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This study on leadership of school heads and teachers’ performance is a guild mark of descriptive design as graciously provided by purposely selected respondents representing teachers in the Division of Laguna for school year 2019-2020 as data resources aiding the present researcher to resolve with finality the five (5) basic problem areas namely: 1.) The level of school heads leadership in school based management as to: school improvement, management system; 2.) the level of school heads in instructional leadership as to framing school goal, supervision and evaluating instruction and promotion of professional development; and 3.) the level of teachers’ performance based on: work ethics, advocacy, managing diverse learner, adoptability and commitment;4.) Significant relationship between the principal leadership and the level of teachers’ performance;5.)The leadership of school heads is significantly related to the teachers ‘performance. Only one (1) set of locally-constructed questionnaire checklist of five-Likert scale type was issued to teacher-respondents to serve the purpose until this research has been finally completed. The result of the study is significant; the schools heads leadership have significant effect on the performance of the teachers that is why the null hypothesis is rejected. While the implication of the study is very important to the teachers, students and the administration because it has a wonderful bases to manage the system in the school and to be more effective in terms of management. This study on leadership of school heads and teachers’ performance is a guild mark of descriptive design as graciously provided by purposely selected respondents representing teachers in the Division of Laguna for the school year 2019-2020 as data resources in aiding the present researcher to resolve with finality the five (5) basic problem areas namely: 1.) The level of school heads leadership in school based management as to: school improvement, management system; 2.) the level of school heads in instructional leadership as to framing school goal, supervision and evaluating instruction and promotion of professional development; and 3.) the level of teachers’ performance based on: work ethics, advocacy, managing diverse learner, adoptability and commitment;
learner, adoptability and commitment; 4.) Significant relationship between the principal leadership and the level of teachers’ performance; 5.) The leadership of school heads is significantly related to the teachers’ performance. Only one (1) set of locally-constructed questionnaire checklist of five-Likert scale type was issued to teacher-respondents to serve the purpose until this research has been finally completed. The responses of the said respondents to the foregoing basic questions raised were processed into data configuration through mean and standard deviation formulae in order to ferret out the weight and variation respectively, and subsequently subjected to empirical testing of null hypothesis at five (5) percent level of significance by means of r-formula. From the procedure recapitulated above, the five (5) basic problems posited in advance were answered. The following are the candid findings of the study: The overall means of 4.20, for school improvement and 4.21 for management system, reveal that the respondents got very high remarks and very high respectively on the teacher performance on work ethics, advocacy, managing diverse learner, adoptability, and commitment. The overall means of 4.20, 4.21, 4.30, and 4.27, reveal that the teachers are “very high level” and highly supported. The Teachers performance while the overall means of 4.30, 4.34, 4.32, 4.32 and 4.32 signify that the teacher agree in “very high” and supported on the teachers’ performance as to works’ ethics, advocacy, managing diverse learner, adoptability and commitment. The leadership of the schools heads based on school improvement and manage system and instructional leadership are significantly related to the teachers’ performance as to works’ ethics, advocacy, managing diverse learner, adoptability and commitment. The overall means of 4.20, 4.21, 4.30, and 4.27, reveal that the teachers are “very high level” and highly supported. The Teachers performance while the overall means of 4.30, 4.34, 4.32, 4.32 and 4.32 signify that the teacher agree in “very high” and supported on the teachers’ performance as to works’ ethics, advocacy, managing diverse learner, adoptability and commitment. The leadership of the schools heads based on school improvement and manage system and instructional leadership are significantly related to the teachers’ performance as to works’ ethics, advocacy, managing diverse learner, adoptability and commitment. The leadership of the schools heads based on school improvement and manage system and instructional leadership are significantly related to the teachers’ performance as to works’ ethics, advocacy, managing diverse learner, adoptability and commitment.

Introduction:-

The problem of some institution is the relationship of its leaders and teachers, hence the school heads face adversities in performing their roles. They need to clearly communicate their school goal to all stakeholders. They engage in various aspects in implementing SBM, SIP, and AIP. Dwayer (2011), contends that successful principals connect their daily on-the-job duties with their goals for students achievement along with the needs and resources of the school Therefore, they must be flexible and how they influenced and lead the teachers.

Also the main problem of the school or some institution lies how effective the school heads in dealing the obstacle or the barrier in the institution thus, the school heads know their duties and task when there are obstacles, and how to handle the problem.

The success of one school depend on the capacity of leader to lead the fellow teachers, students and administration staff. Challenging opportunities for people to change and grow are sought by leaders (Greer, 2011). A leader’s actions may either alienate or commit others to follow. According to the study on principal’s leadership style and school performance (Ali, 2013) in Dubai it was found that leadership style has a strong contribution or impact on teacher’s performance. Also, in Kenya the study on the main effects of leadership styles...
on employee performance (Koech and Namusonge, 2012) revealed that the leadership styles influence the performance of the teachers and it was recommended that managers should remove the laissez-faire leadership style by becoming more involved in guiding their workers; public managers should formulate and implement effective award and recognition systems.

This study was conducted to prove that effective leader may influence the improvement of one school. This study is all about the good leadership which is the best instrument for the improvement of school, and transformative leadership skill necessary for school effectiveness. According to these researchers’, school improvement, management system and instructional leadership, knowing the educational processes of a school will make the vision possible. A leader is a big factor to enhance school Improvement and increasing teacher commitment to motivate them in achieving the school goals. Thereby the school heads become more competent in the school to achieve the quality education of their school.

Objectives:-
The study examined how to evaluate the leadership of the school heads and the teachers’ performance in public school. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the mean level of school heads leadership in school based management?
2. What is the level of School Heads Instructional Leadership?
3. What is the level of teachers’ performance in public school?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the principal leadership and the level of teachers’ performance among the secondary school?
5. Is the leadership of school heads significantly related to the teachers’ performance in the Division of Laguna?

Methodology:-
This study considered the responses on the leadership of school heads and teachers’ performance questionnaire answered by the teacher as respondents. (Nevertheless, the supervisor and the Principal will not answer those questions).

The focus of the study was to know the level of leadership of school heads and the teachers’ performance in the Division of Laguna consisting of 1 Province Division in selected public schools. The total respondents is 359 teachers from the selected schools in Laguna. Collected data were mainly analyzed through descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation.

Literature Review:-
Capli (2015), according to him teachers has a big role in developing the community and the whole characters of the persons. He/she teaches and instructs students, organizes educational activities and cooperates with the family in raising children and cultivating morals in them. A teacher qualified with and scientific competences can create through his practices a new developed generation.

Furthermore, Bradley-Levine (2012), in her study the when the teachers are close to their students it will develop the consciousness or an awareness of social injustices both within and beyond the school. Thus, teacher leaders are driven to advocate leadership because they feel associate with their students or because they deeply understand what they were needs in all aspects in their lives.

As mentioned by Price (2018), the diversity in today’s classroom includes factors of culture, language, ethnicity, race, ability, socio-economic background, religion, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation and age. As teachers they need to teach them things of whatever native about the place where their came from.

According to Tyagi (2015), An active classroom teaching practice can become highly rewarding for students. An instructor practicing active learning approaches may get significantly higher success in inculcating course materials deeply as compared to a lecture based teaching. However, transitioning from prevailing lecture based instruction to an active learning approach can be hampered by the reservations and prejudices of an engineering
educator; a tenure track faculty may find it even more challenging to leave the traditional lecture based teaching approach and adopt an active teaching approach.

On the other hand, Altun (2017), handles the concept of commitment from a direct perspective of education. He expresses that teacher commitment has been considered as a passion to the work. Passion is at the core of effective learning and teaching.

Adding up by Kusumaningrum (2017), school-based management can't be performed well if the standards are not appropriately performed. The standards of autonomy, equity, straightforwardness, organization, support, productivity, and responsibility decide the nature of the school-based the board. Such standards of school-based administration are applied and grasped through the establishments of school-based administration, in particular educational plan and learning, understudies, instructors, instructive assets, foundations, network support, and school culture and condition.

As stated by Goldenberge(2010), to improve schooling and achievement in a diverse society it requires units of analysis that tap into significant structures, processes, and dynamics of culture as they affect individual students and schools. These units must be sensitive to variability among individuals within seemingly homogenous groups and to similarities between apparently heterogeneous communities.

Hallingeret. al (2013), provide a clear definition of instructional leadership by representing the work of Hallinger and Murphy which incorporates three dimensions of school heads in instructional management practices help to obtain the program, and develops a positive school learning climate. These size were further delineated into 10 instructional leadership functions.

In addition Salleh (2014) pointed out that framing school goals refers to a the school heads together with all staff will focus the resources of the school in the whole year especially in opening of the school year. They always think the safety and benefits of all the students. The emphasis is on fewer goals around which staff energy and other school resources can be mobilized.

Wagner (2013) stated that supervisors are expected to provide advice and support to colleagues. Teachers must have confidence in those whom they turn for help. Formal authority and status can produce tension for principals as they seek to establish collegial relationships. If teachers are successful in helping students achieves their goals so too is the principal. And the teacher have direct connection to the students' learning, the principal influence on learning is indirect by the very nature of the structural arrangement of teaching. In the end the principals’ success depends on the teachers.

According to DiPaola (2013), in promoting school-wide professional development, instructional leaders become teachers. They facilitate lifelong-learning by helping teachers identify meaningful and relevant learning opportunities. They help teachers develop individualized professional development plans. They encourage teachers to learn more about students’ achievement by analyzing appropriate data and making decisions based on the outcomes. They provide support and resources to teachers that enable them become more effective in the classroom.

**Discussion:-**

**Level of Leadership Skills of School Heads:**

**Table 1:** Presents level of Leadership Skills of School Heads in terms of School Improvement.

| Indicative Statement                                                      | M     | SD   | Remarks |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------|---------|
| 1. Motivate the teachers how to organize effective internal communication at school. | 4.26  | 0.83 | Very High |
| 2. Organize change relative to school improvement and strategies for upcoming barriers. | 4.24  | 0.78 | Very High |
| 3. Making lasting influence in the lives of the teachers.               | 4.14  | 0.87 | High    |
| 4. Have appropriate attitudes and expertise in doing their school tasks. | 4.25  | 0.82 | Very High |
5. Experience the effect of alumni support.  

**Overall Mean**  

| Indicative Statement | M    | SD    | Remarks  |
|----------------------|------|-------|----------|
| 1. Examine their effectiveness in terms of leadership. | 4.20 | 0.82  | Very High |
| 2. Utilize coercive, reward, legitimate power to be used in the educational leadership. | 4.18 | 0.81  | High |
| 3. Maintain a strict attendance policy. | 4.26 | 0.79  | Very High |
| Can improve well-being of employees in the work place. | 4.19 | 0.89  | High |
| 4. Attain the strategic management system in developing plans and objectives for the institution. | 4.25 | 0.82  | Very High |

Moreover, the computed mean of 4.20 indicates that the teacher-respondents agreed that the school heads have very high level skills of skills as to school improvement. The school heads provide organized internal communication, organized changes and create lasting influences on the lives of the teachers. This implies that through this skill of school heads school personnel are able to develop appropriate attitude and expertise in school tasks, and able develop partnership with the alumni.

Table 2 shows the indicator in terms of management of school that maintains the good system implemented by the leaders.  

**Table 2:** Level of Leadership Skills of School Heads in terms of Management System.

| Indicative Statement | M    | SD    | Remarks  |
|----------------------|------|-------|----------|
| 1. Examine their effectiveness in terms of leadership. | 4.20 | 0.82  | Very High |
| 2. Utilize coercive, reward, legitimate power to be used in the educational leadership. | 4.18 | 0.81  | High |
| 3. Maintain a strict attendance policy. | 4.26 | 0.79  | Very High |
| Can improve well-being of employees in the work place. | 4.19 | 0.89  | High |
| 4. Attain the strategic management system in developing plans and objectives for the institution. | 4.25 | 0.82  | Very High |

Overall Mean  

| Overall Mean | M    | SD    | Remarks  |
|--------------|------|-------|----------|
|              | 4.21 |       | Very High |

As a result, the school heads’ leadership skills in management system obtained an over-all mean of 4.21. This means that the school heads are in very high level in terms of management system.

Table 3 indicates the level of school heads in terms of framing the school goal. In line with this, the school heads skill in developing and providing the school goals through training is marked as very high, with the highest computed mean of 4.28. The school heads adopt the trends for developing school goals through the trainings and seminars the are attending.

Framing school goal, as one of the skills a school head must possess, is highly evident on the schools where the respondents came from. As shown in the table, all the indicators were highly evident in their respective schools. This implied that school heads can lead their teacher towards the school goals. The overall mean is 4.25 which is very high level.

Table 3 shows the plan in the different activities to frame the school goal so that it may help the teachers and the students.  

**Table 3:** Level of School Heads in Instructional leadership in terms of Framing School Goal.

| Indicative Statement | M    | SD    | Remarks  |
|----------------------|------|-------|----------|
| 1. Develop and provide the school goals through appropriate trainings. | 4.28 | 0.78  | Very High |
| 2. Develop goals that seek improvement over current levels of academic performance. | 4.26 | 0.76  | Very High |
| 3. Use the data on students’ academic performance when developing the school academic goal. | 4.26 | 0.75  | Very High |
| 4. Frame the school’s academic goals in terms of staff responsibilities. | 4.23 | 0.78  | Very High |
| 5. Develop goals that are easily translated into classroom objectives by the teachers. | 4.24 | 0.77  | Very High |

Overall Mean  

| Overall Mean | M    | SD    | Remarks  |
|--------------|------|-------|----------|
|              | 4.25 |       | Very High |

Moreover, the school heads can develop goals through trainings, evaluation of students’ academic performances and even the levels of school stakeholders. Through these skills they possess, school heads develop and frame academic goals which are teacher-friendly and student-friendly. Teacher can easily translate the academic goals to the classroom objectives. Thus, if it is so, students can easily adapt with the school’s goal and have a better
academic performance. As an indication, as teachers’ performance increases, then the school’s performance also increases.

Table 4 shows the supervising and evaluating of the school heads to the teacher and the students to evaluate their needs and improve it.

**Table 4:** Level of Leadership of School Heads in Instructional Leadership in terms of Supervising and Evaluating Instruction

| Indicative Statement                                                                 | M    | SD    | Remarks   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-------|-----------|
| 1. Monitor teachers’ instructional materials to render suggestions for enhancement. | 4.24 | 0.75  | Very High |
| 2. Check teachers’ lesson notes to provide assistance for improvement.              | 4.28 | 0.77  | Very High |
| 3. Check staff school attendance to insure regular instructional delivery.           | 4.35 | 0.74  | Very High |
| 4. Check teachers’ record of work done to monitor their progress.                   | 4.28 | 0.76  | Very High |
| 5. Monitor teachers’ compliance to school schedule.                                 | 4.36 | 0.73  | Very High |
| Overall Mean                                                                        | 4.30 |       | Very High |

Aside from it, even with the lowest mean of 4.24, school heads also have very high remarks in monitoring the teachers’ instructional materials and render suggestions for enhancement. Maybe, this is conducted by the school head through classroom observations and checking of daily lesson logs. This implied that teachers and school heads are working hand in hand in maximizing learning experiences of the learners.

Since supervising and evaluating instructional modes of teachers are highly evident among school heads, therefore it is suggested that they continue it to ensure positive progress on the performance of the students and teachers which is reflected on the school’s performance.

Table 5 shows the interrelationship between the school heads and the teachers, support them and coach them in developing professional growth.

**Table 5:** Level of School Heads in Instructional Leadership in terms of Promoting Professional Development

| Indicative Statement                                                                 | M    | SD    | Remarks   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-------|-----------|
| 1. Emphasize the study of teaching and learning.                                     | 4.35 | 0.71  | Very High |
| 2. Support collaboration among teams of teachers.                                    | 4.30 | 0.80  | Very High |
| 3. Develop coaching relationships among educators.                                   | 4.25 | 0.81  | Very High |
| 4. Redesign and align curriculum to standards.                                       | 4.21 | 0.80  | Very High |
| 5. Provide professional development activities that are appropriate for adult learners.| 4.25 | 0.80  | Very High |
| Overall Mean                                                                        | 4.27 |       | Very High |

The table shows the mean score of the teacher respondents about their school heads’ skill in promoting professional development. As a result, the teachers agreed that their school heads redesign and align curriculum to the standards set by the Department of Education. The mean of 4.35 that indicates the school heads’ emphasis on the study of teaching and learning is very high. Though this, both the teachers and principals or school heads to can think of other ways to develop the teaching – learning process within the system.

The ability of the school heads to redesign and align curriculum standards gained a mean of 4.21. It is also remarked as very high level skill. The teacher respondents were able to follow the curriculum guide and standards set by the DepEd with the proper supervision of the school heads.

As a whole, in terms of promoting professional development which gained an over – all mean of 4.27, school heads leadership skill is marked very high. The indicator set by the researcher matched the respondents’ perception on their school heads leadership skill. Thus, this means that it is highly evident in their respective school heads. This implied that school heads provide activities for school personnel in helping them develop
professionally. In addition to this, they also develop coaching relationships that support collaboration among the teachers.

Though the school head’s skills on school improvement have the mean of 4.20, it is marked high level which still connotes positive feedbacks among the teacher-respondents. This maybe because the teachers think that school improvement is important but the least priority among the indicators. Maybe the teachers think that there is a little relationship on the school improvement in the students’ scholastic performance.

**Level of Teachers’ Performance:**

Table 6 shows the importance of works ethics in teaching profession.

| Indicative Statement | M     | SD  | Remarks |
|---------------------|-------|-----|---------|
| 1. Provides some guidance for action around issues related to the profession but are also instruments of regulation which position teachers in sanctioned roles. | 4.34  | 0.70 | Very High |
| 2. Influences morality and have significant educational implications. | 4.34  | 0.71 | Very High |
| 3. Has appropriate ethical actions in teaching that can be characterized as either inspirational or procedural, each type shaping teachers’ roles and morality differently. | 4.37  | 0.69 | Very High |
| 4. Examines about judgement in ethical versus unethical behaviors. | 4.32  | 0.71 | Very High |
| 5. Views carelessness violations as less serious. | 4.10  | 0.85 | High |
| Overall Mean | 4.30  |     | Very High |

The table shows the level of teacher’s performance in terms of work ethics. And as what the table shows, viewing carelessness violations as less serious gained a mean of 4.10. Among the indicators on work ethics it has the lowest mean and marked with high level of performance of the teachers. This is because teachers are more focused with bigger violations and think carelessness as a little one.

Moreover, with the gained mean of 4.30, teachers’ performance in terms of work ethics is very high. It means that they provide guidance for action around issues related to the profession which are also instruments of regulation. They also influence morality with significant educational implications. They also examine judgment on ethical and unethical behaviors.

This is in line with the study conducted by Ayeni (2018) stating that teacher’s professional ethics is an important tool to become an effective and well-performing teacher. Teachers’ compliance on the school’s policy is an indicator for the level of teacher’s performance.

The table shows importance of advocacy of teachers to the students so that they may be aware of whatever happens in the environment.

| Indicative Statement | M     | SD  | Remarks |
|---------------------|-------|-----|---------|
| 1. Actively engages in professional advocacies and reflective practices related to students’ performance. | 4.36  | 0.65 | Very High |
| 2. Promotes the awareness of social injustices in the school. | 4.32  | 0.69 | Very High |
| 3. Is responsible for constructing the facilitation, a culture of collaboration in their schools and that ultimately the facilitation of collaboration affects students’ academic achievements. | 4.31  | 0.68 | Very High |
| 4. Tailors attention to students learning needs | 4.37  | 0.64 | Very High |
5. Actively engages in professional and reflective practices related to students’ performance. 4.36 0.65 Very High

Overall Mean 4.34 Very High

On the other hand, the teachers’ responsibility to construct facilitation of collaboration has a mean of 4.31. This indicates that the teachers have a very high performance in constructing facilitation on collaboration. This is one of the responsibilities of the teachers and that they need to promote collaboration that affects the academic achievements of the students.

Teachers also promote awareness of social injustices in the school. They are also responsible in constructing facilitation of collaborative culture in their schools, that highly affects students’ academic achievement. They also give attention to students learning needs during regular class time.

**Table 8:** Shows level of Teachers’ Performance in terms of Managing Diverse Learners.

| Indicative Statement                                                                 | M   | SD  | Remarks    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|------------|
| 1. Has adequate training for inclusive teaching in the mainstream, but are often inadequately supported. | 4.26| 0.70| Very High  |
| 2. Enhances appreciation of individual differences, whether the learner have different culture. | 4.33| 0.63| Very High  |
| 3. Plans appropriate curriculum for better teaching and learning.                     | 4.32| 0.67| Very High  |
| 4. Applies different techniques that are suited for the needs of the students.       | 4.35| 0.64| Very High  |
| 5. Applies contextualization in teaching and makes a reform in conducting students’ activities. | 4.34| 0.66| Very High  |
| Overall Mean                                                                        | 4.32|     | Very High  |

On the other hand, having the highest mean of 4.35, teachers apply different techniques that are suited for the needs of the students. And in terms of this indicator, the respondents agreed that teachers perform this in a very high manner. This is present from the classroom interactions with the students through providing activities that will engage the learners for maximum learning. Teachers also acquire new methodologies through researches, studying in graduate schools, seminars and trainings.

As revealed in the table, with the mean of 4.32, the level of teachers’ performance in terms of managing diverse learners is very high. The responses are close to each other. This means that the teachers are performing well in managing diversity of learners inside and outside their classrooms.

Teachers as the center of the teaching/learning activities gained the highest mean of 4.36. This is marked by very high performance among the teachers. The teachers use various activities that include modern strategies in the classroom. This is to provide quality education and adopt with the trends of globalization in education. On the other hand, the teachers’ ability to organize workshops and seminars locally gained the lowest mean of 4.26. Nevertheless, this indicator still has a very high level of performance among the teachers. This is present during Division and District In-service trainings and even during the school learning action cell.

Adoptability is another indicator to determine the level of performance of the teachers. As revealed by the table, with the mean of 4.32, teachers’ level of performance in terms of this indicator is very high.

This means that the teachers can adopt with the needs of the students, school heads and other stakeholders. As set by the researcher and as revealed by the result, teacher-respondents set themselves as the center of any teaching and learning activities by using modern teaching strategies.

Table 9 shows the good effect of technology to adopt the different techniques in teaching.

**Table 9:** Level of Teachers’ Performance in terms of Adoptability.

| Indicative Statement | M | SD | Remarks |
|----------------------|---|----|---------|

593
1. Is at the center of any teaching / learning activities, uses modern teaching strategies and uses such strategies.

2. Uses peer assessment reasonably adopted along teachers' assessment in the classroom.

3. Organizes workshops and seminars locally, and rationally teachers in modern teaching / learning strategies should have syllabuses connected to the students’ needs.

4. Adopts new technologies for adult learners which approaches to teaching and learning must be assessed.

Uses technology switching from whole class instruction to individual methods of instructions.

Overall Mean

| Indicative Statement                                                                 | M    | SD   | Remarks  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|----------|
| 1. Has greater teaching commitment tended by the female teachers than the male teachers, expressed by those who were higher in both general and personal efficacy and who taught in school with fewer students per teacher. | 4.25 | 0.80 | Very High |
| 2. Perceives higher commitment under leadership characterized by high consideration, regardless of the level of initiating structure. | 4.34 | 0.67 | Very High |
| 3. Has high level of organizational commitment and positively related to climate openness, characterized by supportive principal behavior and teachers’ engagement, intimacy, and low levels of teacher frustration. | 4.33 | 0.65 | Very High |
| 4. Commits to influence more by the organizational support for the management and boundaries issues, experienced teachers are influenced more by organizational qualities that affect the core of instructional tasks. | 4.33 | 0.69 | Very High |
| 5. Works and influences teachers’ commitment to their profession and to the school where they work through the supportive Principal and it influences the students learning process. | 4.36 | 0.66 | Very High |
| Overall Mean                                                                        | 4.32 |      | Very High |

As classified as revolutionary teachers, teachers adopt to the trend of new technologies in teaching and learning process with proper assessment and evaluation. Additionally, teachers use technology switching from whole class instruction to individual methods of instruction.

Table 10 shows the commitment of teachers in teaching to enhance the learning process.

The teacher’s works and influence on colleagues gained a mean of 4.36. Meaning that this indicator is performed very well by the teacher in the Division of Laguna. A positive influence towards the commitment of each teachers as supported by the principal has a positive effect on the students learning processes. This is through teachers’ collaboration, forum, conferences and sharing educational best practices.

As shown in the table, as a whole with the computed over-all mean of 4.32, teachers’ commitment is in a very high level of performance. This means that they are performing well in doing their job description and profession.
Commitment of the teachers makes them motivated in what they are doing. This is parallel to the study conducted by Altun (2017). According to him, teacher’s motivation is an internal force that derives teachers to invest more time and energy in keeping up involvement in the school.

He then added that their willingness to promote school creates emotional link between them and the school. Through this, it inspires teachers to seek ways of enhancing their teaching practice and work – related aspects. As indicated in the table, among the five indicators of school heads leadership skills as compared with the teachers’ work advocacy, two are with high correlation and three have moderate correlation. Nevertheless, all the indicators are significant affecting the work ethics of the teachers (<0.01 level of significance). Professional promotion (r=0.739, p=0.01) and framing school goals (r=0.762, p=0.01) have the high significant correlation with the teacher’s work ethics.

**Significant Relationship between Leadership Skills of School Heads and Teachers’ Performance:**

**Table 11:** Shows level of Significant Relationship between Leadership Skills of School Heads and Teachers’ Work Ethics.

| Leadership Skills of School Heads       | r      | Interpretation | p     | Significance |
|----------------------------------------|--------|----------------|-------|--------------|
| School Based Management                |        |                |       |              |
| School Improvement                     | .632** | Moderate       | <.01  | Significant  |
| Management System                      | .689** | Moderate       | <.01  | Significant  |
| Instructional Leadership               |        |                |       |              |
| Framing School Goals                   | .762** | High           | <.01  | Significant  |
| Supervision and Evaluating Instruction| .692** | Moderate       | <.01  | Significant  |
| Professional Promotion                 | .739** | High           | <.01  | Significant  |

On the research conducted by Özan and Özdemir (2017), they emphasized that if the effective leadership behaviors are known, leaders can learn to adopt them and accomplish greater effectiveness. Effective leadership behaviors must be evident to each school head so that it can be transferred to the teachers. He added that leaders, to be effective must lay down rules, follow these rules and seek to enforce them. As revealed in the table, there is a significant relationship on the school heads’ leadership skills and the teachers’ advocacy. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected at 0.01 level of significance. The school head’s leadership skills, in terms of school-based management and instructional leadership, has high significant relationship on teachers’ advocacy as shown in the table.

**Conclusion:**

The school heads leadership skills are in very high level of performance, both for school – based management and instructional leadership. The teachers are very high performing in terms of their work-related ethic and advocacy, management of diversity in the classroom, adoptability and commitment. Among the teachers from the Division of Laguna, the school heads leadership skills have significant effect on the performance of the teachers. Based on the study conducted by the researcher, it is found out that all the indicators set have significant relationship. Furthermore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

**Recommendations:**

Based on the aforementioned summary and conclusions, the following recommendations are made

1. The school heads should possess positive and good leadership behavior since they are the one who are being looked – up by the teachers and other stakeholders. Their leadership skills, as a whole is one of the factors to consider for a positive school climate that can contribute to teachers’ job satisfaction, that could motivate them to be better.
2. School heads must continue to encourage their teachers to pursue studies for them to grow professionally and personally. Also, to make them well equipped and competent that they may be able to adopt to the recent trends of the curriculum.

3. School heads must also give credits or incentives for the teachers who are professing well the work-related ethics.

4. A further study can be conducted to include other factors that may influence teacher’s performance, not only limited with the school head’s leadership skills.
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