instructional Leadership and School Based Management and its relation to school performance in Pila Sub-office. This study aimed to assess the supervisory skills of public elementary school heads in Pila Sub Office, Division of Laguna, Specifically, the study find out the answer to the following questions such as, level of instructional of the school heads as assessed by the teachers, and the level of school-based management, significant relationship between instructional leadership style of the public school heads to the school based management and the relationship between instructional leadership of school heads to the school performance.

This study used descriptive correlational design by trying to assess supervisory skills of school heads to the school-based management. The focus of the study were the five (5) public elementary school heads and one hundred (100) teachers.

Teachers agreed that the level of instructional leadership of the school heads are high in terms of transactional leadership, transformational leadership, participative leadership and democratic leadership. The level of school-based management is very high with regards to leadership and governance, decision making process, teacher and staff involvement, parent and community involvement, and communication and transparency. The correlation indicates a very weak negative to weak positive relationship between schools heads instructional leadership and school based management .Also there weak positive relationship between school heads' instructional leadership, democratic leadership, and school-based management in terms of enrolment rates and very weak negative relationship between school heads' instructional leadership in democratic contexts and cohort survival rates in SBM environments highlights the complexity of school improvement strategies.

It is concluded that school heads' instructional leadership style and school-based management have a low to high positive connection. It also indicates that school-based management in these areas rises with school head increased instructional leadership. Therefore, the hypothesis is rejected.

After the experiment, the researchers recommend some adjustments to gain further knowledge. School principals must gain experience and participate in meetings, seminars, and workshops that are related to their instructional leadership.

Keywords: Instructional Leadership; School Based Management; school performance

1. Introduction

The school-based management program was developed in response to this need and it aims to improve openness and accountability in two key ways: by giving parents and teachers more say over how funds are spent and by requiring annual implementation plans and report cards to more clearly outline how funds are being allocated. However, the SBM program did not make any explicit assumptions about when improvements in student achievement would be expected to take place. It is also impossible to get reliable data on how widely the main reforms have been implemented (Pepugal, 2022).

In like manner, according to Pepito and Acibar, (2019) School-Based Management practices are an aspect of improving the school system. It is incredibly helpful in fulfilling the DepEd's purpose, vision, goals, and main thrust. It evaluates how well school principals are doing their responsibilities under Republic Act 9155. It evaluates the degree to which school leaders are prepared to address the many problems, difficulties, gaps, and objectives the institution faces. Lastly, it identifies factors that need to be taken into consideration if results are to be improved. School-Based Management's (SBM) primary goal is to enhance learning outcomes, which is why educational institutions throughout the world have been making so many attempts to raise standards in recent decades. There are a lot of education managers and experts interested in school-based management right now, and that's especially true in the Philippines, where school administrators want to see improvements in student engagement, attendance, retention, and graduation rates, as well as, most importantly, student learning outcomes. The School-Based Management (SBM) in the Philippines is an initiative of the Department of Education that transfers authority from the Central Office to local schools so that they may address local issues and concerns. Among the means by which the SBM award helps schools become more effective is (DepEd Order No. 45, s.2015).

Instructional leadership is an educational leadership approach in which principals consistently focus their efforts directly on the core activities of schooling—teaching and learning—so that students can achieve academic success. (Hallinger et al., 2020).

In the same fashion, instructional leadership, as defined by and Sin (2022), entails the principal's day-to-day duty to address concerns about instruction and professional growth for teachers, as well as any other activities aimed at fostering an environment in the classroom that encourages both teacher fulfillment and student achievement. It is also advised that principals, in their capacity as instructional leaders, should place a priority on fostering an environment in the classroom where teachers can teach more effectively and students can learn better. To do this, they should offer suggestions, input, effective learning models, solicit feedback, encourage collaboration, offer professional development, and reward or commend effective teaching. Currently, there are many well-known models of instructional leadership.

The principal's role as an instructional leader is broken down into eleven distinct tasks in this model, including setting and communicating school goals, supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating curriculum, monitoring student progress, safeguarding classroom time, encouraging professional growth, keeping a public profile, rewarding teachers, enforcing academic standards, and rewarding students. An important part of being an effective instructional leader is getting involved in discussions about how the curriculum and teaching methods impact student learning and performance.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions.

1. What is the level of School Heads Instructional Leadership Style in terms of:
 - 1.1 Transactional Leadership;
 - 1.2 Transformational Leadership;
 - 1.3 Participative Leadership; and

- 1.4 Democratic Leadership?
2. What is the level of Implementation of School Based Management as to:
 - 2.1 Leadership and Governance;
 - 2.2 Decision Making process;
 - 2.3 Teacher and Staff involvement;
 - 2.4 Parent and community involvement; and
 - 2.5 Communication and transparency?
3. What is the level of school performance in terms of:
 - 3.1 Enrollment Rate;
 - 3.2 Achievement Rate;
 - 3.3 Drop out Rate;
 - 3.4 Promotion Rate; and
 - 3.5 Cohort Survival Rate?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the School Heads Instructional Leadership Style and the School-Based Management Implementation?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the School Heads Instructional Leadership Style and the School Performance?
6. What school improvement plan can be proposed after having a result in this study?

2. Methodology

The researcher utilized the descriptive method to determine the data needed under the present investigation. The descriptive method was designed to gather information about the present existing conditions. The principal aims are to describe the nature of a situation, as it exists at the time of study and to explore the cases of particular phenomena.

3. Results and Discussion

This chapter presents, analyzes and interprets the data gathered that determined the significant relationship in School Heads Instructional Leadership Style and the School-Based Management.

Level of School Heads Instructional Leadership

The level of school heads instructional leadership style in terms to transactional leadership, transformational leadership, participative leadership and democratic leadership. The following table shows the statement, mean, standard deviation, remarks, and verbal interpretation.

From the statement below, the school heads strongly agree that value structure, order and predefined rules. The mean and standard deviation ($M = 3.86$ and $SD = 0.35$) suggests a high level of school heads instructional leadership style in terms to transactional leadership. On the other hand, the school heads also strongly agree that motivates the team through money, recognition or praise. While the mean and standard deviation are slightly lower ($M = 3.80$ and $SD = 0.43$), it still indicates a high level of school heads instructional leadership style in terms to transactional leadership.

The school heads strongly agree that value structure, order and predefined rules. The mean and standard deviation ($M = 3.86$ and $SD = 0.35$) suggests a high level of school heads instructional leadership style in terms to transactional leadership. On the other hand, the school heads also strongly agree that motivates the team through money, recognition or praise. While the mean and standard deviation are slightly lower ($M = 3.80$ and $SD = 0.43$), it still indicates a high level of school heads instructional leadership style in terms to transactional leadership.

The level of school heads instructional leadership style in terms to transactional leadership attained a weighted mean score of 3.84 and a standard deviation of 0.38, verbally interpreted as *often* among the respondents.

Table 1. The level of school heads instructional leadership style in terms to transactional leadership. Also shows the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

| STATEMENTS | MEAN | SD | REMARKS |
|---|-------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My school head...</i> | | | |
| <i>...value structure, order and predefined rules.</i> | 3.86 | 0.35 | Always |
| <i>...monitor school personnel to ensure company objectives are met</i> | 3.84 | 0.37 | Always |
| <i>...motivates the team through money, recognition or praise.</i> | 3.80 | 0.43 | Always |
| <i>...often opposed to change or strive to maintain the status quo rather than embrace new ways of thinking or working</i> | 3.85 | 0.39 | Always |
| <i>...prefers to handle issues as they arise rather than proactively seeking to solve problems, mitigate risks or identify new opportunities.</i> | 3.84 | 0.39 | Always |
| Weighted Mean | | 3.84 | |
| SD | | 0.38 | |
| Verbal Interpretation | | Very High | |

In summary, the prevalence of transactional leadership behaviors among school heads and their verbal interpretation as "often" observed among respondents. While transactional leadership can contribute to achieving short-term performance goals and maintaining order within schools, its long-term impact on teacher motivation, engagement, and professional growth warrants careful consideration. Moving forward, efforts to enhance instructional leadership should strive for a balanced approach that integrates transactional leadership with other leadership styles conducive to fostering a culture of collaboration, innovation, and continuous improvement within schools.

Table 2. Level of School Heads Instructional Leadership Style in Terms of Transformational Leadership

| STATEMENTS | MEAN | SD | REMARKS |
|---|-------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My school head...</i> | | | |
| <i>...create a vision for their followers and guide the change through inspiration and motivation.</i> | 3.87 | 0.34 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>...attends to each personnel need and is a mentor, coach or guide to the school personnel</i> | 3.92 | 0.27 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>...challenge assumptions, take risks and solicit everyone's ideas</i> | 3.88 | 0.33 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>...are close contact with their personnel and are authentic in showing their strengths and weaknesses within the firm.</i> | 3.89 | 0.31 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>...see intellectual stimulation to motivate followers</i> | 3.88 | 0.33 | |

| | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|
| <i>to think outside the box</i> | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean | 3.89 |
| SD | 0.32 |
| Verbal Interpretation | Very High |

Table 2 present the level of school heads instructional leadership style in terms to transformational leadership. Also shows the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

The school heads strongly agree that they need to attends to each personnel need and is a mentor, coach or guide to the school personnel ($M = 3.92$ and $SD=0.27$) suggests a high level of school heads instructional leadership in terms to transformational leadership. Meanwhile, school heads also strongly agree to create a vision for their followers and guide the change through inspiration and motivation. Although the mean and standard deviation are slightly decreased ($M = 3.87$ and $SD = 0.34$), it still indicates a high level of school heads instructional leadership in terms to transformational leadership.

The level of school heads instructional leadership in terms to transactional leadership attained a weighted mean score of 3.89 and a standard deviation of 0.32, verbally interpreted as *often* among the respondents.

Overall, the prevalence of transactional leadership behaviors among school heads and their verbal interpretation as "often" observed among respondents. The transformational technique significantly alters both individuals' and organizations' lives. It modifies expectations and aspirations of employees as well as perceptions and values. It is not predicated on a "give and take" relationship, as in the transactional model, but rather on the personality, attributes, and capacity of the leader to effect change through setting an inspiring example, articulating a compelling vision, and setting difficult targets. In the sense that they are a moral role model for working for the good of the group, company, or community, transformative leaders are idealized.

Table 3. Level of School Heads Instructional Leadership Style in Terms of Participative Leadership

| STATEMENT | MEAN | SD | REMARKS |
|--|-------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My school head...</i> | | | |
| <i>...let the employees participate in the decision-making process</i> | 3.85 | 0.36 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>...is approachable to encourage employees to freely voice their opinions.</i> | 3.86 | 0.35 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>...promote and rely on an inclusive, collaborative mindset.</i> | 3.87 | 0.34 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>...values the various perspectives of their team members and works to keep them involved in the decision-making process.</i> | 3.89 | 0.31 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>...ensures that school teaching force remains in the loop about how their performance positively impacts the tasks at hand.</i> | 3.90 | 0.30 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean | | 3.87 | |
| SD | | 0.33 | |
| Verbal Interpretation | | Very High | |

Table 3 depicts the level of instructional leadership style by school heads as participative leadership. Also shows the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

Based on the result, school heads strongly agree that they ensure that school teaching force remains in the loop about how their performance positively impacts the tasks at hand ($M= 3.90$, $SD=0.30$). Also, school heads strongly agree that let the employees participate in the decision-making process ($M= 3.85$, $SD=0.36$). Although it is lower than the other indicators but still it denotes high level of school heads instructional leadership in terms to participative leadership.

The extent of school heads instructional leadership style as participative leadership attained a weighted mean score of 3.87 and a standard deviation of 0.33, verbally interpreted as *often* among the respondents.

In summary, Participatory decision making promotes teacher motivation, which influences individual and organizational outcomes. Teachers' participation in decision-making processes enables school heads to have access to knowledge regarding the source of instructional problems, thereby improving the quality of instructional decisions. This will also boost teachers' commitment to managerial decisions and readiness to implement them. In order to proceed, participation can be conceptualized in a variety of ways, ranging from shared decision-making to delegation. Comparably, collaborative decision-making or the shared influence in determining who is superior to whom through a hierarchy is what is meant by participation or participative leadership. From this vantage point, the main goals of participatory management have been to distribute decision-making authority and power.

Table 4. Level of School Heads Instructional Leadership Style in Terms of Democratic Leadership

| STATEMENTS | MEAN | SD | REMARKS |
|---|------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My school head...</i> | | | |
| <i>...seek to get a wide range of perspectives and value the free flow of ideas.</i> | 3.84 | 0.37 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>...ask for feedback and appreciate the opinions of others.</i> | 3.80 | 0.40 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>...check in with reports to ensure nothing is keeping them from completing their work, and will offer guidance and support throughout the duration of a project.</i> | 3.84 | 0.37 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>...allow their team to do their work in their way.</i> | 3.82 | 0.39 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>...establishes a strong sense of trust, which strengthens the overall culture.</i> | 3.86 | 0.35 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean | | 3.83 | |
| SD | | 0.37 | |
| Verbal Interpretation | | Very High | |

Table 4 presents the level of instructional leadership style by school heads in democratic leadership. Also shows the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

School heads strongly agree that they establish a strong sense of trust, which strengthens the overall culture ($M=3.86$, $SD=0.35$). On the other hand, school heads strongly agree to establishes a strong sense of trust, which strengthens the overall culture ($M=3.80$, $Sd= 0.40$) though it is a little bit smaller still it depicts high level of instructional leadership.

The level of school heads instructional leadership style in terms of democratic leadership attained a weighted mean score of 3.83 and a standard deviation of 0.37, verbally interpreted as *often* among the respondents.

Based to this perspective, democratic leadership is a type of leadership that places more emphasis on

the leader's facilitation function than on giving commands or delegating work. This kind of practical leadership can be used in volunteer organizations, homes, and corporations, among other settings. Democratic leadership produces new leaders who will go on to represent the organization, which is one of its main benefits. People are more inclined to express their creativity and take initiative when a team member is encouraged to participate actively under this leadership style. skills and aptitudes that might be unrecognized otherwise, leading to increased worker productivity.

Level of School Based Management

The level of school-based management as leadership and governance, decision making process, teacher and staff involvement, parent and community involvement, and communication and transparency, was treated statistically using mean and standard deviation.

Table 5. Level of School Based Management in Terms of Leadership Style and Governance

| <i>Statements (Services)</i> | <i>MEAN</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>REMARKS</i> |
|--|-------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>The school-based management develops collaboration and collegial work.</i> | 3.93 | 0.26 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>The school-based management provides professional development.</i> | 3.92 | 0.27 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>The school-based management sets high standards for all staff.</i> | 3.92 | 0.27 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>The school-based management evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of all school personnel.</i> | 3.94 | 0.24 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>The school-based management monitors the professional growth and development of the school personnel.</i> | 3.92 | 0.27 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean | | 3.93 | |
| SD | | 0.26 | |
| Verbal Interpretation | | Very High | |

Table 5 present the extent of school-based management in terms of leadership and governance. Also shows the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

Teachers strongly agree that the school-based management develops collaboration and collegial work (M=3.94, SD=0.24). Similarly, they are strongly agree to school-based management monitors the professional growth and development of the school personnel, (M=3.92, SD=0.27), though it decreased less but still it shows a high level of school-based management in terms of leadership and governance.

The level school-based management as leadership and governance attained a weighted mean score of 3.93 and a standard deviation of 0.26, verbally interpreted as *often* among the respondents.

In the context of education, leadership influences the process, which ultimately leads to the intended outcome. A competent leader should create a vision for the ideals of their educational institutions, both personally and professionally. A successful leader inspires employees to enjoy their jobs and be determined to succeed. Educational leadership is a process in which a leader takes the initiative to create the conditions necessary for achieving change in teaching and learning. The leader in educational leadership is responsible for establishing the educational institution's vision and mission, which serve as a guiding principle for all stakeholders, including students, teachers, and staff. Furthermore, the leader must guarantee that the

educational institution's environment is conducive to learning, including providing a safe and respectful atmosphere.

Table 6. Level of School Based Management in Terms of Decision-Making Process

| STATEMENTS | MEAN | SD | REMARKS |
|--|------|-----------|----------------|
| My school head... | | | |
| ...makes decision that is based on reliable data. | 3.85 | 0.36 | Strongly Agree |
| ...evaluates the implementation of the decisions. | 3.82 | 0.39 | Strongly Agree |
| ...oversees the implementation of the decisions. | 3.87 | 0.34 | Strongly Agree |
| ...can choose the best alternative for every problem that the school encounters. | 3.86 | 0.35 | Strongly Agree |
| ...makes decisions based on mutual agreement. | 3.84 | 0.37 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean | | 3.85 | |
| SD | | 0.36 | |
| Verbal Interpretation | | Very High | |

Table 6 present the level of school-based management in terms decision-making process. Also shows the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

Teachers strongly agree that school head oversees the implementation of the decisions (M=3.87, SD=0.34) and evaluates the implementation of the decisions. (M=3.82, SD=0.39) hence they are both depicts high level of school-based management in terms of decision-making.

The level school-based management as decision-making process attained a weighted mean score of 3.85 and a standard deviation of 0.36, verbally interpreted as *often* among the respondents.

Much research exists concerning the participation of teachers in the decision-making process. The relationship between participative decision making or participative leadership and instructional improvement (Huang, Shi, Zhang & Cheung, 2016), satisfaction, and performance has been examined.

Table 7. The Level of School Based Management in Terms of Teacher and Staff Involvement

| STATEMENTS | MEAN | SD | REMARKS |
|---|------|-----------|----------------|
| My school head... | | | |
| ...accepts teachers' suggestions and communicates back to them using effective communication methods. | 3.86 | 0.35 | Strongly Agree |
| ...informs all school personnel on the improvement of school-based management. | 3.88 | 0.33 | Strongly Agree |
| ...has a line of communication available for discussing ways to enhance the school. | 3.87 | 0.34 | Strongly Agree |
| ...discusses every issue at the school with the school head. | 3.89 | 0.31 | Strongly Agree |
| ...consistently organized a meeting of all school staff. | 3.89 | 0.31 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean | | 3.88 | |
| SD | | 0.33 | |
| Verbal Interpretation | | Very High | |

Table 7 present the level of school-based management in terms of Teacher and Staff Involvement.

Also shows the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

Teachers strongly agree that school heads consistently organized a meeting of all school staff ($M=3.89$, $SD=0.31$). However they also believed that school heads accepts teachers' suggestions and communicates back to them using effective communication methods ($M=3.86$, $SD=0.35$) though it is a little bit smaller still it depicts high level of school-based management in terms of Teacher and Staff Involvement.

The level of school-based management as Teacher and Staff Involvement attained a weighted mean score of 3.88 and a standard deviation of 0.33, verbally interpreted as *often* among the respondents

Table 8 present the level school-based management as Parent and Community Involvement. Also shows the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

Teachers strongly agree that school heads that School stakeholders answer the call of the schools in terms of the urgent activities that need stakeholders' participation, such as the coming of visitors and the conduct of evaluation related to school-based management ($M=3.86$, $SD=0.35$). On the other hand, they strongly agree to School stakeholders participate actively in the different activities initiated by the schools, especially regarding PTA conferences, general assemblies, and parents' daily activities ($M=3.77$, $SD=0.42$).

Table 8. The Level of School Based Management as Parent and Community Involvement

| <i>Statements (Services)</i> | <i>MEAN</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>REMARKS</i> |
|---|-------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>School stakeholders are willing to participate in the school's maintenance week, dubbed as Brigada Eskwela, by extending some of the needed resources (financial, material, labor).</i> | 3.84 | 0.37 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>School stakeholders participate actively in the different activities initiated by the schools, especially regarding PTA conferences, general assemblies, and parents' daily activities.</i> | 3.77 | 0.42 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>School stakeholders participate in school activities to reduce illiteracy in schools, especially by visiting mentors in the school reading intervention program and the reading recovery program.</i> | 3.85 | 0.36 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>School stakeholders answer the call of the schools in terms of the urgent activities that need stakeholders' participation, such as the coming of visitors and the conduct of evaluation related to school-based management.</i> | 3.86 | 0.35 | Strongly Agree |
| <i>Eagerly engage in meaningful volunteer work in our school community (value formation activity, sports competition) that enhances positive interaction among the youth.</i> | 3.85 | 0.36 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean | | 3.83 | |
| SD | | 0.36 | |
| Verbal Interpretation | | Very High | |

A substantial body of literature documents the positive impact of parent, family, and community engagement on student achievement.

Table 9. The Level of School Based Management as Communication and Transparency

| STATEMENTS | MEAN | SD | REMARKS |
|--|------|-----------|----------------|
| My school head... | | | |
| ...leverages/uses the available technology and platforms in communication. | 3.91 | 0.29 | Strongly Agree |
| ...ensures the safety and privacy of the teachers. | 3.90 | 0.30 | Strongly Agree |
| ...instructs and sends brief and precise messages. | 3.93 | 0.26 | Strongly Agree |
| ...updates the teachers with the latest memorandum/ orders and guidelines in the department. | 3.93 | 0.26 | Strongly Agree |
| ...listens to suggestions and ideas. | 3.88 | 0.33 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean | | 3.91 | |
| SD | | 0.29 | |
| Verbal Interpretation | | Very High | |

Table 9 show the level of school-based management as Communication and Transparency. Also shows the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

Teachers strongly agree that school heads instruct and sends brief and precise messages ($M=3.93$, $SD=0.26$). Meanwhile school head...listens to suggestions and ideas attained a little lower ($M=3.88$, $SD=0.33$), still it depicts high level of school-based management.

The level of school-based management as Parent and Communication and Transparency attained a weighted mean score of 3.91 and a standard deviation of 0.29, verbally interpreted as *often* among the respondents.

Level of School Performance

In this study, the level of school performance refers to enrollment rate, achievement rate, drop out rate, promotion rate and cohort survival rate.

The following table shows the participating schools and the enrollment rate percentage.

Table 10 presents the level of school performance by school heads as democratic leadership.

Table 10. The Level of School Performance in terms to Enrollment Rate.

| Participating School | Enrollment Rate Percentage |
|----------------------|----------------------------|
| School A | 57 |
| School B | 96.35 |
| School C | 96.5 |
| School D | 100 |
| School E | 97.2 |

Mean= 89.41

SD = 18.18

The level of school performance in terms to enrollment rate attained a weighted mean score of 89.41 and a standard deviation of 18.18.

The level of preparation a student needs to enroll and succeed-without remediation-in a credit bearing general education course at a postsecondary institution that offers a baccalaureate degree or transfer to a baccalaureate program” (Conley, 2007, p 1). At one time the perception of Technology Education courses

was that they cater only to those students who were not intending to attend college. Career and Technical Education (CTE) courses, including Technology Education, have begun a transformation since that time. "Once considered a track for non-college bound high school students, CTE has evolved to include an increased emphasis on rigorous academic preparation and integrated.

Table 11 presents the level of school performance by school as achievement rate.

Table 11. The Level of School Performance in terms to Enrollment Rate.

| Participating School | Achievement Rate Percentage |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| School A | 79.9 |
| School B | 83.26 |
| School C | 81.15 |
| School D | 79.08 |
| School E | 82 |

Mean= 81.078

SD = 1.66

The level of school performance in terms to achievement rate attained a weighted mean score of 81.078 and a standard deviation of 1.66.

In this paper, we review the relevant studies at home and abroad and comment on them accordingly. The analysis of academic achievement has gradually become the focus of research by scholars and experts, but the definition of the concept is still controversial. In this paper, academic achievement is used as an outcome variable to investigate how to motivate higher vocational college students to learn while promoting academic achievement. Therefore, a literature review of the concept of academic achievement and its influencing factors is conducted to provide theoretical support for this study. Academic is explained as "academic work, school work" (Pandey et al., 2016). The term "academic work" refers to the results achieved by students as a result of the accumulation of learning, while "school work" refers to the learning tasks set by the school and is characterized by stages.

Table 12 presents the level of school performance by school as dropout rate.

Table 12. The Level of School Performance in terms to Drop Out Rate

| Participating School | Drop out Rate Percentage |
|----------------------|--------------------------|
| School A | 0.01 |
| School B | 0 |
| School C | 0.86 |
| School D | 0 |
| School E | 0 |

Mean= 0.174

SD = 0.38

The level of school performance in terms to drop out rate attained a weighted mean score of 0.174 and a standard deviation of 0.38.

The greater part of the existing literature has described only one or some dropout determinants, has not provided an overview of, or clear connections to, other dropout determinants, and has only to a limited extent been informative about studies on dropout prevention strategies. This finding is in line with Wilson et al. (2017), who have found in total 167 experimental or quasi experimental studies eligible for inclusion in their systematic review on school dropout and completion. There are two main reasons why high-quality studies of dropout prevention measures or interventions are lacking. First, as various observed and unobserved factors influence the decision to leave school early, evaluations may fail to show program

effectiveness. This would result in ‘publication bias’s (i.e., negative or insignificant results are not published). Second, there is a general lack of uniformity and transparency with respect to school attendance and enrollment registration. Many studies therefore have to rely on surveys/questionnaires or (costly) local experimental settings. Due to self-reported data on attendance behavior and sample selection, this may lead to difficult statistical inference.

Table 13 presents the level of school performance by school as promotion rate.

Table 13. The Level of School Performance in terms to Promotion Rate.

| Participating School | Promotion Rate Percentage |
|----------------------|---------------------------|
| School A | 99 |
| School B | 100 |
| School C | 100 |
| School D | 100 |
| School E | 100 |

Mean= 99.8

SD = 0.45

The level of school performance in terms to promotion rate attained a weighted mean score of 99.8 and a standard deviation of 0.45.

Academic achievement of college students is an important factor affecting the achievement of higher education goals (Zhu, 2016). Academic achievement is a direct manifestation of learning effectiveness and a valid indicator to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching and education in higher education as well as the overall development of students. Academic achievement of college students is influenced by various factors, and researchers have done a lot of research.

Table 14 presents the level of school performance by school as cohort survival rate.

The level of school performance in terms to cohort survival rate attained a weighted mean score of 88.943 and a standard deviation of 6.60.

In summary, school achievement is really important for a variety of reasons. It is an important part of human resource development that contributes significantly to the creation of a skilled labor force. Poor school achievement can lower a child's self-esteem and generate worry for parents. Poor school performance can be caused by a variety of circumstances, including medical problems, learning challenges, emotional disorders, and environmental variables. Identifying the causes of a kid's poor performance early on is critical for developing an appropriate treatment plan and helping the child realize their full potential. Furthermore, the school atmosphere can have a substantial impact on academic success, especially for visually challenged kids. Creating a stimulating atmosphere and engaging youngsters in cognitive tasks might aid enhance.

Table 14. The Level of School Performance in terms to Cohort Survival Rate.

| Participating School | Cohort Survival Rate Percentage |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| School A | 95 |
| School B | 82.65 |
| School C | 86.725 |
| School D | 83.46 |
| School E | 96.88 |

Mean= 88.943

SD = 6.60

The school performance involves factors such as the intellectual level, personality, motivation, skills, interests, study habits, self-esteem or the teacher-student relationship. When a gap between the academic

performance and the student's expected performance occurs, it refers to a diverging performance. An unsatisfactory academic performance is the one that is below the expected performance. Sometimes it can be related to teaching methods. (Marti, 2018, p. 376).

Significant Relationship between School Heads Instructional Leadership Style and School Based Management

The significant relationship between school heads instructional leadership style and school-based management in terms of leadership and governance, decision making process, teacher and staff involvement, parent and community involvement, and communication and transparency was treated statistically using Real Statistics Data Analysis Tools using the Pearson correlation coefficient.

Table 15. Significant Relationship between School Heads Instructional Leadership Style and School-Based Management

| Instructional Leadership Style (IV) | School-Based Management (DV) | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | L_G | D_M_P | T_S_I | P_C_I | C_T |
| Transactional: Pearson Correlation | 0.44** | 0.63** | 0.66** | 0.22** | 0.48** |
| Significance(2-Tailed) | <.001 | <.001 | <.001 | <.026 | <.001 |
| N | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Transformational: Pearson Correlation | 0.54** | 0.71** | 0.67** | 0.26** | 0.65** |
| Significance(2-Tailed) | <.001 | <.001 | <.001 | <.007 | <.001 |
| N | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Participative: Pearson Correlation | 0.45** | 0.59** | 0.64** | 0.33** | 0.58** |
| Significance(2-Tailed) | <.001 | <.001 | <.001 | <.001 | <.010 |
| N | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Democratic: Pearson Correlation | 0.60** | 0.74** | 0.51** | 0.35** | 0.59** |
| Significance(2-Tailed) | <.001 | <.001 | <.001 | <.001 | <.001 |
| N | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

The correlation coefficients measure the strength and direction of the relationship between school heads instructional leadership style and school-based management in terms of leadership and governance, decision making process, teacher and staff involvement, parent and community involvement, and communication and transparency. A positive correlation indicates that as school principals' leadership styles increase, emotional intelligence also tends to increase.

Correlations were computed among five school heads instructional leadership style on data for 100 respondents. A correlation coefficient of 1 indicates a perfect positive correlation, while a coefficient of -1 indicates a perfect negative correlation.

The correlation coefficients range from 0.22 to 0.74, indicating a weak to strong positive relationship between school heads instructional leadership style and school-based management. This implies that as school heads instructional leadership increases, there is an increase in the school-based management in these areas.

This implies that the importance of school heads' instructional leadership styles in shaping various dimensions of SBM implementation. Transactional, transformational, participative, and democratic leadership styles emerged as particularly conducive to fostering inclusive governance structures, participatory decision-making processes, stakeholder involvement, equitable resource allocation, and transparent communication. Educators and policymakers should recognize the role of leadership in driving successful SBM initiatives and prioritize strategies that cultivate empowering and collaborative leadership practices within educational

institutions.

Significant Relationship between School Heads Instructional Leadership Style and School Performance

The significant relationship between school heads instructional leadership style and school performance in terms of enrolment rate, achievement rate, dropout rate, promotion rate and cohort survival rate was treated statistically using Real Statistics Data Analysis Tools using the Pearson correlation coefficient.

Table 16. Significant Relationship between School Heads Instructional Leadership Style and School Performance

| Instructional Leadership Style (IV) | School Performance (DV) | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------|------|--------|-------|
| | E_R | A_R | D_R | P_R | C_R |
| Transactional: Pearson Correlation | 0.08 | -0.06 | 0.09 | 0.07 | -0.02 |
| Significance(2-Tailed) | .455 | .539 | .389 | .479 | .808 |
| N | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Transformational: Pearson Correlation | 0.14 | -0.12 | 0.11 | 0.13 | 0.00 |
| Significance(2-Tailed) | .175 | .241 | .269 | .210 | .948 |
| N | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Participative: Pearson Correlation | 0.10 | -0.06 | 0.13 | 0.10 | 0.11 |
| Significance(2-Tailed) | .320 | .567 | .188 | .322 | .261 |
| N | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Democratic: Pearson Correlation | 0.28** | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.27** | -0.08 |
| Significance(2-Tailed) | .005 | .965 | .447 | .006 | .432 |
| N | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

The correlation coefficients measure the strength and direction of the relationship between school heads instructional leadership style and school performance in terms of enrolment rate, achievement rate, dropout rate, promotion rate and school leadership. A positive correlation indicates that as school heads instructional leadership increase, school performance also tends to increase.

Correlations were computed among five school heads instructional leadership on data for 100 respondents. A correlation coefficient of 1 indicates a perfect positive correlation, while a coefficient of -1 indicates a perfect negative correlation.

The correlation coefficients range from -0.08 to 0.28, indicating a *very weak negative* to *weak positive* relationship between schools' heads instructional leadership style and school-based management. This implies that as school heads instructional leadership in terms of democratic leadership increases, there is a slightly increase in the school-based management in terms of enrolment rate.

This implies the weak positive relationship between school heads' instructional leadership, democratic leadership, and school performance in terms of enrolment rates underscores the importance of these leadership styles in shaping the educational landscape. By fostering a collaborative, supportive, and accountable school environment, school leaders can enhance teaching effectiveness, student learning outcomes, and ultimately contribute to increased enrolment rates.

While as school heads instructional leadership style in terms of democratic leadership increases, there is a slightly decrease in the school-based management in terms of cohort survival rate.

This implies the very weak negative relationship between school heads' instructional leadership style in democratic contexts and cohort survival rates in SBM environments highlights the complexity of school improvement strategies. Policymakers and school leaders should consider the potential trade-offs between academic excellence and student retention when designing and implementing educational policies and

practices.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

In the light of the findings of the study, the following conclusions were given:

1. The association indicates that school principals' instructional leadership and school-based management have a low to high positive relationship. It also shows that school-based management in these areas increases as school heads' instructional leadership grows, hence the hypothesis is rejected.
2. This demonstrates how different components of SBM implementation are influenced by the instructional leadership styles of school leaders. Transactional, transformational, participative, and democratic leadership styles have been found to be the most effective in supporting inclusive governance structures, participatory decision-making processes, stakeholder involvement, equitable resource distribution, and open communication. Leadership plays a critical role in accelerating the success of SBM initiatives, and educators and policymakers must recognize this. They should prioritize ways that promote collaborative and empowering leadership styles in educational institutions.
3. The connection demonstrates that school leaders' instructional leadership and school-based management have a very weak negative to weak positive association. This demonstrates that there is a minor increase in school-based management in terms of enrollment rate when school heads' instructional leadership in terms of democratic leadership improves, therefore the hypothesis is accepted. It also indicates that the significance of different approaches to leadership in influencing the educational environment is highlighted by the weakly positive association that exists between school heads' democratic leadership, instructional leadership, and school-based management in terms of enrolment rates. School administrators can improve student learning results, teaching effectiveness, and enrollment rates by creating a collaborative, supportive, and responsible school climate.

In the formulated conclusions from the findings, it was recommended that:

1. School heads are encouraged to be effective leaders in guiding teachers toward the team's desired outcome. Nonetheless, leadership ability can influence organizational transformation and innovation. The findings revealed that leadership is frequently connected with changes in instructional leadership of the school administrators. Nonetheless, they demonstrate worldwide leadership and are found to have a good link with the adoption of educational initiatives. As Transformational leaders should foster a readiness to change in schools. Therefore, the Principal, as head, must first be willing to accept change.
2. As the study indicated that school heads had a high level of instructional leadership, it is strongly encouraged that school heads show off their finest leadership abilities because there is always room for improvement and there is no such thing as job perfection. School administrators should also receive lectures and training. in order for modern and novel approaches to school-based management to be put into practice.
3. The findings suggest that effective instructional leadership requires a collaborative effort between school leaders, teachers, and the community to ensure the success of educational institutions.
4. Finally, it is proposed that another study should be undertaken using additional variables that are thought to influence school success.

Reference:

Pepugal 2022 Instructional leadership in centralized systems: Evidence From Greek high-performing secondary schools

Pepito 2019 The principal as instructional leader: Guiding schools to Improve instruction. *Education as Change*, 17(1), S79-S92. doi:10.1080/16823206.2014.865992

Hallinger 2014 Building a new structure for school leadership. Washington DC: The Albert Shanker Institute.

Sukarmin 2022 Instructional Leadership and Students Academic Performance: Mediating Effects of Teacher's Organizational Commitment. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*. Vol 19, No 10, <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.19.10.13>