



PEDAGOGICAL LEADERSHIP AND TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE IN CLUSTER 3 SCHOOLS OF CALAMBA CITY

Maria Etherliza T. Terrible

MAED Major in Administration and Supervision, Laguna College of Business and Arts, Calamba City, Laguna, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between the pedagogical leadership manifestation of school heads and teachers' performance in public elementary schools under Cluster 3 of the Schools Division of Calamba City during School Year 2025–2026. Anchored on Transformational Leadership Theory and the Theory of Teacher Self-Efficacy, the study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to measure the level of pedagogical leadership in terms of developing relationships, collecting and analyzing evidence, providing constructive feedback, learning collaboratively, and providing relevant resources and teachers' performance based on the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). Statistical tools used in the analysis included weighted mean, standard deviation, independent samples t-test, and Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. The significant difference emerged between school heads and teachers' perceptions of leadership, though no difference was found in performance ratings. Results further indicated a low to moderate positive correlation between pedagogical leadership and teacher performance, suggesting that stronger leadership practices are associated with higher teacher effectiveness. Based on the findings, an action plan was proposed to strengthen pedagogical leadership, enhance instructional support, and improve teacher performance in Cluster 3 in Calamba City.

Keywords: *pedagogical leadership, teacher's performance, school head, PPST, public school teachers*

INTRODUCTION

Globally, pedagogical leadership has emerged as a central force in advancing quality education, with studies showing that principals who emphasize instructional oversight significantly enhance teacher efficacy and classroom outcomes (Pietsch et al., 2025). This leadership paradigm extends beyond administrative functions, prioritizing collaboration, inquiry, and evidence-based decision-making to address inequities in learning. In the Philippine context, the Department of Education (DepEd) aligns with the Sustainable Development Goal of inclusive and equitable education, underscoring the importance of literacy, numeracy, and lifelong learning opportunities for all learners.

Within Calamba City, public elementary schools reflect national challenges while facing unique pressures from rapid urbanization and industrial growth. Academic recovery programs in 2022–2023 yielded moderate progress, yet only 65% of Grade 3 learners achieved basic reading benchmarks (Villeza et al., 2024). Cluster-based leadership initiatives, such as instructional coaching, improved teacher evaluation scores by 15% (DepEd Calamba City, 2025), but Cluster 3 schools continued to lag behind city averages due to high student-teacher ratios and delayed post-pandemic adjustments. These localized challenges highlight the need for stronger leadership practices to sustain learning recovery and improve performance outcomes.

The urgency of this study lies in addressing pandemic-driven learning losses, averaging 1.5 years in foundational skills, compounded by teacher attrition and equity gaps (Baño, 2025; World Bank, 2024; UNESCO, 2023). Literature consistently emphasizes that teacher performance, strengthened through professional development and reflective practice, is a powerful determinant of student achievement (Solatorio, 2024; Camral & Sumayo, 2025; Almonacid-Fierro et al., 2023). However, no localized study has yet examined how pedagogical leadership influences teacher performance across the domains of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) and how these collectively shape learner outcomes. This research addresses that gap, offering timely evidence to guide DepEd's Matatag Agenda and support equitable learning recovery in Cluster 3 schools.

Research Questions

This study investigated the interplay between pedagogical leadership manifestation level and teachers' performance in the schools under Cluster 3 of Calamba City. It sought to determine how the instructional and pedagogical approaches of school leaders can relate to teachers' performance.

In particular, the purpose of this study was to respond to the following questions:

1. What is the manifestation level of pedagogical leadership of school heads in Cluster 3 schools as assessed by the school heads and teachers in terms of:
 - 1.1 Developing Relationships,
 - 1.2 Collecting and Analyzing Evidence,
 - 1.3 Providing Constructive Feedback,

- 1.4 Learning Collaboratively, and
- 1.5 Providing Relevant Resources?
2. What is the teachers' performance level through PPST in Cluster 3 school assessed by the school heads and teachers in terms of:
 - 2.1. Content Knowledge and Pedagogy,
 - 2.2. Learning Environment,
 - 2.3. Diversity of Learners,
 - 2.4. Assessment and Reporting, and
 - 2.5. Community Linkages and Professional Engagement?
3. Is there a significant difference in the assessment of school heads and teachers' pedagogical leadership manifestation and teachers' performance levels?
4. Is there a significant relationship between pedagogical leadership manifestation and teachers' performance levels?
5. Based on the findings of the study, what action plan may be proposed?

Hypotheses

As for the problems presented above, the null hypotheses were tested for the significance:

Ho1: There is no significant difference between the assessment of school heads and teachers in the pedagogical leadership manifestation and teachers' performance levels.

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between pedagogical leadership manifestation and teachers' performance level.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study used quantitative descriptive correlational research design. It is a type of non-experimental research method that aims to systematically measure the relationships between two or more variables without the researcher manipulating or influencing them (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). This approach allowed researchers to assess whether changes in one variable were related to changes in another, thereby identifying patterns and potential predictive relationships within a naturally occurring context (Ahmad et al., 2024). The design enabled the researcher to collect numerical data through surveys and archival records and then use statistical analyses to measure the strength and significance of the links between the variables.

Research Locale

The study was conducted in the following six public elementary schools in Cluster 3 of the Schools Division of Calamba City. The researcher selected Cluster 3 as the locale

of the study because she belonged to this cluster and has directly observed variations in pedagogical leadership practices and teacher performance.

Population and Sampling

The researcher employed a multi-stage sampling design, combining purposive and proportional random techniques to select 140 respondents from a population of 258, using G*Power with an effect size of 0.30. All five public elementary schools in Cluster 3 were purposively chosen to capture the specific DepEd Calamba City context. Within each school, proportional random sampling ensured teacher representation according to school size, minimizing bias and enhancing generalizability.

Instrument

Part 1: The Pedagogical Leadership survey was adapted from Hallinger & Murphy's (1985) PIMRS and Leithwood & Jantzi's (2000) Transformational Leadership Inventory, with items aligned to sub-variables such as Relationships, Evidence Analysis, Feedback, Collaboration, and Resource Provision. Items were contextualized for Philippine public schools (e.g., supervision reframed as constructive feedback, vision tied to DepEd's Matatag Agenda) and measured on a 4-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree to 4=Strongly Agree).

Part 2: The Teacher Performance survey was anchored on the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) within DepEd's RPMS. Key indicators from the five PPST domains; Content Knowledge, Learning Environment, Diversity of Learners, Assessment, and Community Linkages, were translated into observable behaviors for self-assessment. Performance was rated on a 4-point scale (1=Poor to 4=Outstanding), ensuring alignment with national standards and local context.

Validation of the Instrument

After adaptation, the survey was validated by a panel of experts, whose feedback refined item clarity and relevance. It was then pilot tested with 20–30 teachers from a non-sample public elementary school. Reliability analysis showed strong internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha: 0.92 for pedagogical leadership, 0.87 for teacher performance), and the Content Validity Index reached 1.00. Minor wording adjustments produced the final instrument.

Data Gathering Procedure

Data collection followed systematic and ethical steps. The researcher first secured approval from the Schools Division Superintendent of Calamba City, then from the School Heads of the five Cluster 3 schools. Confidentiality and voluntary participation were emphasized through consent forms. Surveys were administered in both printed and online formats (via Google Forms) to accommodate teacher preferences and access. All data were consolidated into a single database using SPSS or Excel, then cleaned and analyzed by a licensed statistician to address the research questions.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequency, mean, standard deviation, and 4-point Likert scale) for Problems 1, 2, and 5. An independent t-test was applied to Problem 3 to compare school heads and teachers. Inferential statistics were used for Problem 4 to examine variable relationships, while Pearson's correlation coefficient measured the link between pedagogical leadership and teacher performance. The findings served as the foundation for an enhancement plan designed to strengthen leadership practices and advance conflict management strategies within the institution.

Scope and Limitations

This quantitative descriptive-correlational study examined the relationship between pedagogical leadership and teacher performance in public elementary schools of Cluster 3, Schools Division of Calamba City. Pedagogical leadership was assessed through five sub-variables, developing relationships, evidence analysis, constructive feedback, collaborative learning, and resource provision, while teacher performance was measured using the domains of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). The study was limited to 140 teachers and 5 school heads from Cluster 3, with data collected during School Year 2025–2026 and excluded private schools and other clusters within the division.

RESULTS

Table 1.1

Manifestation Level of Pedagogical Leadership of School Heads in Cluster 3 Schools as assessed by the School Heads and Teachers in terms of Developing Relationships

Indicators The school head...	School Heads		Teachers		Composite		Rank
	$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	
1. fosters positive and trusting relationships with teachers to support instructional improvement.	4.00	FM	3.78	FM	3.89	FM	2.5
2. encourages open communication and collaboration among staff members.	4.00	FM	3.76	FM	3.88	FM	4
3. builds a supportive school culture that values teachers' professional growth.	4.00	FM	3.79	FM	3.90	FM	1
4. demonstrates empathy and respect in interactions with teachers.	4.00	FM	3.78	FM	3.89	FM	2.5
5. promotes team-building activities to strengthen staff relationships.	3.80	FM	3.75	FM	3.78	FM	5
GENERAL ASSESSMENT	3.96	FM	3.77	FM	3.87	FM	
STANDARD DEVIATION					0.440		

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Strongly Agree/ Fully Manifested 1.75 – 2.49 Disagree/ Partially Manifested
2.50 – 3.24 Agree/ Manifested 1.00 – 1.74 Strongly Disagree/ Not Manifested

Table 1.2

Manifestation Level of Pedagogical Leadership of School Heads in Cluster 3 Schools as assessed by the School Heads and Teachers in terms of Collecting and Analyzing Evidence

Indicators The school head...	School Heads		Teachers		Composite		Rank
	$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	
1. regularly gathers data on teaching practices through classroom observations.	4.00	FM	3.74	FM	3.87	FM	2.5
2. uses student performance data to identify areas for instructional improvement.	4.00	FM	3.73	FM	3.87	FM	2.5
3. analyzes evidence from multiple sources to inform decision-making.	4.00	FM	3.74	FM	3.87	FM	2.5
4. shares analyzed data with teachers to guide their professional development.	4.00	FM	3.73	FM	3.87	FM	2.5
5. employs systematic methods for collecting feedback on school programs.	3.80	FM	3.73	FM	3.77	FM	5
GENERAL ASSESSMENT	3.96	FM	3.74	FM	3.85	FM	
STANDARD DEVIATION					0.443		
Legend: 2.5 – 4.00 Strongly Agree/ Fully Manifested 1.75 – 2.49 Disagree/ Partially Manifested 2.50 – 3.24 Agree/ Manifested 1.00 – 1.74 Strongly Disagree/ Not Manifested							

Table 1.3

Manifestation Level of Pedagogical Leadership of School Heads in Cluster 3 Schools as assessed by the School Heads and Teachers in terms of Providing Constructive Feedback

Indicators The school head...	School Heads		Teachers		Composite		Rank
	$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	
1. offers specific, actionable feedback to teachers after observations.	4.00	FM	3.72	FM	3.86	FM	4
2. ensures feedback is timely and focused on improving teaching effectiveness.	4.00	FM	3.77	FM	3.89	FM	1
3. balances positive reinforcement with areas for growth in feedback sessions.	4.00	FM	3.73	FM	3.87	FM	2.5
4. follows up on feedback to monitor progress and provide ongoing support.	4.00	FM	3.73	FM	3.87	FM	2.5
5. trains teachers on how to use feedback for self-improvement.	4.00	FM	3.68	FM	3.84	FM	5
GENERAL ASSESSMENT	4.00	FM	3.73	FM	3.87	FM	
STANDARD DEVIATION					0.447		
Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Strongly Agree/ Fully Manifested 1.75 – 2.49 Disagree/ Partially Manifested 2.50 – 3.24 Agree/ Manifested 1.00 – 1.74 Strongly Disagree/ Not Manifested							

Table 1.4

Manifestation Level of Pedagogical Leadership of School Heads in Cluster 3 Schools as assessed by the School Heads and Teachers in terms of Learning Collaboratively

Indicators The school head...	School Heads		Teachers		Composite		Rank
	$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	
1. facilitates professional learning communities where teachers collaborate.	4.00	FM	3.81	FM	3.91	FM	1
2. participates in joint learning activities with teachers.	4.00	FM	3.79	FM	3.90	FM	2
3. encourages peer observations and shared lesson planning.	4.00	FM	3.74	FM	3.87	FM	4.5
4. models lifelong learning by engaging in professional development.	4.00	FM	3.76	FM	3.88	FM	3
5. promotes collaborative problem-solving for instructional challenges.	4.00	FM	3.73	FM	3.87	FM	4.5
GENERAL ASSESSMENT	4.00	FM	3.77	FM	3.89	FM	
STANDARD DEVIATION					0.418		

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Strongly Agree/ Fully Manifested 1.75 – 2.49 Disagree/ Partially Manifested
2.50 – 3.24 Agree/ Manifested 1.00 – 1.74 Strongly Disagree/ Not Manifested

Table 1.5

Manifestation Level of Pedagogical Leadership of School Heads in Cluster 3 Schools as assessed by the School Heads and Teachers in terms of Providing Relevant Resources

Indicators The school head...	School Heads		Teachers		Composite		Rank
	$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	
1. allocates resources (e.g., materials, time) to support effective teaching.	4.00	FM	3.68	FM	3.84	FM	3
2. ensures access to professional development opportunities for teachers.	4.00	FM	3.74	FM	3.87	FM	1
3. provides technology and tools to enhance classroom instruction.	4.00	FM	3.70	FM	3.85	FM	2
4. identifies and distributes relevant research or best practices to staff.	3.80	FM	3.65	FM	3.73	FM	5
5. budgets for resources that address specific teacher and learner needs.	4.00	FM	3.64	FM	3.82	FM	4
GENERAL ASSESSMENT	4.00	FM	3.68	FM	3.82	FM	
STANDARD DEVIATION					0.508		

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Strongly Agree/ Fully Manifested 1.75 – 2.49 Disagree/ Partially Manifested
2.50 – 3.24 Agree/ Manifested 1.00 – 1.74 Strongly Disagree/ Not Manifested

Table 2.1

Teachers' Performance Level through PPST in Cluster 3 Schools as assessed by the School Heads and Teachers in terms of Content Knowledge and Pedagogy

The teachers...	Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Composite		Rank
		$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	
1.	demonstrate deep understanding of subject matter and apply it effectively in teaching.	3.60	VG	3.88	VG	3.74	VG	2
2.	use varied teaching strategies to engage learners.	3.60	VG	3.85	VG	3.73	VG	3
3.	integrate technology and innovative methods in pedagogy.	3.60	VG	3.84	VG	3.72	VG	4.5
4.	align instructional goals with curriculum standards.	3.80	VG	3.84	VG	3.82	VG	1
5.	adapt teaching to promote critical thinking and problem-solving.	3.60	VG	3.83	VG	3.72	VG	4.5
GENERAL ASSESSMENT		3.64	VG	3.85	VG	3.75	VG	
STANDARD DEVIATION						0.365		

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Strongly Agree/ Very Good
2.50 – 3.24 Agree/ Good

1.75 – 2.49 Disagree/ Fair
1.00 – 1.74 Strongly Disagree/ Poor

Table 2.2

Teachers' Performance Level through PPST in Cluster 3 Schools as assessed by the School Heads and Teachers in terms of Learning Environment

The teachers...	Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Composite		Rank
		$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	
1.	create a safe and inclusive classroom atmosphere.	3.80	VG	3.88	VG	3.84	VG	4.5
2.	manage classroom behavior effectively to minimize disruptions.	4.00	VG	3.83	VG	3.92	VG	2.5
3.	foster positive student-teacher and peer relationships.	4.00	VG	3.87	VG	3.94	VG	1
4.	organize physical space to support learning activities.	4.00	VG	3.84	VG	3.92	VG	2.5
5.	promote a culture of respect and collaboration in the classroom.	3.80	VG	3.88	VG	3.84	VG	4.5
GENERAL ASSESSMENT		3.92	VG	3.86	VG	3.89	VG	
STANDARD DEVIATION						0.345		

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Strongly Agree/ Very Good
2.50 – 3.24 Agree/ Good

1.75 – 2.49 Disagree/ Fair
1.00 – 1.74 Strongly Disagree/ Poor

Table 2.3

Teachers' Performance Level through PPST in Cluster 3 Schools as assessed by the School Heads and Teachers in terms of Diversity of Learners

The teachers...	Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Composite		Rank
		$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	
1.	differentiate instruction to meet diverse learner needs.	3.80	VG	3.79	VG	3.80	VG	4
2.	accommodate learners with special needs or from varied backgrounds.	3.80	VG	3.83	VG	3.82	VG	3
3.	use culturally responsive teaching practices.	3.80	VG	3.78	VG	3.79	VG	5
4.	assess and address individual learning styles and paces.	3.80	VG	3.86	VG	3.83	VG	2
5.	promote equity and inclusion for all learners.	3.80	VG	3.87	VG	3.84	VG	1
GENERAL ASSESSMENT		3.80	VG	3.83	VG	3.82	VG	
STANDARD DEVIATION		0.381						

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Strongly Agree/ Very Good
2.50 – 3.24 Agree/ Good

1.75 – 2.49 Disagree/ Fair
1.00 – 1.74 Strongly Disagree/ Poor

Table 2.4

Teachers' Performance Level through PPST in Cluster 3 Schools as assessed by the School Heads and Teachers in terms of Assessment and Reporting

The teachers...	Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Composite		Rank
		$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	
1.	use a variety of assessment tools to measure learner progress.	3.80	VG	3.85	VG	3.83	VG	4
2.	provide timely and constructive feedback to learners.	3.80	VG	3.89	VG	3.85	VG	1
3.	analyze assessment data to inform instruction.	3.80	VG	3.84	VG	3.82	VG	5
4.	report learner performance accurately to stakeholders.	3.80	VG	3.87	VG	3.84	VG	2.5
5.	ensure assessments are fair and aligned with objectives.	3.80	VG	3.88	VG	3.84	VG	2.5
GENERAL ASSESSMENT		3.80	VG	3.87	VG	3.84	VG	
STANDARD DEVIATION		0.342						

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Strongly Agree/ Very Good
2.50 – 3.24 Agree/ Good

1.75 – 2.49 Disagree/ Fair
1.00 – 1.74 Strongly Disagree/ Poor

Table 2.5

Teachers' Performance Level through PPST in Cluster 3 Schools as assessed by the School Heads and Teachers in terms of Community Linkages and Professional Engagement

The teachers...	Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Composite		Rank
		$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	$\bar{X}$	VI	
1.	collaborate with parents and community for learner support.	3.80	VG	3.87	VG	3.84	VG	1
2.	participate in school and community activities.	3.80	VG	3.85	VG	3.83	VG	2
3.	build partnerships with external organizations for resources.	3.60	VG	3.75	VG	3.68	VG	5
4.	engage in professional networks and associations.	3.60	VG	3.80	VG	3.70	VG	4
5.	advocate for community involvement in education.	3.80	VG	3.80	VG	3.80	VG	3
GENERAL ASSESSMENT		3.72	VG	3.81	VG	3.77	VG	
STANDARD DEVIATION						0.407		

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Strongly Agree/ Very Good
2.50 – 3.24 Agree/ Good

1.75 – 2.49 Disagree/ Fair
1.00 – 1.74 Strongly Disagree/ Poor

Table 3.1

Test of Significant Difference on the Assessment of School Heads and Teachers on the Manifestation Level of Pedagogical Leadership of School Heads in Cluster 3 Schools

Sub-variables		t value	df	Mean difference	Sig.	Remarks	Decision
Developing Relationships	Equal variances assumed	1.041	138				
	Equal variances not assumed	3.572	12.20	.1896	.013	Significant	Reject H ₀
Collecting and Analyzing Evidence	Equal variances assumed	1.263	138				
	Equal variances not assumed	4.264	11.66	.22370	.003	Significant	Reject H ₀
Providing Constructive Feedback	Equal variances assumed	1.503	138				
	Equal variances not assumed	7.837	134.0	.27259	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
Learning Collaboratively	Equal variances assumed	1.394	138				
	Equal variances not assumed	7.268	134.0	.23407	.002	Significant	Reject H ₀
Providing Relevant Resources	Equal variances assumed	1.377	138				
	Equal variances not assumed	4.986	14.52	.27704	.003	Significant	Reject H ₀

Level of significance 0.05

Table 3.2

Test of Significant Difference on the Assessment of School Heads and Teachers on the Teachers' Performance Level through PPST in Cluster 3 Schools

Sub-variables				t value	df	Mean difference	Sig.	Remarks	Decision	
Content Knowledge and Pedagogy				Equal variances assumed	-1.497	138	-.20889	.473	Not Significant	Accept H ₀
				Equal variances not assumed	-1.128	4.163				
Learning Environment				Equal variances assumed	.465	138	.06074	.201	Not Significant	Accept H ₀
				Equal variances not assumed	1.105	6.337				
Diversity of Learners				Equal variances assumed	-.177	138	-.02519	.346	Not Significant	Accept H ₀
				Equal variances not assumed	-.125	4.141				
Assessment and Reporting				Equal variances assumed	-.493	138	-.06667	.224	Not Significant	Accept H ₀
				Equal variances not assumed	-.331	4.127				
Community Linkages and Professional Engagement				Equal variances assumed	-.626	138	-.09333	.718	Not Significant	Accept H ₀
				Equal variances not assumed	-.498	4.183				

Level of significance 0.05

Table 4

Test of Significant Relationship between the Manifestation Level of Pedagogical Leadership of School Heads and Teachers' Performance Level through PPST in Cluster 3 Schools

Manifestation Level of Pedagogical Leadership of School Heads	Level of Teachers' Performance	r value	P value	Remarks	Decision
Developing Relationships	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	.541**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Learning Environment	.533**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Diversity of Learners	.376**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Assessment and Reporting	.462**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	.438**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
Collecting and Analyzing Evidence	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	.550**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Learning Environment	.550**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Diversity of Learners	.426**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Assessment and Reporting	.535**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	.513**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀

Providing Constructive Feedback	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	.531**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Learning Environment	.517**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Diversity of Learners	.440**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Assessment and Reporting	.506**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	.597**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
Learning Collaboratively	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	.500**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Learning Environment	.535**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Diversity of Learners	.415**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Assessment and Reporting	.528**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	.519**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
Providing Relevant Resources	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	.467**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Learning Environment	.520**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Diversity of Learners	.307**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Assessment and Reporting	.366**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀
	Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	.447**	.000	Significant	Reject H ₀

**Correlational at the level 0.01

*Correlational at the level 0.05(Two-tailed)

Table 5
Proposed Action Plan

Key Areas	Objectives	Strategies / Activities	Tim Frame	People Involved	Success Indicator
Employing systematic methods for collecting feedback on school programs (Collecting and Analyzing Evidence)	To establish an efficient and automated feedback collection system that systematically gathers, analyzes, and reports participant insights to identify the program's strengths and weaknesses and support continuous improvement.	- Utilize Digital Platforms for Automated Collection - Use Microsoft Forms, Google Forms, or survey software as the main collection tool. - Generate QR codes or links for easy access. - Review and Update the System Regularly through FGD - Automate Data Processing and Reporting through faculty meeting	Year Round	School Heads, ICT Teachers	100% success of using digital platforms to support continuous improvement
Integrating technology and innovative methods in pedagogy (Content Knowledge and Pedagogy)	To train teachers in technology integration, improving usage in lessons.	- Conduct Hands on Training Workshops via LAC on technology by: - Collaborative Lesson Planning in the different subject areas - Implement Peer Mentoring or "Technology Champions" - Gamification; Game based Learning	Year Round	School Heads, ICT Coordinator and Teachers	100% Accomplished

• Building partnerships with external organizations for resources (Community Linkages and Professional Engagement)	• To organize engagement activities yearly.	- Develop career activity engagement partnership - Conduct Stakeholder Mapping - Attractive Engage Partnership. - like Be My Hero - signing of MOA - Strengthening Communication Channels via Facebook and other online platform - Host activities like exhibits and other related programs.	Year Round	School Heads, Teachers, Focal Person	100% Committed and Accomplished
--	---	--	------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------

DISCUSSION

This study investigated the interplay between pedagogical leadership manifestation level and teachers' performance in the schools under Cluster 3 of Calamba City. It sought to determine how the instructional and pedagogical approaches of school leaders can relate to teachers' performance. In particular, the purpose of this study was to respond to the following questions:

Research Question Number 1. What is the manifestation level of pedagogical leadership of school heads in Cluster 3 schools as assessed by the school heads and teachers in terms of:

1.1. Developing Relationships

Developing Relationships had a general assessment of 3.87 which was verbally interpreted as Strongly Agree or Fully Manifested and with standard deviation of 0.440 indicated minimal variations in responses and showed little divergence among respondents. All indicators were verbally interpreted as Strongly Agree or Fully Manifested. Then, the indicator "The school heads build a supportive school culture that values teachers' professional growth" had the highest computed composite mean of 3.90 meanwhile, the indicator "The school promotes team-building activities to strengthen staff relationships" had the lowest computed composite mean of 3.78.

This concludes that school heads are highly effective in cultivating supportive and growth-oriented relationships within the school community. However, greater investment in structured team-building initiatives could further strengthen staff cohesion potentially leading to improved instructional outcomes and reduced turnover in Cluster 3 schools. School heads should schedule at least one structured team-building activity per quarter (e.g., collaborative planning days, wellness sessions, or off-site retreats) and involve teachers in co-designing these events to increase ownership and participation. Cluster supervisors are recommended to include a "staff relationship health check" item in their

quarterly monitoring tool, using a short anonymous survey to track perceived trust and collaboration levels over time.

The findings were supported by Cordis (2025), who found that school heads exhibited very high levels of supportive leadership, including emotional support and open communication, leading to strong relational dynamics and teacher empowerment. This aligned with the current study, as both highlighted the role of empathetic and inclusive practices in enhancing trust and collaboration.

1.2 Collecting and Analyzing Evidence

Pedagogical leadership in collecting and analyzing evidence was Strongly Agree or Fully Manifested with general assessment mean of 3.85. The standard deviation of 0.443 indicated relatively low variability in perceptions. Four indicators tied for the highest rank (mean = 3.87), including “regularly gathering data through classroom observations and using student performance data for improvement”, while “employing systematic methods for collecting feedback” ranked lowest (mean = 3.77).

This pattern underscores the priority given to data-driven decision-making, which supported insights from educational leadership literature emphasizing that effective evidence collection directly contributed to targeted instructional enhancements. The difference between school heads' and teachers' ratings could have stemmed from teachers' limited visibility into leaders' analytical processes, as attributed in studies where frontline educators perceived data-sharing as less systematic than intended.

The results imply that more transparent data-sharing mechanisms could empower teachers and elevate overall school performance by fostering a culture of evidence-based practice in Calamba City's Cluster 3.

Alagos (2024) supported the present findings which underscored the value of adaptive decision-making and data utilization in effective school leadership. On the other hand, Namoc (2025) highlighted moderate challenges in data utilization for decision-making, it potentially indicated areas where manifestation could be inconsistent if stakeholder involvement is low.

1.3 Providing Constructive Feedback

Providing constructive feedback was Fully Manifested with a general assessment of 3.87. Moreover, a standard deviation of 0.447 indicated respondents' “answers” showed little divergence. The top-ranked indicator was “ensuring feedback was timely and focused on improving teaching effectiveness” (mean = 3.89), while “training teachers on using feedback for self-improvement” ranked lowest (mean = 3.84).

These outcomes illustrate the critical role of feedback in pedagogical leadership, consistent with attributions in research where timely, actionable feedback is linked to enhance teacher efficacy and student achievement. The lower teacher ratings may have

stemmed from insufficient follow-through on training, as noted in similar studies where feedback loops tend to be more leader centric. The results imply that opportunities for professional development workshops on feedback utilization can help bridge perceptual gaps and contribute to sustain improvements in teaching quality within Cluster 3 schools. Zrien and David (2023) corroborated the present findings through their case study in a Dubai school, where constructive feedback from leaders significantly enhanced instructional practices and teacher reflection. Additionally, Alba et al. (2025) noted effective feedback as a key practiced in instructional supervision despite challenges. However, Cordis (2025) mentioned minor communication delays that could subtly challenge the consistency of feedback delivery.

1.4 Learning Collaboratively

Collaborative Learning was Strongly Agree or Fully Manifested, with a general assessment of 3.89. The standard deviation of 0.418 reflected shared experiences of the respondents showed minimal difference.” Facilitated professional learning communities” ranked highest (mean = 3.91), while “encouraging peer observations and promoting collaborative problem-solving” tied for the lowest rank (mean = 3.87).

The findings emphasize the value of shared learning environments, aligning with insights that collaborative practices in pedagogical leadership foster innovation and collective problem-solving. Differences in ratings may be attributed to varying participation levels, where school heads overestimating engagement compared to teachers' experiences. The results imply that expanding peer observation programs might enhance professional growth and ultimately benefit learner outcomes in the studied schools. A voluntary “peer learning circle” initiative can encourage teachers to conduct peer observations followed by reflective debrief using a common protocol.

The findings were supported by Tatoy (2024), who found that extensive collaboration among school heads fostered shared leadership and professional growth, with a significant positive correlation to performance, which mirrored the current focus on professional learning communities and peer observations. Cordis (2025) reinforced this through the lens of transformational and servant leadership enhancing collaboration and trust.

1.5 Providing Relevant Resources

Providing Relevant Resources was Fully Manifested with a general assessment of 3.82. A higher standard deviation of 0.508 showed minimal dispersion in responses reflecting strong agreement across respondents. “Ensuring access to professional development opportunities” ranked highest (composite mean = 3.87), while “identifying and distributing relevant research” ranked lowest (composite mean = 3.73).

It can be concluded that school heads demonstrated strong leadership in resource provision, particularly in supporting professional development. However, addressing gaps in research dissemination and ensuring equitable distribution of resources across schools

should be prioritized. Such measures would not only promote fairness but also enhance teachers' access to knowledge and tools necessary for sustained instructional improvement, especially within Cluster 3.

These results highlighted resource allocation as a foundational aspect of pedagogical leadership, supporting literature that linked adequate resources to improved instructional delivery (Berhanu, 2023). Teachers' lower scores might have been due to perceived inequities in distribution, as attributed in studies on resource management in educational settings. The results imply that prioritizing budget reallocations for research dissemination could address gaps and promote equitable professional development in Cluster 3.

The findings were aligned with Alagos (2024), who emphasized resource management and access to digital tools as essential for leadership capacity, supporting the current study's focus on allocating materials and professional development opportunities. Alba et al. (2025) further backed this by identifying inadequate resources as a challenge but effective practices like data-driven supervision helping to mitigate it.

Research Question Number 2. What is teachers' performance level through PPST in Cluster 3 schools as assessed by the school heads and teachers?

2.1 Content Knowledge and Pedagogy

Teachers were Very Good in both subject Content knowledge and Pedagogy teaching skills, with an overall score of 3.75. This showed that "most people strongly agree with their performance". The small variation in scores (standard deviation of 0.365) means that "the responses were quite consistent". In short, teachers were seen as performing strongly and there was clear agreement about it. "Aligning instructional goals with curriculum" standards ranked highest (mean = 3.82), while "integrating technology and adapting teaching for critical thinking" tied for lowest (mean = 3.72).

This reflects high subject mastery, consistent with PPST standards that emphasize pedagogical innovation for student engagement. The higher self-ratings by teachers may be attributed to their direct involvement in lesson delivery, differs from school heads' observational perspectives. It implies that targeted training in technology integration, potentially elevating performance and aligning with national educational goals in the Philippines.

In support of this, Manigbas et al. (2024), revealed that Grade 1-3 teachers in Buhi South District were highly competent in applying content knowledge and pedagogy, though moderately competent in research-based principles, aligning with the current high ratings in strategies and alignment. Similarly, Almonacid-Fierro et al. (2023) highlighted the need for pedagogical content knowledge in science teaching, emphasizing transformative strategies.

2.2 Learning Environment

Learning Environment was Very Good with a general assessment of 3.89. A low standard deviation of 0.345 demonstrated low variability in response, indicating uniform agreement among respondents. “Fostering positive relationships” ranked highest (mean = 3.94), while “creating a safe atmosphere and promoting respect” tied for lowest (mean = 3.84).

However, creating a safe atmosphere and promoting respect received the lowest mean (3.84), indicating an area that still requires improvement. Slight variations in ratings may be attributed to contextual challenges such as large class sizes and limited physical space, which are commonly noted concerns in Philippine educational settings. These conditions may affect the consistent implementation of safety protocols and behavior management strategies, potentially leading to classroom disruptions. Given these findings, it is recommended that schools strengthen initiatives focused on classroom safety, respect, and inclusive practices through targeted professional development and leadership support. Enhancing safety protocols and reinforcing positive behavior strategies can help sustain conducive learning environments that promote academic achievement.

The findings found support in Camral and Sumayo (2025), who reported very competent ratings in maintaining safe and inclusive environments among elementary teachers, paralleling the current focus on positive relationships and classroom management. Also, Prudente et al. (2024) added by noting PD programs that enhanced 21st-century skills like collaboration in supportive environments.

2.3 Diversity of Learners

Diversity of Learner was Very Good with general assessment of 3.82. The standard deviation of 0.381 indicated due to standardized questionnaire, small variation that made their responses not much difference. “Promoting equity and inclusion” ranked highest (mean = 3.84), while using “culturally responsive practices” ranked lowest (mean = 3.79).

This highlights inclusive efforts, supporting PPST domains that advocated for differentiated instruction. Ratings can be influenced by diverse student populations in Calamba City, attributing to challenges in cultural responsiveness. It also implies that cultural sensitivity training, fostering greater equity potentially reduce achievement gaps among learners.

The findings were corroborated by Almonacid-Fierro et al. (2023), who stressed context-sensitive pedagogical strategies for diverse needs in science education, supporting the current emphasis on differentiation and inclusivity. Manigbas et al. (2024) aligned with this through high competency in multilingual instruction for diverse backgrounds.

2.4 Assessment and Reporting

Teachers were Very Good in Assessment and Reporting, with an overall score of 3.84. The small difference in scores (standard deviation of 0.342) showed that “most people gave similar ratings.” In short, teachers were consistently seen as strong in this area. Providing timely feedback ranked highest (mean = 3.85), while analyzing data to inform instruction ranked lowest (mean = 3.82).

These outcomes emphasize feedback's role in learning, consistent with literature on assessment literacy enhancing instruction. Teachers' higher ratings might have been due to their hands-on experience, contrasting with heads' oversight. Implications included data analysis workshops, which could refine reporting accuracy and support evidence-based teaching in the cluster.

The findings were supported by Solatorio (2024), who found very extensive effectiveness in assessment and evaluation among Davao teachers, with a positive correlation to strategies which mirrored the current high ratings in data analysis and feedback. Camral and Sumayo (2025) reinforced this with excellence in preparing assessments.

2.5 Community Linkages and Professional Engagement

Community Linkages and Engagement were Very Good with general assessment of 3.77. The standard deviation of 0.407 suggested some variability. “Collaborating with parents” ranked highest (mean = 3.84), while “building partnerships with organizations” ranked lowest (mean = 3.68). This suggests strong parental involvement, aligning with PPST's focus on external collaborations for resource enhancement. Lower rankings in partnerships could have been attributed to limited external networks in urban settings like Calamba. Implications pointed to expanding community outreach, which might secure additional resources and bolster professional development for teachers. These findings imply the need to expand community outreach initiatives beyond parent collaboration to include broader institutional partnerships that can provide additional resources, expertise, and professional learning opportunities for teachers. Strengthening partnerships with local government units, higher education institutions, and private organizations can help augment instructional resources, support teacher professional development, and enhance learner exposure to real-world contexts. By diversifying and deepening community engagement efforts, schools can further strengthen their external support systems and contribute to sustainable school improvement.

The findings were aligned with Banderlipe (2022) who explored teachers' voluntary community participation as an extension of professionalism, supporting the current focus on partnerships and advocacy. Prudente et al. (2024) further backed this through PD themes including community linkages.

Research Question Number 3. Is there a significant difference in the assessment of school heads and teachers in pedagogical leadership manifestation level and teachers' performance?

As shown in Table 3.1, the computed probability values (.013, .003, .000, .002, and .003) were all lower than the accepted threshold of 0.05, which means there was significant difference in the findings and were statistically significant. Because these values fell below the set standard, the null hypothesis that there was difference between the two groups was rejected. In practical terms, this shows that school heads and teachers do not view pedagogical leadership in the same way, and there was a meaningful difference in their responses. This difference highlights that the perspectives of the two groups vary, suggesting that their experiences and expectations of leadership may not fully align.

On the other hand, school heads rated their pedagogical leadership higher than teachers, indicating a possible perceptual gap between both groups. This may be due to self-assessment bias among leaders, while teachers base their ratings on daily classroom experiences. The findings suggest the need for stronger dialogue and joint training sessions in Cluster 3 schools to align perceptions, improve collaboration, and enhance overall school morale.

The findings were supported by Aquino et al. (2021), who found statistically significant discrepancies between school heads' and teachers' evaluations of leadership practices in Nueva Vizcaya, despite overall high quality, aligned with the current perceptual gaps. Zrien and David (2023) also noted differences in feedback perceptions.

Table 3.2

There was no significant difference between the assessment of the school heads and teachers of Cluster 3 schools on the teacher's performance. It had generated computed probability values .473, .201, .346, .224, and .718 which were all greater than the level of significance of 0.05 using Independent Samples T-test; thus, accepting the null hypothesis.

This uniformity in ratings offers insight into a shared understanding of performance standards under the PPST framework, suggesting that both groups draw from similar observational criteria despite their roles. The lack of differences may be attributed to standardized evaluation tools that minimize subjective variances and promote consistency in performance appraisals. The results imply that the potential for collaborative performance reviews in Cluster 3 schools can reinforce trust and support targeted professional development without the hindrance of conflicting views.

The lack of significant differences in performance assessments contrasted with Aquino et al. (2021), who implied potential variances but found consistent "very satisfactory" ratings across demographics, partially supporting uniformity. However, Manigbas et al. (2024) found significant demographic differences in competency, which could debunk the complete absence of differences if extended to assessments.

Research Question Number 4. Is there a significant relationship between pedagogical leadership manifestation level and teachers' performance in Cluster 3 Calamba City?

On the test of significant relationship between the manifestation level of pedagogical leadership of school heads and teachers' performance level through PPST in Cluster 3 Schools, the r values ranging from .307 to .597 were interpreted as with low positive to moderate positive correlation. The computed probability values .000, .001, .002, .004 and .005 were less than the level of significant ($P < 0.05$); thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. It resulted that there was a significant relationship between dependent and independent variables.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the manifestation level of pedagogical leadership of school heads has a significant relationship with the level of teachers' performance through PPST in Cluster 3 Schools. The higher the manifestation level of pedagogical leadership of school heads, the higher the level of teachers' performance.

The findings were supported by Tatoy (2024), who revealed a significant positive correlation among instructional leadership, collaboration, and performance, which underscored collective impact. Zrien and David (2023) aligned with this through feedback that enhanced performance.

Research Question Number 5. Based on the findings of the study, what project action plan may be proposed?

To strengthen the outcomes of the study, an action plan was proposed focusing on key areas of professional practice. It emphasized evidence-based decision-making through systematic data collection and analysis, provision of instructional resources to enhance teaching performance, and the development of content knowledge and pedagogy. The plan also highlighted community linkages and professional engagement to foster collaboration and ensure sustainable and impactful pedagogical leadership.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions have been derived:

1. That effective pedagogical leadership among school heads fosters collaborative and resource-rich environment, ultimately contributing to enhanced instructional quality.
2. That the high-performance level of teachers underscores teachers' proficiency in creating inclusive, engaging, and data-informed classrooms, directly supporting learner success.

3. That disparities in leadership among school heads highlight perceptual gaps among school leaders potentially rooted in role-based biases, while the consensus on performance affirms shared standards.

4. That pedagogical leadership directly associates with teacher performance, promoting a cycle of instructional improvement and professional engagement. These also validated the interconnectedness of leadership practices and teacher outcomes, providing empirical support for leadership-focused intervention.

5. That the proposed project action plan is needed to address the least assessed indicators across pedagogical leadership and teachers' performance domains through targeted, actionable strategies. By focusing on these key result areas, the plan ensures measurable success indicators, including increased participation rates, improved ratings, and data-informed decisions, leading to enhanced cohesion, equity, and instructional quality. Ultimately, successful implementation will bridge identified gaps.

Recommendations

Based on the results given, the following recommendations are offered:

1. The school heads may elevate teachers and learners by building reliable partnerships coaching with conscientiousness, celebrating professional growth, and creating a supportive culture where teachers feel valued and empowered to give their best in teaching.

2. The school heads may create potent automated feedback system, use a single digital survey tool, automate data collection and visual reporting, and keep the process simple and anonymous for users. Additionally, they may collect feedback regularly and train teachers to analyze results and guide them in improving instruction. Framing this within pedagogical leadership empowers leaders to make data-informed decisions, support professional growth, and ensure feedback directly strengthens teaching practices and learning outcomes.

3. The school leaders may provide hands-on training supported by peer mentoring and simple follow-up guidance to boost teachers' confidence in using technology. Through strong pedagogical leadership, school heads can model effective use of tech and create a supportive culture that encourages teachers to use, reflect, and integrate technology naturally into their daily teaching.

4. The school heads further strengthen their leadership practices through continuous training, mentoring, and coaching. Teachers should also be encouraged to actively engage in CPD aligned with PPST to further improve their competencies. Additionally, school-based programs and support systems should be enhanced to ensure that strengthened pedagogical leadership consistently translates into improved teaching performance and better learner outcomes.

5. The school heads institutionalize data-driven pedagogical leadership by consistently using digital feedback systems and sustaining technology-focused professional development initiatives. Regular analysis of feedback data, coupled with continuous capacity-building through Learning Action Cells, peer mentoring, and collaborative lesson planning, will strengthen teachers' instructional practices and effectiveness. Additionally, schools should reinforce partnerships with external stakeholders through formal agreements, active communication, and regular monitoring of engagement activities. These efforts will help sustain resources, support innovative teaching practices, and ultimately improve instructional quality and learner outcomes.

6. Future researchers may conduct a longitudinal mixed-methods investigation examining the lifelong impact of targeted pedagogical leadership interventions on teachers' PPST performance levels and subsequent learners' academic achievement.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

This study followed the ethical standards set by the Laguna College of Business and Arts (LCBA) Research Manual, assuring that all research procedures were carried out with honesty, transparency, and respect for all participants. The researcher was upholding the principles of voluntary participation, informed consent, and confidentiality throughout the data-gathering process. In accordance with Republic Act No. 10173, or the Data Privacy Act of 2012, all information collected from respondents remained undisclosed and can be utilized exclusively for academic purposes. All data securely stored and handled following established data protection guidelines. All secondary references including books, journals, online publications, and other scholarly sources were properly cited using the APA style to keep academic integrity and avoid plagiarism. To improve the clarity, coherence, and overall scholarly quality of the manuscript, the researcher employed artificial intelligence tools such as Microsoft Copilot, Grammarly and Turnitin to avoid plagiarism. These tools aided in enhancing grammar, structure, and content while ensuring that the researcher's original ideas and contributions were preserved.

Acknowledgments

The researcher extends heartfelt gratitude to God Almighty for wisdom, strength, and blessings throughout this journey. Sincere thanks are given to Dean Alfredo G. Perez Jr., Dr. Ma. Lorena M. Tagala, and adviser Dr. Eulalia M. Javier for their guidance, encouragement, and constructive feedback, and to Dr. Melchor A. Villapando for his expert statistical support. Appreciation is also conveyed to the research defense panel; Dr. Enrico G. Jocson, Dean Perez, and Dr. Tagala, for their valuable insights. Deepest thanks go to the researcher's parents, Mr. Pio and Mrs. Edna Terrible, for their love and support, and to friends Jenny Mondejar and Myra Regondola for their encouragement and companionship. Gratitude is likewise extended to the School Heads and teachers of Cluster 3 public elementary schools for their participation. Finally, the researcher acknowledges all who, in various ways, contributed to the completion of this thesis.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, R., Ismail, A., & Wan Ismail, W. K. (2024). The impact of leadership styles on teacher performance. ResearchGate. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.12345.67890>
- Alagos, R. M. (2024). School heads' innovativeness, leadership competence and productivity. IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 6(4), 114–121. <https://doi.org/10.54476/ioer-imrj/688319>.
- Alba, C. R. S., Abayon, R. M., Alcaraz, R. J. M., Antipolo, R. N., Aparejado, B. R. M., Galan, R. N., Gueta, L. D., Tumbaga, C. A., Ydian, R. E., & Daguro, N. G. (2025). Best practices of school heads in providing instructional supervision to public elementary school teachers. Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 37(10), 1055–1061. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.371003>.
- Almonacid-Fierro, A., Sepúlveda-Vallejos, S., Valdebenito, K., Montoya-Grisales, N., & Aguilar-Valdés, M. (2023). Analysis of pedagogical content knowledge in science teacher education: A systematic review 2011–2021. International Journal of Educational Methodology, 9(3), 525–534. <https://doi.org/10.12973/ijem.9.3.525>
- Aquino, C. J. C., Afalla, B. T., & Fabelico, F. L. (2021). Managing educational institutions: School heads' leadership practices and teachers' performance. International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education, 10(4), 1325–1333. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i4.21518>.
- Baiño, J. F. (2025). Post-pandemic challenges in addressing learning gaps of students in Mathematics: Experiences of the Junior High School teachers of the Division of Gingoog City. Pantao Journal, 4(2), 1518-1531.
- Banderlipe, M. R. I. S. (2022). Teachers as builders: Professional development and community participation of public school teachers in Metro Manila, Philippines [Master's dissertation, University of Glasgow]. ResearchGate. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.14617.29286>
- Berhanu, K. Z. (2025). The relationship between principals' pedagogical leadership practices and teachers' job performance: The role of sociodemographic characteristics. BMC Psychology, 13(89). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-02415-7>
- Camral, A. C., & Sumayo, G. S. (2025). Continuing professional development engagement and pedagogical competence of public elementary school teachers. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies in Higher Education, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.70847/592788>
- Cordis, G. M. (2025). Role of supportive leadership and teacher-school head relationships in Cabuyao District 4 elementary schools. International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Educational Research, 7(3), 438–468. https://www.ijmcer.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/IJMCER_V0730438468.pdf
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (6th Ed.). SAGE Publications.
- DepEd Calamba City. (2025). Annual schools performance review: Cluster initiatives 2024-2025. <https://depedcalambacity.com.ph/>
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. The Elementary School Journal, 86(2), 217–247. <https://doi.org/10.1086/461445>
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. School Leadership & Management, 40(1), 5-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
- Manigbas, J. P. III, Ollet, A. L., Noble, M. P. L., Angeles, J. R., Cayetano, N. M., & Fucio, M. P. (2024). Teachers' competency in content knowledge and pedagogy in Buhi South

- District, Philippines. *International Education Trend Issues*, 2(1), 21–30. <https://doi.org/10.56442/ieti.v2i1.365>
- Namoc, J. J. G. (2025). Decision-making practices and challenges encountered by the school heads: A perspective analysis. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 5(7), 1361–1377. <https://www.ijams-bbp.net/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/7-IJAMS-JULY-2025-1361-1377.pdf>.
- Pietsch, M., Aydin, B., & Gümüş, S. (2025). Putting the instructional leadership–student achievement relation in context: A meta-analytical big data study across cultures and time. *American Educational Research Journal*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737231197434>
- Prudente, M. S., Garcia, J. A. S., Mistades, V. M., Roleda, L. S., & Talaue, F. T. (2024). Systematic review of professional development programs for teachers in the Philippines (Research Paper Series No. 003). Second Congressional Commission on Education. https://edcom2.gov.ph/media/2024/02/18_Prudente-et-al-Systematic-Review-of-Professional-1.pdf
- Solatorio, M. L. (2024). Teaching strategies and effectiveness of public elementary teachers in Davao City Division. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 5(6), 2086–2091. <https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.5.0624.1468>
- Tatoy, A. M. T. (2024). School heads' instructional leadership, collaboration and performance. *IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 6(4), 110–113. <https://doi.org/10.54476/ioer-imrj/334949>.
- UNESCO. (2023). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- Villeza, A. T., Rayton, M. P. C., Limos-Galay, J. A., & Lazaro, N. J. (2024). Management of learning and school performance in the reopened in-person classes SY 2022-2023 in Calamba, Laguna. *International Journal of Research Studies in Management*, 12(3), 143-160. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsm.2024.1056>
- World Bank. (2024). *The state of global learning poverty: Post-COVID trends*. World Bank Group.
- Zrien, Z., & David, S. A. (2023). The impact of school leaders' feedback in enhancing teachers' performance towards school improvement: A single case study among teachers in a private school in Dubai. *Journal for Researching Education Practice and Theory*, 6(2), 4–48. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377851990>.

APA Citation:

Terrible, M. E. T. (2026). PEDAGOGICAL LEADERSHIP AND TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE IN CLUSTER 3 SCHOOLS OF CALAMBA CITY. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(9), 1437–1460. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22767405>

mariaetherliza.terrible@deped.gov.ph