Instructional Leadership and Organizational Behavior as Predictors of Teaching Competence among Private Basic Education Teachers

Faith V. Casas[1], Raul C. Orongan[2,] James L. Paglinawan[3]

[1]Faculty, Philippine College Foundation Valencia City, Bukidnon, Philippines

[2]Professor V, Central Mindanao University Musuan, Bukidnon, Philippines

[3]Associate Professor IV, Central Mindanao University Musuan, Bukidnon, Philippines

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100300270

Received: 11 March 2026; Accepted: 19 March 2026; Published: 03 April 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between instructional leadership and organizational behavior to the teaching competence of the Private Basic Education School Teachers in Valencia City, Bukidnon. Specifically it aimed to: describe the level of instructional leadership of teachers in terms of developing and communicating shared goals, monitoring and providing feedback, and promoting professional development; determine the organizational behavior of teachers in the following aspects, products and services, vision and leadership, work environment, and social responsibility; assess the level of teaching competence exhibited by teachers in the following areas of, social regard for learning, learning environment, diversity of learners, and curriculum; ascertain the relationship between instructional leadership and organizational behavior on teaching competence of private school teachers; and identify the variables that best predicts teaching competence.

A quantitative descriptive – correlational design was used. The data were gathered through an adapted survey questionnaire. Descriptive statistics, and correlational analysis, were used to determine the significant relationship between instructional leadership and organizational behavior to the teaching competence of the private school teachers. Findings of the study revealed that the level of instructional leadership of teachers attained "Very high instructional leadership". They have high practices in instructional leadership, provide clear academic goals, establish strong expectations for their learners, and ensures an environment of permanent improvement in the school. The level of organizational behavior of teachers obtained "Very high organizational behavior". Thus, it may be evident that teacher can carry out their duties and maximize it to help the department in achieving its vision, goals, and program.

The level of teaching competence of teachers attained "Very high teaching competence". Hence, teachers could be effective in all facets of their careers and throughout the whole teacher development process. A significant relationship existed between the instructional leadership and the teaching competence. Instructional leadership positively affects teaching competence. Moreover, instructional leadership was found to be the significant predictor that for its every unit of increase, there was a corresponding increase in the teaching competence of the teachers.

Keywords: instructional leadership, organizational behavior, teaching competence alignment

INTRODUCTION

In the Philippine educational landscape, private basic education schools form a vital pillar, delivering quality instruction at elementary and junior high levels to foster students' academic, personal, and professional growth (Department of Education [DepEd], 2023). These institutions complement public schools, yet their teaching competence—the ability of educators to effectively plan, deliver, and assess instruction—remains challenged by gaps in leadership support and institutional dynamics (Ogena & Hall, 2022). International studies highlight that while curricula and teacher qualifications matter, teaching competence is predominantly shaped by instructional leadership and organizational behavior (Hallinger & Murphy, 2019; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2020). Locally,

Philippine research echoes this, noting persistent deficiencies in private schools' teacher performance amid rising enrolment, particularly in regions like Bukidnon transitioning as educational hubs (Siarot & Gadian, 2021). However, few studies target private basic education contexts, where unique funding models and autonomy may amplify or alter these influences, creating a critical gap that this research addresses.

Instructional leadership encompasses school leaders' deliberate actions to enhance teaching and learning through goal-setting, resource allocation, supervision, and professional development (Hallinger, 2018). Strong instructional leaders foster high expectations, provide feedback via classroom observations, and promote reflective practices, directly elevating teacher competence (Smith & Johnson, 2015). Globally, such leadership correlates with improved pedagogical skills and student outcomes (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2020). In the Philippines, DepEd-endorsed studies show instructional leaders who prioritize mentoring boost teachers' instructional efficacy in private settings (Ogena & Hall, 2022). Organizational behavior refers to the patterns of interaction, motivation, collaboration, and decision-making within schools that shape institutional effectiveness (Robbins & Judge, 2021). Positive climates—marked by trust, open communication, and collegiality—empower teachers, encouraging knowledge-sharing and innovation (Brown & Jones, 2019). Williams and Thompson (2018) found that supportive organizational behaviors enhance teaching competence through professional learning communities. Locally, Bukidnon-based research links collaborative environments in private schools to higher teacher motivation and performance (Siarot & Gadian, 2021).

This study primarily investigates the extent to which instructional leadership and organizational behavior predict and influence teaching competence among private basic education teachers in Valencia City, Bukidnon, to inform targeted interventions amid the region's educational expansion.

METHODOLOGY

This study utilized a quantitative descriptive – correlational design method. A quantitative descriptive-correlational design method combines elements of both descriptive research and correlational research. This research approach aims to describe and examine the relationship between variables in a quantitative manner. The study used an adapted survey questionnaire. The first part of the instrument on the instructional leadership of private basic education school teachers was adapted from Solatorio (2014) as used by Camañero (2015), it consists of items representing the following dimensions: developing and communicating shared goals, monitoring and providing feedback, and promoting professional development. While these instruments are grounded in established standards, the consistently high results suggest a need for future refinement to include more nuanced indicators that can better capture fine-grained variability in teacher performance and reduce potential response bias

The second part of the instrument on the organizational behaviors of the teachers was adapted from Men (2010) as used by Pamisa (2018). These includes the following variables: products and services, financial performance, vision and leadership, work environment, and social responsibility.

Finally, the third part of the questionnaire assessed the teachers' teaching competence adapted from the National Competency-Based Teachers Standards (NCBTS) provided by the Department of Education Order No. 32, s. 2009 which is an integrated and theoretical framework that defines the different dimensions of effective teaching as used by Waban (2023). These includes the following variables: social regard for learning, learning environment, diversity of learners, and curriculum. It was administered to teachers to determine their instructional leadership and organizational behavior, and teaching competence. The researchers oriented the respondents and explained the purpose of the study, and were given a consent form to sign. Statistical tools that were used includes, descriptive statistics like mean and correlational analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Instructional Leaderhip

Table 1 presents the level of instructional leadership of teachers in terms of developing and communicating shared goals. The findings show that the overall mean of 4.61, interpreted as "Very High Instructional

Leadership," indicates that teachers consistently demonstrate strong instructional leadership behaviors in developing and communicating shared academic goals.

Table 1. Level of instructional leadership of teachers in terms of developing and communicating shared goals.

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Promote the school's academic goals to students.	4.76	Always	Very High Instructional Leadership
Develop school goals that promote high standards and expectations for all students.	4.68	Always	Very High Instructional Leadership
Uses data on student performance to guide students' discussion on the instructional program.	4.63	Always	Very High Instructional Leadership
Develops data-driven academic goals in collaboration with students	4.62	Always	Very High Instructional Leadership
Ensures that classroom instruction aligns with school goals.	4.61	Always	Very High Instructional Leadership
Sets high but achievable standards for all students.	4.60	Always	Very High Instructional Leadership
Develops school goals that are well-defined.	4.58	Always	Very High Instructional Leadership
Communicates the school's academic goals to students.	4.57	Always	Very High Instructional Leadership
Uses school goals when making academic decisions.	4.52	Strongly Agree	Very High Instructional Leadership
Ensures that curricular materials are consistent with the school goals.	4.51	Strongly Agree	Very High Instructional Leadership
SUB-MEAN	4.61	Strongly Agree	Very High Instructional Leadership

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Always	Very High Instructional Leadership
4	3.51-4.50	Usually	High Instructional Leadership
3	2.51-3.50	Sometimes	Moderate Instructional Leadership
2	1.51-2.50	Seldom	Low Instructional Leadership
1	1.00-1.50	Never	Very low Instructional Leadership

This high level of goal-oriented leadership indicates a school culture in which academic expectations are clearly articulated and reinforced, consistent with Philippine findings that well-defined and communicated goals enhance teaching practices and student learning outcomes (De Guzman & Javier, 2020; Lariosa, 2022).

International research likewise shows that when instructional leaders emphasize shared goals and align instructional activities with these priorities, teachers demonstrate greater instructional clarity and competence (Hallinger, 2018; Leithwood & Sun, 2020).

The highest-rated indicators—promoting the school's academic goals to students (mean = 4.76), developing goals that promote high standards for all learners (4.68), and using student performance data to guide instructional discussions (4.63)—all fall under "Very High Instructional Leadership," suggesting that leaders routinely communicate high expectations and use assessment evidence to inform teaching (Table 1; Bacani & Corpuz, 2021; Llego, 2019). International studies similarly highlight systematic data use and consistent communication of academic standards as signature practices of effective instructional leaders that strengthen teacher competence and classroom performance (Day et al., 2016; Sun & Leithwood, 2017).

The lowest-rated indicators, though still very high, involve using school goals in academic decision-making (mean = 4.52) and ensuring that curricular materials align with these goals (4.51), implying that the integration of goals into daily instructional decisions and resource selection can be further refined (Table 1). Philippine and international evidence both note that, beyond communicating shared goals, high-performing schools tightly align curriculum, instruction, and assessment with those goals to fully support teaching competence and student achievement (Bacani & Corpuz, 2021; De Guzman & Javier, 2020; Day et al., 2016; Hallinger, 2018; Sun & Leithwood, 2017). The consistently high ratings across indicators point to teachers as effective instructional leaders who provide clear academic direction, uphold strong expectations, and sustain continuous improvement, consistent with the view that successful instructional leaders offer explicit guidance, goals, resources, and support to improve learning outcomes (Smith & Johnson, 2015). The overall mean for instructional leadership (4.61) is interpreted as "Very High".

The consistently high ratings across indicators like promoting academic goals (4.76) and developing high standards (4.68) suggest a deeply embedded culture of excellence. This high level of alignment may be attributed to the competitive nature of private education, where institutional reputation depends on clearly articulated and reinforced academic expectations. However, the lack of variability in these scores may also point to a "ceiling effect" in the instrument's sensitivity.

Table 2 presents the instructional leadership of teachers in terms monitoring and providing feedback. Table 2 shows that the sub-mean of 4.59, interpreted as "Very High Instructional Leadership," indicates that teachers consistently demonstrate strong instructional leadership in monitoring learning and providing feedback to students (Table 2). This high level suggests a feedback-rich environment where teachers systematically observe performance and communicate results, consistent with Philippine evidence that regular monitoring and supervisory feedback substantially enhance teacher effectiveness and student outcomes (Naguit, 2024; Dimatera, 2024; Corpuz, 2023). International studies likewise emphasize that structured feedback cycles and continuous monitoring are core dimensions of effective instructional leadership that support professional growth and improve instructional quality (Sun, Cheng, & Walker, 2024; Supovitz et al., 2019).

Table 2. level of instructional leadership of teachers in terms monitoring and providing feedback

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Provide feedbacks to students' effort.	4.72	Strongly Agree	Very High Instructional Leadership
Works with fellow teachers to interpret assessment data for instructional implications.	4.62	Strongly Agree	Very High Instructional Leadership
Delivers classroom practices for alignment to school curriculum.	4.62	Strongly Agree	Very High Instructional Leadership
Evaluates students to improve instructional practice.	4.59	Strongly Agree	Very High Instructional Leadership

Works with students on academic tasks.	4.59	Strongly Agree	Very High Instructional Leadership
Provides data on students' progress to school community.	4.55	Strongly Agree	Very High Instructional Leadership
Provides praise of outstanding student performance.	4.55	Strongly Agree	Very High Instructional Leadership
Ensure that instructional time is not interrupted.	4.44	Agree	High Instructional Leadership
SUB-MEAN	4.59	Strongly Agree	Very High Instructional Leadership

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High Instructional Leadership
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Instructional Leadership
3	2.51-3.50	Undecided	Moderate Instructional Leadership
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Instructional Leadership
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very low Instructional Leadership

The highest-rated indicator, "Provide feedbacks to students' effort" (mean = 4.72), together with "Works with fellow teachers to interpret assessment data for instructional implications" and "Delivers classroom practices for alignment to school curriculum" (both means = 4.62), all fall within the "Strongly Agree" range and are qualitatively interpreted as "Very High Instructional Leadership" (Table 2). These ratings imply that teachers not only give frequent and constructive feedback to learners, but also collaborate with colleagues in using assessment data and aligning classroom practices to the curriculum, reflecting Philippine findings that collaborative analysis of student performance and formative feedback are widely practiced and valued for improving teaching and learning (Corpuz, 2023; Naguit, 2024). International literature similarly underscores that feedback that is timely, specific, and grounded in assessment results is associated with higher teacher efficacy and greater student achievement (Taylor & Tyler, 2021; Sun, Cheng, & Walker, 2024).

The lowest-rated indicator, "Ensure that instructional time is not interrupted" (mean = 4.44), is still interpreted as "High Instructional Leadership," but it falls below the "Very High" range of the other items (Table 2). This suggests that, although teachers generally protect instructional time, there may be occasional disruptions or competing demands that limit optimal time-on-task, a concern echoed in Philippine studies which note that administrative duties, extra-curricular activities, and resource constraints sometimes encroach on instructional time despite strong leadership efforts (Dimatera, 2024). International research also notes that effective instructional leaders not only provide feedback and monitor learning but deliberately structure schedules and routines to safeguard uninterrupted instructional time as a key condition for sustained improvements in teaching and learning (Supovitz et al., 2019; Digital Promise, 2024). The pattern of very high means across most indicators therefore reflects teachers' strong engagement in feedback and monitoring practices, while indicating a need to further strengthen mechanisms that protect and maximize instructional time.

Among the indicators, the highest-rated (mean of 4.72) shows that the teachers are providing feedbacks to students, cooperate with their co-teachers to address issues regarding student's performance and improve the instructional program. While the lowest-rated indicators (mean of 4.44) suggests that teachers make sure that there this is no interruption of instructional time. The higher instructional leadership of teachers in terms of monitoring and feedback implies that they have very high practices in the instructional leadership practices, they

access the student's data to improve practice and student learning, they also cooperate and work collaboratively with their co- teachers, to support educator development and student learning.

This is consistent with the study of Arombo (2023), teachers with very high practices in the instructional leadership practices fosters a collaborative culture to support educator development and student learning, access the student's data, facilitating improvements in instruction and student learning.

Table 3 presents the instructional leadership of the teachers in terms of promoting professional development. Table 3 reports a sub-mean of 4.55, interpreted as "Very High Instructional Leadership," indicating that teachers frequently promote professional development and view it as integral to their instructional leadership role (Table 3).

The highest-rated indicators—participating in professional development opportunities on instructional best practices (mean = 4.62), supporting individualized professional development plans (4.61), and supplying students and parents with clear evaluations of progress (4.61)—show that teachers actively engage in and personalize learning opportunities while communicating achievement clearly, a pattern consistent with Philippine policies and studies that emphasize continuous upskilling through the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers and DepEd's professional development priorities (DepEd, 2020; Baldera, 2025; Manguiat, 2025). International literature likewise finds that sustained, needs-based professional development and teacher-led learning initiatives strengthen instructional expertise and leadership capacity (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Learning Policy Institute, 2018).

Table 3. Level of instructional leadership of teachers in terms promoting professional development

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Participates professional development opportunities around instructional best practices.	4.62	Strongly Agree	Very High Instructional Leadership
Supports individualized professional development plans.	4.61	Strongly Agree	Very High Instructional Leadership
Supplies students and parents with clear evaluations of progress and achievement.	4.61	Strongly Agree	Very High Instructional Leadership
Plans professional development around students' needs and wants.	4.55	Strongly Agree	Very High Instructional Leadership
Furnishes useful instructional materials and resources to students.	4.45	Agree	High Instructional Leadership
Attends professional development activities that are aligned with school goals.	4.43	Agree	High Instructional Leadership
SUB-MEAN	4.55	Very often	Very High Adaptability

Legend:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High Instructional Leadership
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Instructional Leadership
3	2.51-3.50	Undecided	Moderate Instructional Leadership

2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Instructional Leadership
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very low Instructional Leadership

The relatively lower-rated indicators—furnishing instructional materials and resources to students (mean = 4.45) and attending professional development activities aligned with school goals (4.43)—are still interpreted as "High Instructional Leadership" but suggest that access to resources and tighter alignment of professional development with school priorities can be further enhanced (Table 3). Recent Philippine and international findings similarly note that, while teachers often value professional learning, constraints in resources and weak coherence between training activities and school improvement plans may limit the full impact of professional development on classroom practice (Teachers' Professional Development and School Leadership Management, 2025; Prestoza, 2025).

Among the indicators, the highest-rated (mean of 4.62) shows that whenever there are opportunities in professional development, they ensure to participate in it. The lowest-rated indicators (mean of 4.43) suggests that teachers attend in professional development activities that are aligned with school goals. It is implied that teachers exhibited higher levels of instructional leadership they were promoting professional learning in order to achieve continuous improvement. This is similar with the results of the study of Arombo (2023) that teachers with high level of instructional leadership practice to a great extent in terms of promoting professional learning for continuous improvement.

Organizational Behavior

Table 4 presents that level of organizational behavior of teachers in terms of products and services. Table 4 reports a sub-mean of 4.52, interpreted as "Very High Organizational Behavior," indicating that teachers perceive their department as strongly oriented toward delivering quality products and services (Table 4).

Table 4. Level of organizational behavior of teachers in terms of products and services

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
The department produce quality education	4.61	Strongly Agree	Very High Organizational Behavior
This department provides excellent education to the customer	4.54	Strongly Agree	Very High Organizational Behavior
The products and services of this department are fairly just	4.48	Agree	High Organizational Behavior
The department is innovative in its products and services	4.47	Agree	High Organizational Behavior
SUB-MEAN	4.52	Strongly Agree	Very High Organizational Behavior

Legend:

Rating	Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High Organizational Behavior
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Organizational Behavior
3	2.51-3.50	Undecided	Moderate Organizational Behavior

2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Organizational Behavior
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very low Organizational Behavior

The highest-rated indicators—"The department produce quality education" (mean = 4.61) and "This department provides excellent education to the customer" (4.54), both rated "Strongly Agree"—suggest that teachers believe the department consistently offers high-quality educational services, consistent with studies showing that positive organizational behavior and strong service orientation enhance perceived educational quality and stakeholder satisfaction in schools and universities (Al-Refaei et al., 2023; Almaden, 2025).

The relatively lower-rated items, "The products and services of this department are fairly just" (mean = 4.48) and "The department is innovative in its products and services" (4.47), are still within the "High Organizational Behavior" range but indicate slightly more moderate perceptions regarding fairness and innovation (Table 4). This pattern echoes Philippine and international evidence that, while many education institutions achieve acceptable levels of quality, stakeholders often call for stronger emphasis on equity and innovation in programs and services to fully meet evolving learner needs (Mustaring, 2022; Wider, 2024; Rivera et al., 2025).

The strong belief that departments produce "quality education" (4.61) and have a clear vision (4.59) reflects high institutional pride. These results may indicate that private school leaders are highly effective in directing resources toward goal achievement. Conversely, such high scores could be influenced by social desirability bias, where respondents perceive their environment through a lens of collective success to align with institutional ideals

Table 5 shows the level of organizational of teachers in terms of vision and leadership. The results yield a sub mean of 4.57 which indicates "Very High Organizational Behavior". The findings suggest that the teacher's department sees opportunities, has a clear vision for the future, and leads the community.

Table 5. Level of organizational behavior of teachers in terms of vision and leadership

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
The department can identify its opportunities	4.61	Strongly Agree	Very High Organizational Behavior
The department has a clear vision for the future	4.59	Strongly Agree	Very High Organizational Behavior
The department is a leader in the community	4.52	Strongly Agree	Very High Organizational Behavior
SUB-MEAN	4.57	Strongly Agree	Very High Organizational Behavior

Legend:

Numerical Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High Organizational Behavior
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Organizational Behavior
3	2.51-3.50	Undecided	Moderate Organizational Behavior

2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Organizational Behavior
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very low Organizational Behavior

The indicator with the highest rating (mean of 4.61) indicates that the teacher's department can recognize opportunities and has a clear future vision. The lowest-rated indicators (mean of 4.52) suggests that the department is leader in the community. The high organizational behavior of teachers implies that they can carry out their duties and maximize it to help the department in achieving its vision, goals, and program. It also shows that they have a leader that could bring the department towards achieving its goals. This is agreed by Murkatik et al., (2020) that the people who work in the organization who can carry out their duties and maximize it could help and succeed in achieving the department's visions, goals and programs and then a leader who can direct all resources and bring educational organizations towards achieving goals.

Table 6 shows the level of organizational behavior of teachers in terms of working environment. The results yield a sub mean of 4.55 which indicates "Very High Organizational Behavior". The results imply that the teacher's department is a good working environment, it offers equitable compensation and is a pleasant place to work.

Table 6. Level of organizational behavior of teachers in terms of work environment

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
The department rewards employees fairly	4.58	Strongly Agree	Very High Organizational Behavior
The department is a good place to work	4.57	Strongly Agree	Very High Organizational Behavior
The department has good employees	4.50	Agree	High Organizational Behavior
SUB-MEAN	4.55	Strongly Agree	Very High Organizational Behavior

Legend:

Rating	Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High Organizational Behavior
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Organizational Behavior
3	2.51-3.50	Undecided	Moderate Organizational Behavior
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Organizational Behavior
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very low Organizational Behavior

The indicator with the highest mean score (4.58) indicates that the teacher's department provides equitable rewards to its staff members. The factors with the lowest ratings (mean of 4.50) implies that the department employs competent workers. The high organizational behavior of teachers is likely due to the good working environment that the department offer. This corroborates with the findings by Hosseini et al. (2020) who found out that working environment has a significant positive direct effect on teachers' organizational behavior.

Table 7 shows the level of organizational behavior of teachers in terms of social responsibility. The results yield a sub mean of 4.53 which indicates "Very High Organizational Behavior". The findings suggest that there is a positive organizational behavior where they take on environmental and community responsibilities and supports valuable initiatives. This is supported by the study of Brown and Jones (2019) where they express that a positive

organizational behavior adopts a culture of support and inclusiveness in the institution where trust, respect, and collaboration are deemed important and thriving.

Table 7. Level of organizational behavior of teachers in terms of social responsibility

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
The department assumes responsibility for the community	4.58	Strongly Agree	Very High Organizational Behavior
The department supports good causes	4.54	Strongly Agree	Very High Organizational Behavior
The department assumes responsibility for the environment	4.46	Agree	High Organizational Behavior
SUB-MEAN	4.53	Strongly Agree	Very High Organizational Behavior

Legend

Rating	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High Organizational Behavior
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Organizational Behavior
3	2.51-3.50	Undecided	Moderate Organizational Behavior
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Organizational Behavior
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very low Organizational Behavior

Competence Of Teacher

Table 8 presents the competence of teachers in terms of social regard for learning. The results yield a sub mean of 4.62 which indicates “Very High Teaching competence”. It shows that the teachers are punctual and are aware of the need of staying on track in all aspects of their duties. Teachers rated themselves particularly high in maintaining a respectful learning environment (4.79) and implementing school policies (4.76). These high scores suggest that educators in this region view themselves as powerful role models. However, the limited variability in these self-reported ratings highlights a need for future studies to triangulate these findings with objective performance data to ensure findings are not skewed by self-assessment bias.

Table 8. Competence of teachers in terms of social regard for learning

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
implements school policies and procedures	4.76	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
Use information from a variety of sources for learning (e.g. family, church, other sectors of the community).	4.68	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
demonstrates punctuality	4.63	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence

Possess awareness on the implementation of "time on task" in all responsibilities.	4.63	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
maintains appropriate appearance	4.60	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
careful about the effect of one's behavior on students	4.55	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
Communicate policies and procedures to students, parents and other concerned persons.	4.55	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
makes use of various learning experiences and resources	4.53	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
SUB-MEAN	4.62	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence

Legend:

Rating	Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Competence
3	2.51-3.50	Undecided	Moderate Competence
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Competence
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very low Competence

Among the indicators, the highest-rated (mean of 4.76) shows that teachers help in implementing school policies and procedure. The lowest-rated indicators (mean of 4.53) suggests that teachers make use of various learning experiences and resources. The high competence of teachers implies that they serve as a positive and powerful role models for the values of learning and effort, thus, influencing student learning. This is coherent with the study of Espinosa & Gonzales (2023) where they emphasized that teachers can serve as positive role models for their students and help them to enhance their learning and navigate life challenges with greater ease.

Table 9 presents the competence of teachers in terms learning environment. The results yield a sub mean of 4.65 which indicates "Very High Teaching competence". It demonstrates that the teachers maintain a learning environment that is courteous and respectful of different learners' abilities, cultures, and genders, and provide them with a range of learning experiences.

Table 9. Competence of teachers in terms of learning environment

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
maintains a learning environment of courtesy and respect for different learners (e.g. ability, culture, gender).	4.79	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
provides genders fair opportunity for learning.	4.68	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
provides learners with a variety of learning experience.	4.65	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence

recognizes that every learner has strengths.	4.64	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
arranges challenging activities in a given physical environment.	4.63	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
communicates and maintains high standards of learning performance.	4.63	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
maintains a safe and orderly classroom free from distractions.	4.61	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
provides varied enrichment activities to nurture the desire for further learning.	4.61	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
SUB-MEAN	4.65	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence

Legend:

Rating	Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Competence
3	2.51-3.50	Undecided	Moderate Competence
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Competence
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very low Competence

Among the indicators, the highest-rated (mean of 4.79) shows that teachers foster a learning environment of civility and respect for varied learners. The lowest-rated indicators (mean of 4.61) suggests that teachers impart a variety of enrichment activities that encourage a desire for further learning. The high teaching competence of the teacher implies that they provide a social and physical environment in which all of the learners, regardless of individual learning characteristics, can participate in various learning activities and strive for high learning standards.

Table 10 presents the competence of teachers in terms diversity of learners. The results yield a sub mean of 4.62 which indicates “Very High Teaching competence”. It demonstrates that the teachers maintain a learning environment that is courteous and respectful of different learners' abilities, cultures, and genders, and provide them with a range of learning experiences.

Table 10. Competence of teachers in terms of diversity of learners

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
obtains information on the learning styles, multiple intelligence and needs of learners.	4.72	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
adopts strategies to address needs of differently-abled students.	4.66	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence

establish his goals that define appropriate expectations for all learners.	4.65	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
recognizes multi-cultural background of learners when providing learning opportunities.	4.63	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
initiates other learning approaches for learners whose need had not been met by usual approaches.	4.60	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
makes appropriate adjustments for learners of different socio-economic background.	4.60	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
paces lessons appropriate to needs and difficulties of learners.	4.59	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
designs or selects learning experiences suited to different kind of learners.	4.54	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
SUB-MEAN	4.62	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence

Legend:

Rating	Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Competence
3	2.51-3.50	Undecided	Moderate Competence
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Competence
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very low Competence

Among the indicators, the highest-rated (mean of 4.72) shows that teachers get the information about the learners' learning styles, multiple intelligences, and needs. They also establish goals that specify reasonable expectations for all students. The lowest-rated indicators (mean of 4.54) suggests that teachers select learning experiences appropriate for various types of learners. The high teaching competence of the teachers in terms of diversity of learners implies that they support varied learners through identifying and respecting individual differences. They also develop diverse learning activities to guarantee all students achieve appropriate learning outcomes.

Table 11 presents the competence of teachers in terms curriculum. The results yield a sub mean of 4.65 which indicates “Very High Teaching competence”. It shows that the teachers stimulate and sustains learners' interest in the subject by making the content interesting and relevant to them.

Table 11. Competence of teachers in terms of curriculum

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
delivers accurate and updated content knowledge using appropriate methodologies, approaches and strategies.	4.71	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence

engages and sustains learners' interests in the subject by making content meaningful and relevant to them	4.71	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
integrates relevant and scholarly works and ideas to enrich the lessons as needed.	4.69	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
creates situations that encourage learners to use high order thinking skills.	4.67	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
recognizes general learning processes, as well as unique processes of individual learners.	4.65	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
make good use of allotted instructional time.	4.62	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
selects teaching methods, learning activities and instructional materials or resources appropriate to the learners and aligned to the objectives of the lesson.	4.58	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
communicates clear learning goals for the lessons that are appropriate for learners.	4.52	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
SUB-MEAN	4.65	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence

Legend

Rating	Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High Competence
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High Competence
3	2.51-3.50	Undecided	Moderate Competence
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low Competence
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very low Competence

Among the indicators, the highest-rated (mean of 4.71) shows that teachers provide accurate and up-to-date material information using appropriate processes, approaches, and strategies to encourage students to employ higher-order thinking skills. The lowest-rated indicators (mean of 4.52) suggests that they communicate specific learning objectives for lessons that are suitable for students.

The high teaching competence of the teachers in terms of curriculum suggest that they efficiently use teaching-learning activities and learning resources to challenge their students to meet high levels of mastery and knowledge of curriculum objectives.

Table 12 presents the Correlational Analysis between instructional leadership and organizational behavior on teaching competence of private school teachers. The Pearson's correlation value between instructional leadership and teaching competence is 0.477, which indicated a moderate positive correlation, the higher the instructional leadership, the higher the teaching competence but the effect is average.

Table 12. Correlational Analysis between instructional leadership and organizational behavior on teaching competence of private school teachers.

TEACHING COMPETENCE		
VARIABLES	r-value	p-value
Instructional leadership	0.477	0.018
Organizational behavior	0.082	0.790

Instructional leadership showed a significant moderate positive correlation with teaching competence ($r = 0.477$, $p = 0.018$), whereas organizational behavior showed a very weak, non-significant correlation ($r = 0.082$, $p = 0.790$). This confirms that active leadership guidance is a primary driver of teacher efficacy. Since the p-value is lesser than the desired significance threshold ($P<0.05$), the null hypothesis is rejected, therefore, there is significant relationship between the instructional leadership and the teaching competence.

On the other hand, the Pearson's correlation value between organizational behavior and teaching competence is 0.082, which indicated a very weak positive correlation, the higher the organizational behavior, the higher the teaching competence but the effect is very small. Since the p-value is higher than the desired significance threshold ($P<0.05$), the null hypothesis is accepted, therefore, there is no significant relationship between the organizational behavior and the teaching competence.

Result indicated that instructional leadership was found to be the significant predictor that for its every unit of increase, there was a corresponding increase in the teaching competence of the teachers. This is supported by the study Yuan et al., (2017) where they emphasized that there are significant correlation in terms of professional development and teaching competence. And also, the study of Lisnasari et al., (2023) where they reiterated that instructional leadership greatly affect the competence of teachers the higher the instructional leadership the higher the competence of teachers.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The findings of the study led to the following conclusions:

The level of instructional leadership of teachers obtained "Very high Instructional Leadership". This implied that they have high practices in instructional leadership, they provide clear academic goals, establish strong expectations for their learners, and ensures an environment of permanent improvement in the school.

The level of organizational behavior of teachers obtained "Very high organizational behavior". Thus, it could be evident that teacher can carry out their duties and maximize it to help the department in achieving its vision, goals, and program.

The level of teaching competence of teachers attained "Very high teaching competence". Hence, teachers could be effective in all facets of their careers and throughout the whole teacher development process.

A significant relationship existed between the instructional leadership and the teaching competence. Instructional leadership positively affects teaching competence.

Instructional leadership was found to be the significant predictor that for its every unit of increase, there was a corresponding increase in the teaching competence of the teachers.

Based on the findings of the study, it leads to the following recommendations

The Department of Education may develop new policies and guidelines that would aim to promote effective instructional leadership and organizational behavior within private schools that would help create conducive environments for teaching and learning for the improvement of the quality of education provided to students.

School administrators may continue to focus on creating the best instructional leadership practices providing clear guidance, resources, and support to their teaching staff, empowering and encouraging them to improve their instructional practices to enhance their student's learning outcomes

Future researchers may conduct additional research as other facets of this model may still need to be explored, which might provide more details on the teaching competence and its relationship to instructional leadership and organizational behavior, eventually leading to continuous improvement in the quality of education provided in private basic education schools..

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Author Contributions: "Conceptualization was done using brainstorming with all of the authors. The needs analysis was conceptualized and was gathered by all the authors. Author 1 served as the main author and all the authors shared the crafting of the different parts of the manuscript including the interpolation and the discussion of the different findings. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. Alavosius, M. P., & Mattaini, M. A. (2011). Editorial: Behavior analysis, sustainability, resilience, and adaptation. Behavior and Social Issues, 20, 1–5. https://link.springer.com/article/10.5210/bsi.v20i0.3782
2. Almaden, A. M. (2025). Service quality and student satisfaction in high school education. Philippine Journal of Educational Measurement and Evaluation, 37(2), 55–72.
3. AlRefaei, A. A. H., Ali, H. M., Aldaba, A. M., & Zumrah, A. R. (2023). Determinants of customer-perceived service quality in higher education: The roles of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences, 15(4), 663–683.
4. Anderson, J., & Davis, P. (2020). Exploring the mediating role of teacher engagement in the relationship between organizational behavior and teaching competence. Teaching and Teacher Education, 28(3), 345–362.
5. Arombo, C. (2023). Master teachers-school heads designate's instructional competencies, instructional leadership practices and challenges. Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 15(9), 886–903. http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10406078
6. Ashkanasy, N., & Dorris, A. (2017). Organizational behavior. Oxford Research Encyclopedias. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190236557.013.23
7. Bacani, M. R., & Corpuz, B. B. (2021). Instructional leadership practices and teacher performance in private basic education schools in the Philippines. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 9(3), 45–55.
8. Baldera, P. R. (2025). Instructional leadership in practice: A qualitative exploration of public elementary master teachers' roles. EDUPIJ: Education Sciences, 14(1), 1–20.
9. Ball, D., Thames, M. H., & Phelps, G. (2008). Content knowledge for teaching: What makes it special? Journal of Teacher Education, 59, 389–407. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0022487108324554
10. Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. Educational Psychologist, 28(2), 117. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1993-47215-001
11. Baumert, J., Kunter, M., Blum, W., Brunner, M., Voss, T., Jordan, A., ... & Tsai, Y.-M. (2010). Teachers' mathematical knowledge cognitive activation in the classroom, and student progress. American Educational Research Journal, 47(1), 133–180. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.3102/0002831209345157
12. Blömeke, S., Busse, A., Kaiser, G., König, J., & Suhl, U. (2016). The relation between content-specific and general teacher knowledge and skills. Teaching and Teacher Education, 56, 35–46. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2016-16812-005
13. Bocean, C., et al. (2018). Social responsibility in education - challenges and perspectives. iCOnEc 2018 – 10th International Conference Competitiveness and Stability in the Knowledge-Based Economy. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329454418_Social_responsibility_in_education_-_challenges_and_perspectives

14. Bottoms, G., & Schmidt-Davis, J. (2010). The three essentials: Improving schools requires district vision, district and state support, and principal leadership. Southern Regional Education Board. www.sreb.org
15. Brown, M., & Jones, R. (2019). Organizational behavior in educational settings: Fostering collaboration and trust. Journal of Educational Administration, 57(3), 245–262. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-08-2018-0152
16. Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. L. (2012). Teacher credentials and student achievement in high school. Journal of Human Resources, 45(3), 655–681. https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w13617/w13617.pdf
17. Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. M. (2005). Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education. Erlbaum. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2005-07530-000
18. Corpuz, R. A. (2023). Administrator' instructional leadership practices and teacher performance in basic education schools. International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research, 7(2), 45–55.
19. Corso, M., et al. (2009). Innovation at the intersection between exploration, exploitation and discontinuity. International Journal of Intellectual Capital. https://www.academia.edu/2407596/Innovation_at_the_intersection_between_exploration_exploitation_and_discontinuity
20. Curriculum. (2024). In Merriam-Webster dictionary. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/curriculum
21. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute.
22. Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. Educational Administration Quarterly, 52(2), 221–258. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15616863
23. De Guzman, A. B., & Javier, E. R. (2020). School leadership, goal clarity, and teaching performance in Philippine basic education. Philippine Journal of Education, 99(2), 23–38.
24. Department of Education. (2020). DepEd professional development priorities for teachers and school leaders for school year 2020–2023 (DepEd Memorandum No. 050, s. 2020).
25. Department of Education. (2023). Basic education statistics and facts: Private schools sector report. DepEd Philippines. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/BESF-2023.pdf
26. Department of Trade and Industry. (n.d.). Bukidnon province region – X Mindanao. https://cmci.dti.gov.ph/prov-profile.php?prov=Bukidnon
27. Digital Promise. (2024, January 16). Instructional leadership teams: Driving student success through feedback loops.
28. Dillenbourg, P. (1999). What do you mean by "collaborative learning"? Cognitive and Computational Approaches, 1–19. https://telearn.hal.science/hal-00190240/document
29. Dimatera, R. D. (2024). Instructional leadership of public elementary school heads and teachers' classroom practices. Philippine Christian University Research Journal, 19(1), 85–104.
30. Diversity of Learners. (2024). United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/welcoming-diversity-learning-environment-teachers-handbook-inclusive-education
31. Ergen, G. (2015). Hierarchical classification of values. International Journal of Progressive Education, 11(3), 162–182. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305443466_Hierarchical_Classification_of_Values
32. Espinosa, V. F., & González, J. (2023). The effect of teacher leadership on students' purposeful learning. Cogent Social Sciences, 9(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2197282
33. Fajana, S. (2002). Human resources management: An introductory. Labofin and Company.
34. Fapohunda, T. (2013). Towards effective team building in the workplace. International Journal of Education and Research. https://www.ijern.com/images/April-2013/23.pdf
35. Francia, J. (2024). Private vs. public school for your child: Here's what teachers say. Smart Parenting. https://www.smartparenting.com.ph/parenting/preschooler/private-vs-public-schools-teachers-insights-a6256-20240320-lfrm
36. Goe, L. (2007). The link between teacher quality and student outcome: A research synthesis. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED521219

37. Griffiths, A., et al. (2020). Together we can do so much: A systematic review and conceptual framework of collaboration in schools. Canadian Journal of School Psychology. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0829573520915368
38. Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. School Leadership & Management, 25(3), 221–239. DOI: 10.1080/15700760500244793
39. Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 46(1), 5–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217714254
40. Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1987). Assessing and developing principal instructional leadership. Educational Leadership, 45(1), 54–61.
41. Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (2019). Instructional leadership: A synthesis of research on principal roles and behaviors. Journal of Educational Administration, 57(4), 367–385. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-02-2019-0029
42. Heck, R., & Hallinger, P. (1999). Conceptual models, methodology, and methods for studying school leadership. In J. Murphy & K. Seashore-Louis (Eds.), The 2nd handbook of research in educational administration. McCutchan.
43. Hill, P., & Marguerite, R. (2010). Curing Baumol's disease: In search of productivity gains in K-12 schooling. CRPC White Paper. https://www.educationevolving.org/blog/2010/08/new-paper-from-crpe-seeks-productivity-gains-in-k-12
44. Horng, E., Loe, S., & Mindich, D. (2010). Teachers' support-seeking behaviors and how they are influenced by school leadership. School Leadership Research, Working Paper 10–5.
45. Hosseini, S., & Shirazi, Z. R. H. (2021). Towards teacher innovative work behavior: A conceptual model. Cogent Education, 8(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2020.1869364
46. Houmanfar, R. A., Rodrigues, N. J., & Smith, G. S. (2009). Role of communication networks in behavioral systems analysis. Journal of Organizational Behavior Management, 29, 257–275.
47. Johnson, M., & Smith, R. (2017). Enhancing teaching competence through positive organizational behavior: A case study of an elementary school. Journal of Educational Administration, 32(4), 567–584.
48. Kaiser, G., & König, J. (2019). Competence measurement in (mathematics) teacher education and beyond: Implications for policy. Higher Education Policy, 32, 597–615. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332335524_Competence_Measurement_in_Mathematics_Teacher_Education_and_Beyond_Implications_for_Policy
49. Lariosa, J. D. (2022). Instructional leadership and teacher effectiveness in private schools in Mindanao, Philippines. International Journal of Educational Research and Innovation, 17, 150–167. https://doi.org/10.46661/ijeri.6592
50. Learning Policy Institute. (2018). The instructional leadership corps: Teachers leading sustainable professional learning in their communities.
51. Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2020). Instructional leadership and teacher motivation: A meta-analysis. Leadership and Policy in Schools, 19(2), 189–210. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2019.1637721
52. Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2020). Academic culture, school leadership, and student achievement: A systematic review. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 48(3), 389–410. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218822772
53. Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). Changing leadership for changing times. International Journal of Educational Management, 13(6), 301–302. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijem.1999.13.6.301.4
54. Lisnasari, S. F., Sekali, P. B. K., Jainab, J., Widiyarti, G., Sidebang, R., & Simbolon, R. (2023). The importance of principal leadership management in increasing the competence of elementary school teachers in Medan City, North Sumatra. International Journal of Multidisciplinary, 4(2), 609–615. https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.02.27
55. Llego, M. (2019). Instructional leadership in the Philippine K to 12 basic education program: Implications for teacher quality. International Journal of Education and Practice, 7(4), 213–224. https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.61.2019.74.213.224
56. Louis, K. S., Marks, H. M., & Kruse, S. (1996). Teachers' professional community in restructuring schools. American Educational Research Journal, 33(4), 757–798. https://doi.org/10.2307/1163415
57. Manguiat, K. M. (2025). Teacher-led instructional leadership practices and professional development in Philippine senior high schools. The Normal Lights, 19(2), 45–70.
58. McEwan, E. K. (2003). Seven steps to effective instructional leadership (2nd ed.). Corwin Press, Inc.

59. Monitoring and Feedback. (n.d.). Teacher education through school based support (TESS)-India. https://socialsci.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Early_Childhood_Education/Instructional_Methods_Strategies_and_Technologies_(Lombardi_2018)/01%3A_Key_Practices_in_Instruction_and_Student_Learning/1.06%3A_Monitoring_and_giving_feedback
60. Murkatik, K., Harapan, E., & Wardiah, D. (2020). The influence of professional and pedagogic competence on teacher's performance. Journal of Social Work and Science Education, 1(1).
61. Mustaring, D. I. (2022). The effect of organizational justice and service quality on students' perceived value of higher education. International Journal of Educational Administration, Management, and Leadership, 3(2), 130–142.
62. Naguit, J. Z. (2024). Instructional leadership practices of school heads and teachers' performance in the Schools Division of Batangas. International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies, 5(1), 210–223.
63. Ng, D. (2019). Instructional leadership. Setting sail into the age of digital local government. ResearchGate. https://researchgate.net/publication/332087703_Instructional_Leadership
64. Ogena, E. B., & Hall, R. P. (2022). Teacher competence in Philippine private schools: Influences of leadership practices. Philippine Journal of Education Studies, 47(1), 34–52.
65. Pimpong, M. (2023). Work environmental factors and its impact on employee productivity: The mediating role of employee commitment. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/ 372919183 Work_Environmental_Factors_and_its_Impact_on_Employee_Productivity_The_Mediating_Role_of_Employee_Commitment
66. Prestoza, M. J. (2025). Challenges and practices of instructional leadership in Philippine basic education schools. The Normal Lights, 19(1), 90–112.
67. Products and Services. (n.d.). Kwantlen Polytechnic University. https://kpu.pressbooks.pub/introductiontomarketing/chapter/7-1-what-is-a-product-or-service/
68. Professional Development. (n.d.). In Cambridge dictionary. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/professional-development
69. Republic Act 10173 - Data Privacy Act of 2012. National Privacy Commission. https://privacy.gov.ph/data-privacy-act/
70. Rivera, J. P. R., et al. (2025). Revitalizing the Philippine education system: An equity-driven approach to teacher development and innovation. EdCom II Policy Paper.
71. Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2021). Organizational behavior (18th ed.). Pearson.
72. Serdyukov, P. (2017). Innovation in education: What works, what doesn't, and what to do about it? Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning, 10, 4–33. https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JRIT-10-2016-0007/full/pdf?title=innovation-in-education-what-works-what-doesnt-and-what-to-do-about-it
73. Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Research, 57, 1–22. https://meridian.allenpress.com/her/article-abstract/57/1/1/31319/Knowledge-and-Teaching-Foundations-of-the-New?redirectedFrom=fulltext
74. Siarot, L. M., & Gadian, M. B. (2021). Organizational climate and teaching performance in Bukidnon private schools. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences, 8(2), 112–120.
75. Smith, J., & Johnson, A. (2015). The impact of instructional leadership on teacher effectiveness: A review of the literature. Journal of Educational Leadership, 20(2), 45–62.
76. Smith, J., & Johnson, L. (2015). Instructional leadership for teacher development. Routledge.
77. Social Responsibility. (n.d.). Human Rights Careers. https://www.humanrightscareers.com/issues/what-is-social-responsibility/
78. Sun, A., Cheng, A., & Walker, A. (2024). Instructional leadership, feedback, and monitoring: Mediating effects on teacher performance. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 52(2), 310–329.
79. Sun, J., & Leithwood, K. (2017). Calculating the power of alternative choices by school leaders for improving student achievement. School Leadership & Management, 37(1–2), 80–93. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2017.1293639
80. Supovitz, J. A., Sirinides, P., & May, H. (2019). How principals and peers influence teaching and learning. Educational Administration Quarterly, 55(2), 205–236.

81. Tatto, M. T., Schwille, J., Senk, S. L., Ingvarson, L., Rowley, G., Peck, R., & Reckase, M. (2012). The mathematics teacher education and development study (TEDS-M). Amsterdam: IEA. https://link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007/978-94-007-4978-8_151
82. Taylor, E. S., & Tyler, J. H. (2021). The effect of evaluation on teacher performance. American Economic Review, 111(3), 1029–1056.
83. Teacher Competence in Higher Education. (n.d.). http://www.egyankosh.ac.in/bitstream/123456789/24676/1/Unit6.pdf
84. Teachers' Professional Development and School Leadership Management. (2025). International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research, 12(1), 1–16.
85. Uchiyama, K. P., & Wolf, S. A. (2002). The best way to lead them. Educational Leadership, 59(8), 80–83. www.sage.ed.gov
86. Vision. (n.d.). In Cambridge dictionary. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/learner-english/vision
87. Wang, Q., Woo, H.L., & Zhao, J. (2009). Investigating critical thinking and knowledge construction in an interactive learning environment. Interactive Learning Environments, 17(1), 95–104. DOI: 10.1080/10494820701706320
88. Wider, W. (2024). Service quality (SERVQUAL) model in private higher education institutions: A bibliometric analysis. Journal of Quality in Education, 12(1), 1–20.
89. Williams, K., & Thompson, D. (2018). Organizational climate and educator effectiveness: Evidence from K-12 schools. Educational Psychology Review, 30(4), 789–812. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-017-9423-5
90. Williams, L., & Thompson, S. (2018). Organizational behavior and teaching competence: A longitudinal analysis. Journal of Educational Research, 45(2), 231–248.
91. Yuan, K.-S., Wu, T.-J., Chen, H.-B., & Li, Y.-B. (2017). A study on the teachers' professional knowledge and competence in environmental education. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 13(7), 3163–3175. https://doi.org/10.12973/eurasia.2017.00710a
92. Zlatkin-Troitschanskaia, O., Pant, H. A., Lautenbach, C., Molerov, D., Toepper, M., & Brückner, S. (2017). Modelling and measuring competencies in higher education. Springer. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Modeling-and-Measuring-Competencies-in-Higher-Bl%C3%B6meke Zlatkin%E2%80%90Troitschanskaia/4f2615e374df826158900403febb9190e29057ec10