

The Influence of the School Heads' Leadership on the Teachers' Professional Development in the Public Secondary Schools in Sagñay District, Division of Camarines Sur

Mary Jane P. Bongalonta¹

¹School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026 Keywords: School Heads' Leadership Philippines School-Based Survey Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance Teacher Perceptions	The study assessed school heads' leadership and teachers' professional development in public secondary schools in Sagñay District during school year 2025–2026. A descriptive–evaluative–correlational survey involved 184 respondents and employed frequency, percentage, weighted mean, rank, and Kendall's coefficient of concordance. Among leadership domains, administrative and managerial skills received the highest reported overall mean (4.31), followed by engagement in professional development (4.00), transformational and relational leadership (3.86), and instructional leadership (3.79). Professional-development domains were rated Much Influential, led by coaching and mentoring and online courses and webinars (4.41 each), action research (4.35), seminars and workshops (4.28), and professional learning communities (4.20). Concordance was reported in most domains; online courses and webinars was a stated exception ($W = 0.63$, $\chi^2 = 13.23$, $p > .05$). The study describes perceived leadership and professional-development support rather than causal effects or verified changes in teacher competence.

1. Introduction

In the Philippine basic education system, school heads' leadership and teachers' professional development is situated at the intersection of classroom practice, school policy and local resource conditions. The way educational practices are organized within a district cannot be inferred from national policy statements alone; information on local implementation and the views of the personnel responsible for delivery is also necessary. The study therefore focused on public secondary schools in Sagñay District, Division of Camarines Sur, a setting in which the routines supporting instructional leadership, engagement in professional development and action research can vary across schools.

The phenomenon examined by the study involves more than the presence of a program or institutional requirement. What respondents recognize as frequent, substantial or effective practice may depend on exposure, school size, resource access, the specific indicator being rated and the standards used for judging it. For this reason, evidence about school heads' leadership and teachers' professional development must distinguish the extent of reported implementation from measurable changes in teachers' work or learners' outcomes. The ratings obtained in a cross-sectional questionnaire provide one form of evidence, but not every form required for a causal claim.

The study organized its inquiries around substantive domains rather than a single unqualified effectiveness score. The domains included instructional leadership, administrative and managerial skills, transformational and relational leadership, engagement in professional development. Considering these areas separately makes it possible to identify strengths and weaknesses that may be hidden by a favorable overall mean. It also allows school leaders to direct follow-up observation and support toward specific activities instead of treating all facets of school heads' leadership and teachers' professional development as interchangeable.

A second analytical concern was whether respondent groups ranked the indicators similarly. Concordance across group rankings addresses the consistency of priorities or perceptions, not the magnitude of implementation or a relationship between an intervention and an educational outcome. Accordingly, the study treated means and ranks as descriptive indicators while interpreting the significance tests within the narrower meaning of Kendall's coefficient of concordance.

The study is also relevant to established educational guidance. The relevant work by Department of Education, 2020 sets out a policy or research framework against which reported practices may be considered. Such guidance offers analytical context without transforming survey responses into direct observational evidence. The research questions therefore concerned the extent of practices in the specified setting, respondent-group agreement about their ordering, and implications for local educational improvement.

2. Methods

2.1 Design and setting

The study adopted a descriptive–evaluative–correlational survey using questionnaires and comparisons of respondent-group rankings. It investigated school heads' leadership and teachers' professional development in public secondary schools in Sagñay District, Division of Camarines Sur during the study period. The design was observational. Although the term “correlational” appeared in the design description, the inferential results reported in the study primarily concerned agreement among ranked indicators; the resulting statistics did not estimate causal effects or the strength of a learner-level association.

2.2 Participants and sampling

The reported study participants consisted of 184 respondents. Respondents were grouped by the school classifications or school groupings shown in the results. Survey estimates should be read in light of the actual respondent composition rather than as probability-sample estimates for all Philippine schools. Where the study did not provide distinct pupil assessments or repeated measures, teachers' accounts of student development were interpreted as perceptions.

2.3 Instrument and procedure

The study used a structured questionnaire or researcher-made rating scale encompassing the stated domains of school heads' leadership and teachers' professional development. Item-level statements were evaluated through the verbal-response categories and weighted-mean interpretation bands displayed with the study tables. The study described instrument preparation and administration through participating schools and used grouped ratings to address the research questions. Reported validity, reliability and response-handling details were not independently reconstructed or substituted where documentation was incomplete.

2.4 Data treatment and interpretation

The study reported frequency, percentage, weighted mean, rank, Kendall's W and chi-square. Weighted means described central tendencies in ordinal rating responses, while reported ranks established the relative order of indicators. Kendall's W described concordance in ranks across the specified school groups; related chi-square results were treated according to the reported thresholds. No new significance calculations, sample-based confidence intervals or unreported multivariable estimates were introduced. Tables reproduce printed figures, including any discrepancies requiring verification.

2.5 Ethical and reporting considerations

The study was reported using aggregated responses. Individual-level datasets, consent documentation, and institutional ethics reference numbers were not reproduced in the available study chapters, and none is supplied here as though verified. Interpretation avoids identifying individual teachers or learners and refrains from attributing perceived outcomes to the surveyed practices without appropriate longitudinal or comparative evidence.

3. Results

The tables present the numerical entries and response-scale labels reported for each domain. Domain-level means describe respondent ratings; significance tests refer to group rank concordance.

Table 1. Respondents and school group distribution

School Type	Teachers	Percentage
Big School		
Nato National High School	82	45
Medium Schools		
Turague National High School	23	13
Sibaguan Agro-Industrial High School	26	14
Catalotoan High School	18	10
Tinorongan National High School	12	7
Sub-total	79	43
Small Schools		
Jose T. Fuentebella National High School	8	4
Mabca National High School	11	6
Atulayan Integrated School	4	2
Sub-total	23	12
Grand Total	184	100

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of school heads' leadership and teachers' professional development, including operational aspects associated with instructional leadership. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of instructional leadership would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 2. Instructional leadership ratings

Indicators	Big School	Big School	Big School	Medium Schools	Medium Schools
INDICATORS	Wx	I	R	Wx	I
Provides clear instructional direction to teachers.	4.04	ME	3	3.88	ME
Ensures alignment of instruction with curriculum standards.	3.77	ME	6	3.66	ME
Encourages the use of effective teaching strategies.	3.55	ME	8	3.56	ME
Gives constructive feedback to teachers.	3.45	E	9	3.50	ME

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Promotes learner-centered instruction.	4.02	ME	4	3.67	ME
Monitors classroom teaching regularly.	3.78	ME	5	3.65	ME
Supports teachers in lesson planning.	4.12	ME	1	4.05	ME
Encourages innovation in teaching practices.	3.67	ME	7	3.55	ME
Conducts classroom observations consistently.	4.05	ME	2	4.45	ME
Average Wx	3.83	ME		3.77	ME

Note. Counts and statistical entries retain the study's reported values.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of school heads' leadership and teachers' professional development, including operational aspects associated with administrative and managerial skills. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of administrative and managerial skills would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 3. Administrative and managerial skills ratings

Indicators	Big School	Big School	Big School	Medium Schools	Medium Schools
Indicators	Wx	I	R	Wx	I
Manages school operations effectively.	4.25	ME	6	4.55	VME
Demonstrates good decision-making skills.	4.11	ME	8	4.04	ME
Organizes school activities efficiently.	4.45	ME	1	4.36	ME
Implements school policies properly.	4.44	ME	2	4.35	ME
Maintains accurate school records.	4.12	ME	7	4.05	ME
Manages time and resources wisely.	4.34	ME	5	4.22	ME
Resolves school issues promptly.	4.35	ME	4	4.43	ME
Delegates responsibilities fairly.	4.43	ME	3	4.46	ME
Average Wx	4.31	ME		4.31	ME

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of school heads' leadership and teachers' professional development, including operational aspects associated with transformational and relational leadership. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools. The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of transformational and relational leadership would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 4. Engagement in professional development ratings

Indicators	Big School	Big School	Big School	Big School	Medium Schools
INDICATORS	Wx	I	R	Wx	Wx
Facilitates school-based training programs.	3.57	ME	9	3.39	3.39
Participates actively in professional development activities.	3.56	ME	10	4.00	4.00
Supports teachers' continuing education.	3.87	ME	7	3.89	3.89
Provides opportunities for skills enhancement.	4.05	ME	6	4.06	4.06
Shares new knowledge and practices with teachers.	4.23	ME	4	4.11	4.11
Promotes mentoring and coaching among teachers.	4.12	ME	5	4.36	4.36
Encourages teachers to conduct educational research.	4.52	ME	1	4.22	4.22
Encourages teachers to attend seminars and trainings.	3.59	ME	8	4.01	4.01
Recognizes teachers' professional achievements.	4.32	ME	3	4.50	4.50
Encourages participation in learning communities.	4.44	ME	2	4.44	4.44
Average Wx	4.03	ME		4.10	4.10

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of school heads' leadership and teachers' professional development, including operational aspects associated with engagement in professional development. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of engagement in professional development would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 5. Summary of school heads' leadership ratings

Indicators	Big School	Big School	Big School	Big School	Medium Schools
INDICATORS	Wx	I	R	Wx	Wx
Instructional Leadership	3.83	ME	4	3.77	3.77
Administrative and Managerial Skills	4.31	ME	1	4.31	4.31
Transformational and Relational Leadership	3.84	ME	3	3.89	3.89
Engagement in Professional Development	4.03	ME	2	4.10	4.10
Average Wx	4.00	ME		4.02	4.02

Note. Counts and statistical entries retain the study's reported values.

The summary consolidates the domain-level ratings and makes visible the relative standing of major components of school heads' leadership and teachers' professional development. The relative order of these reported domains is more informative for local prioritization than the overall mean alone, because the domains may involve distinct resources and implementation processes.

An apparently favorable average does not mean every school implemented each activity equally or that learners experienced the same educational benefits. The reported categories reflect a survey scale; they should not be read as externally verified proficiency standards or comparable units of learning gain.

The practical use of this finding is diagnostic. Components with lower ratings, including potential constraints affecting seminars and workshops, may warrant closer monitoring, better implementation documentation and targeted professional support before a district-level improvement claim is made.

Table 6. Rank concordance across leadership domains

Indicators	Instructional Leadership	Administrative and Managerial Skills	Transformational and Relational Leadership	Engagement in Professional Development
Sum of squares of the difference	470	270	484	676.5
Number of Cases	9	8	9	10
Number of Groups	3	3	3	3
Coefficient of Concordance W	0.87	0.71	0.90	0.91
Computed x2 Value	20.88	14.91	21.60	24.57
Degree of Freedom	8	7	8	9
Tabular x2 value				
0.05	15.51	14.07	15.51	16.92
0.025	18.17	16.01	18.17	19.68
0.01	20.09	18.48	20.09	21.67
0.005	21.96	20.28	21.96	23.59
0.001	26.12	24.32	26.12	27.88
Decision on Alternative Hypothesis H1	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted
Significance of Agreement	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.005

This table addresses the study question concerning agreement in the ordering of the reported indicators. The statistical decision must be understood alongside the coefficient, chi-square value, number of ranked cases and stated significance level; it does not evaluate how strongly school heads' leadership and teachers' professional development changed in practice.

Concordance among school-group rank profiles is analytically different from agreement among all individual respondents. Particularly when some groups are smaller, highly similar aggregate rankings can coexist with unreported within-group variation. Conversely, a nonsignificant concordance result does not establish the absence of an educational practice.

The immediate implication is to examine whether the observed group differences reflect school circumstances, access to support or indicator interpretation. Follow-up work on professional learning communities could use school-level records, interviews, observation protocols or direct learner measures, depending on the outcome being investigated.

Table 7. Seminars and workshops ratings

Indicators	Big School	Big School	Big School	Medium Schools	Medium Schools
INDICATORS	Wx	I	R	Wx	I
Encourages attendance in seminars.	4.32	MI	5	4.22	MI
Provides budget support for trainings.	4.11	MI	9	4.05	MI
Aligns seminars with teachers' needs.	4.31	MI	6	4.32	MI
Shares information on available workshops.	4.45	MI	2	4.31	MI
Allows teachers to attend external trainings.	4.22	MI	7	4.3	MI
Requires participation in relevant seminars.	4.35	MI	3	4.21	MI
Invites experts as resource speakers.	4.21	MI	8	4.12	MI
Organizes in-house seminars.	3.89	MI	10	4.02	MI
Monitors teachers' participation in seminars.	4.52	VMI	1	4.34	VMI
Evaluates the impact of attended trainings.	4.33	MI	4	4.45	MI
AVERAGE Wx	4.27	MI		4.23	MI

Note. Counts and statistical entries retain the study's reported values.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of school heads' leadership and teachers' professional development, including operational aspects associated with coaching and mentoring. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of coaching and mentoring would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 8. Action research ratings

Indicators	Big School	Big School	Big School	Medium Schools	Medium Schools
INDICATORS	Wx	I	R	Wx	I
Provides research guidance.	4.44	MI	3	4.32	MI
Encourages conduct of action research.	4.50	VMI	1	4.45	MI
Supports topic identification.	4.33	MI	6	4.34	MI
Assists in proposal writing.	4.45	MI	2	4.49	MI
Allocates time for research.	4.43	MI	4	4.23	MI
Encourages data-based decision making.	4.35	MI	5	4.42	MI
Mentor teachers in research.	4.22	MI	8	4.15	MI
Reviews research outputs.	4.24	MI	7	4.31	MI
AVERAGE Wx	4.37	MI		4.34	MI

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of school heads' leadership and teachers' professional development, including operational aspects associated with online courses and webinars. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools. The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of online courses and webinars would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 9. Summary of professional-development influence ratings

Indicators	Big School	Big School	Big School	Medium Schools	Medium Schools
INDICATORS	Wx	I	R	Wx	I
Seminars and Workshops,	4.27	MI	4	4.23	MI
Professional Learning Community	4.22	MI	5	4.19	MI
Coaching and Mentoring	4.35	MI	3	4.44	MI
Online Courses and Webinar	4.37	MI	1.5	4.43	MI
Action Research	4.37	MI	1.5	4.34	MI
AVERAGE Wx	4.32	MI		4.33	MI

The summary consolidates the domain-level ratings and makes visible the relative standing of major components of school heads' leadership and teachers' professional development. The relative order of these reported domains is more informative for local prioritization than the overall mean alone, because the domains may involve distinct resources and implementation processes.

An apparently favorable average does not mean every school implemented each activity equally or that learners experienced the same educational benefits. The reported categories reflect a survey scale; they should not be read as externally verified proficiency standards or comparable units of learning gain.

The practical use of this finding is diagnostic. Components with lower ratings, including potential constraints affecting action research, may warrant closer monitoring, better implementation documentation and targeted professional support before a district-level improvement claim is made.

Table 10. Rank concordance across professional-development domains

Indicators	Seminars and Workshops	Professional Learning Community	Coaching and Mentoring	Online Courses and Webinar	Action Research
Sum of squares of the difference	588.5	644.5	470	240	330
Number of Cases	10	10	9	8	8
Number of Groups	3	3	3	3	3
Coefficient of Concordance W	0.79	0.87	0.87	0.63	0.87
Computed x2 Value	21.33	23.49	20.88	13.23	18.27
Degree of Freedom	9	9	8	7	7
Tabular x2 value 0.05	16.92	16.92	15.51	14.07	14.07

RESEARCH ARTICLE

0.025	19.68	19.68	18.17	16.01	16.01
0.01	21.67	21.67	20.09	18.48	18.48
0.005	23.59	23.59	21.96	20.28	20.28
0.001	27.88	27.88	26.12	24.32	24.32
Decision on Alternative Hypothesis H1	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted	Rejected	Accepted
Significance of Agreement	0.025	0.01	0.01	NS	0.025

This table addresses the study question concerning agreement in the ordering of the reported indicators. The statistical decision must be understood alongside the coefficient, chi-square value, number of ranked cases and stated significance level; it does not evaluate how strongly school heads' leadership and teachers' professional development changed in practice.

Concordance among school-group rank profiles is analytically different from agreement among all individual respondents. Particularly when some groups are smaller, highly similar aggregate rankings can coexist with unreported within-group variation. Conversely, a nonsignificant concordance result does not establish the absence of an educational practice.

The immediate implication is to examine whether the observed group differences reflect school circumstances, access to support or indicator interpretation. Follow-up work on instructional leadership could use school-level records, interviews, observation protocols or direct learner measures, depending on the outcome being investigated.

4. Discussion

Taken together, the findings suggest a differentiated profile of school heads' leadership and teachers' professional development within public secondary schools in Sagñay District, Division of Camarines Sur. Some domains were rated more favorably than others, but the study's comparisons concerned respondents' evaluations of program activity or practice. The interpretation should therefore emphasize the organization and visibility of those practices rather than unobserved changes in educational outcomes.

The domains must also be considered conceptually. For example, instructional leadership and action research involve different operational demands even when they appear in the same questionnaire. An overall rating cannot establish that schools have equivalent capacity, resources or instructional conditions. Follow-up should identify the precise activities behind each item and test whether respondents applied a shared meaning to the measurement scale.

The study's rank-concordance analysis makes an additional contribution by examining alignment in the order assigned to indicators. Kendall's W is sensitive to patterns of ranking among the selected groups; it does not assess causation, pupil-level correlations or improvements over time. A statistically significant result should therefore be explained as concordance of ordered profiles, while nonsignificant outcomes should not be called evidence that a practice was ineffective.

The cited scholarship and policy provide context but should not be treated as validating the local mean scores. Guidance from Department of Education, 2020, Department of Education, 2017, Desimone, 2009 highlights the importance of clearly specified practices, appropriate pedagogical support or relevant educational standards. Applying such guidance requires attention to local implementation, documentation and direct assessment rather than reliance on favorable response categories alone.

Implications for school administrators include establishing observable criteria for high-priority activities, checking participation and resource access across schools, and using professional conversations to determine why some dimensions received lower assessments. If the objective is to understand effects on actual teacher or learner performance, a subsequent design should add independent outcome data, repeated observations and an appropriate comparison framework.

The main limitations arise from the local scope of the respondents, reliance on reported ratings, the unequal or limited respondent groups in some analyses, and incomplete access to item-level observations for independent verification. In addition, the underlying survey cannot by itself separate the contribution of action research from other school, family, learner or policy influences. The conclusions therefore remain descriptive and context-specific; extension beyond the study setting requires additional evidence.

5. Conclusion

The study documented the reported status of school heads' leadership and teachers' professional development in public secondary schools in Sagñay District, Division of Camarines Sur. Its domain-level results and agreement tests offer an account of local respondent perceptions, areas of comparatively stronger implementation and aspects warranting closer attention. Reported means and statistical decisions were retained as presented, without reinterpretation as experimental effects.

The findings support evidence-informed review of instructional leadership, seminars and workshops and action research. Implementation monitoring, clearer criteria for rating performance, and direct observational or learner-level evidence are suitable priorities for further research. The study does not demonstrate that an individual practice caused an improvement in school, teacher or learner outcomes.

References

- [1] Department of Education. (2020). DO 24, s. 2020: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024-.pdf
- [2] Department of Education. (2017). DO 42, s. 2017: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2017/08/11/do-42-s-2017-national-adoption-and-implementation-of-the-philippine-professional-standards-for-teachers-2/>
- [3] Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher*, 38(3), 181–199. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X08331140>