

# School Head's Instructional Leadership Styles, Teachers' Performance and Literacy Performance of Key Stage 1-2 Learners

**MAYBETH N. MODINA**

Teacher III

Western Leyte College

Master of Arts in Education

Major in School Administration and Supervision

maybeth.modina@deped.gov.ph

*Abstract* — This study determined the significant relationship between the School head's Instructional Leadership Styles in relation to the level to the performance of teachers and literacy performance of the key stage 1-2 learners. A proposed Instructional Supervisory plan was formulated based on the result of the study. This study utilized a descriptive-correlational design to explore the relationship between School Head's Instructional Leadership Styles, Teachers' Performance, and the Literacy Performance of Key Stage 1 and 2 Learners. This approach allowed for a systematic examination of the variables, facilitating the investigation of potential correlations between them. By focusing on these relationships, the study aimed to illuminate how different leadership styles influenced teachers' performance and the literacy performance of Grade 6 learners. Understanding this connection provided valuable insights into the factors that affected both teacher engagement and student achievement in literacy. The Test of Relationship, which illustrates the statistical correlation between two sets of variables: Leadership Style and IPCRF (Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form) of Teachers, and IPCRF of Teachers and Academic Performance of Learners. The table provides statistical indicators including the correlation coefficient ( $r$ ), computed t-values, the critical table value at the 0.05 significance level, the decision on the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ), and the interpretation of the strength of the relationship. The analysis aims to examine whether there are significant relationships between school leadership, teacher performance, and student academic outcomes. The first relationship tested in the table is between Leadership Style and the IPCRF of Teachers. With a correlation coefficient of 0.86 and a computed t-value exceeding the table value, the null hypothesis was rejected. This indicates a very strong and significant relationship between the leadership style of school heads and teacher performance. This means that more effective and adaptive leadership practices positively influence how teachers perform, as reflected in their IPCRF ratings. The second relationship is between the IPCRF of Teachers and the Academic Performance of Learners. The correlation coefficient is indicating a weak relationship, even though the computed t-value) is higher than the table value, resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis. This suggests that while the relationship is statistically significant, the strength of the connection between teacher performance and student academic performance is relatively low. Other factors beyond teacher performance may be influencing student outcomes. These results have several implications. First, the very strong relationship between leadership style and teacher performance suggests that effective school leadership plays a critical role in enhancing the work performance of educators. Second, although the relationship between teacher performance and learner academic performance

is weak, it is still statistically significant, implying that teacher effectiveness, as measured by the IPCRF, contributes—though modestly—to learners' academic achievements. The overall findings emphasize the importance of strengthening school leadership to elevate teacher performance, which in turn may have a ripple effect on student outcomes. The result implies that leadership development programs for school heads should be prioritized as a strategic step to indirectly support learner achievement.

***Keywords — School Heads Instructional Styles, Performance, Teachers, Literacy performance***

---

## I. Introduction

Effective instructional leadership is essential in the Philippine setting for improving teacher effectiveness and encouraging student involvement, particularly when it comes to the K–12 program's implementation. In order to guarantee that the objectives of the K–12 system are fulfilled, school administrators are entrusted with assisting teachers as they adjust to this new educational framework. This includes curriculum modifications, professional development, and creative teaching techniques. Instructional leaders play a crucial role in creating an atmosphere where teachers and students may flourish by offering resources, support, and a clear vision. This eventually improves learning outcomes across the country.

Establishment of DepEd Order 24 s. 2020, or the general acceptance and application of DepEd Order 25, s., and the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH). 2020 or the National The Philippine Professional Standards for Supervisors (PPSS) were adopted and put into effect, setting a global The nationwide framework and foundation for raising the bar for supervisors and school heads' professional standards in the Education Department (Pegg et al., 2020).

In order to increase teacher effectiveness and promote student engagement, instructional leadership is essential. Professionally speaking, leaders that place a high priority on instructional excellence give teachers the direction, tools, and ongoing feedback they need to improve their teaching methods. High standards are set, evidence-based teaching practices are encouraged, and a culture of continuous learning and professional development is fostered by effective instructional leaders. Teachers may provide excellent education that engages and inspires students by concentrating on curriculum alignment, data-driven decision-making, and classroom assistance. Higher levels of student involvement, more in-depth educational opportunities, and general academic achievement follow from this.

Since it has a direct impact on teacher effectiveness and student engagement, instructional leadership is a professional pillar of educational achievement. Teachers are empowered to improve their instructional practices and match them with the needs of their students when they receive clear vision, strategic direction, and continual professional development opportunities from instructional leaders. A culture of high standards, data-driven decision-making, and reflective practice are fostered by effective instructional leadership, which empowers educators to

experiment and adapt in the classroom. Students exhibit increased levels of motivation, engagement, and accomplishment when teachers gain self-assurance and proficiency in their positions. Essentially, instructional leadership acts as a catalyst for ongoing enhancements to the caliber of instruction and the educational experiences of students.

Conducting research on *The Role of Instructional Leadership in Enhancing Teacher Performance and Student Engagement* presents several challenges that can impact the study's effectiveness. One significant issue is the varying interpretations and implementation of instructional leadership across different schools and educational contexts. Leaders may have differing levels of commitment, knowledge, and capacity to provide meaningful instructional support, which can result in inconsistencies in data collection and analysis. Additionally, measuring the direct impact of instructional leadership on teacher performance and student engagement is complex, as multiple external factors—such as socioeconomic conditions, curriculum changes, and student diversity—can influence the outcomes. Resistance to change from educators, who may view instructional leadership initiatives as additional workload rather than support, also poses a significant challenge. Furthermore, time constraints and the lack of adequate professional development resources can hinder the effectiveness of instructional leadership efforts, making it difficult to sustain long-term improvements.

One key challenge is the lack of a clear and standardized framework for instructional leadership, leading to inconsistencies in how it is practiced and perceived by teachers. Additionally, school leaders may face difficulties in balancing their administrative responsibilities with the demands of providing instructional support, resulting in insufficient time for classroom observations, coaching, and feedback. Another common issue is the resistance from teachers who may feel overwhelmed by frequent evaluations or perceive instructional leadership efforts as intrusive rather than supportive. Moreover, limited access to professional development opportunities and resources can impede teachers' ability to fully benefit from instructional leadership initiatives. These challenges highlight the need for a well-structured and sustainable approach to instructional leadership that takes into account the diverse needs and realities of educators and students.

Thus, the importance of instructional leadership serves as a strong incentive for the researcher to carry out this investigation in an effort to find fresh approaches that might help teachers improve their performance. This entails concentrating on enhancing learning outcomes and cultivating a positive work atmosphere within the school community, particularly given the difficulties presented by the K–12 curriculum. The study looks at the effects of good leadership in order to find strategies for empowering educators, increasing student involvement, and eventually establishing a more vibrant and productive learning environment.

This study determined the significant relationship between the School head's Instructional Leadership Styles in relation to the level to the performance of teachers and literacy performance

of the key stage 1-2 learners. A proposed Instructional Supervisory plan was formulated based on the result of the study.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the extent of leadership styles of school heads in terms of the following:
  - 1.1 Transformational leadership styles;
  - 1.2 Transactional leadership styles; and
  - 1.3 Laissez-faire leadership styles?
2. What is the level of performance of teachers in terms of IPCRF?
3. What is the Literacy performance of the key stage 1-2 learners?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the following:
  - 4.1. Leadership performances and level of performance of teachers in terms of IPCRF;
  - 4.2. Teachers' performance and Literacy performance of the pupils?
5. What instructional supervisory plan can be proposed based on the findings of the study?

#### Statement of Hypothesis

There is no significant relationship between the following:

- a. Leadership performances and level of performance of teachers in terms of IPCRF;
- b. Teachers' performance and Literacy performance of the pupils?

## II. Methodology

**Design.** This study utilized a descriptive-correlational design to explore the relationship between School Head's Instructional Leadership Styles, Teachers' Performance, and the Literacy Performance of Key Stage 1 and 2 Learners. This approach allowed for a systematic examination of the variables, facilitating the investigation of potential correlations between them. By focusing on these relationships, the study aimed to illuminate how different leadership styles influenced teachers' performance and the literacy performance of Grade 6 learners. Understanding this connection provided valuable insights into the factors that affected both teacher engagement and student achievement in literacy.. The main locale of the study was Ampihanon Elementary School in the Division of Baybay City. The respondents of the study were the 7 teachers and 84 learners. The information for the analysis was gathered using The information for the analysis was gathered using two (2) distinct survey instruments: one to gauge school heads' levels of transformational,

transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles, and another to assess teachers' performance through classroom observation tools.

The assessment of the school heads' instructional leadership styles by teachers was conducted using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Avolio & Bass in 1991. The survey consisted of 21 items rated on a 4-point Likert scale, where participants evaluated their principals' leadership styles under three categories: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. The scale ranged from 4 (frequently), 3 (often), 2 (occasionally), and 1 (never). The proposed Intervention Plan was taken based on the findings of the study.

**Sampling** The respondents of the study were the 7 teachers and 84 learners that were involved in this study were being identified and the primary means of reach is during the actual conduct of the study as well as during the gathering of data in the school where the study was conducted.

**Research Procedure.** In order to gather the necessary data within one month (30 days), the researcher sought permission from the Schools Division Office headed by the Schools Division Superintendent through a transmittal letter. The same letter was also sent to the Public Schools District Supervisor, the School Principal, and the teachers who were identified as respondents under their care.

The researcher distributed the survey questionnaires to the school administrators, which were then answered by the teachers. After one month, the completed questionnaires were retrieved, consolidated, and subjected to statistical treatment using Pearson's  $r$ . The data were collated and submitted for appropriate statistical analysis.

**Ethical Issues.** The right to conduct the study was strictly adhered through the approval of the principal, approval of the Superintendent of the Division. Orientation of the respondents both School Principal, teachers were done. Participation was strictly voluntary. Anonymity and confidentiality were maintained throughout the study. Results were used solely for research and educational improvement purposes.

**Treatment of Data.** The following statistical formulas were used in this study:

The quantitative responses were tallied and tabulated. The data were treated statistically using the following tool:

The Simple Percentage and weighted mean was employed to determine the extent of School Head's Instructional Leadership Styles, Teachers' Performance And Literacy performance of Grade 6 Learners.

Pearson  $r$  Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to determine the significant relationship between School Head's Instructional Leadership Styles, Teachers' Performance And Literacy performance of Key Stage 1-2 Learners.

### III. Results and Discussion

**Table 1**  
**Extent Of Leadership Styles**

A.	Transformational Leadership	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1	The school head inspires teachers to commit to shared educational goals.	4.00	Very High
2	Encourages innovation and creativity in teaching practices.	3.80	Very High
3	Leads by example in maintaining professional integrity and enthusiasm.	4.00	Very High
4	Fosters a collaborative school culture.	4.00	Very High
5	Recognizes and celebrates the achievements of teachers and students.	4.00	Very High
6	Supports teachers in their professional growth and development.	3.70	Very High
7	Encourages open communication and feedback from staff.	4.00	Very High
	Mean	3.93	Very High
B	Transactional Leadership		
1	Clearly communicates expectations and responsibilities to teachers.	4.00	Very High
2	Uses rewards and recognition based on teacher performance.	4.00	Very High
3	Monitors teacher performance based on set goals.	3.90	Very High
4	Provides corrective feedback when performance standards are not met.	4.00	Very High
5	Uses data to inform instructional decisions and strategies.	3.80	Very High
6	Holds staff accountable for following school policies.	4.00	Very High
7	Implements structured supervision plans and schedules.	4.00	Very High
	Mean	3.96	Very High
C	LAISSEZ-FAIRE LEADERSHIP		
1	Allows staff to make decisions without much guidance.	4.00	Very High
2	Rarely intervenes in instructional issues unless necessary.	4.00	Very High
3	Gives staff freedom in managing their classrooms and teaching styles.	4.00	Very High
4	Often delegates leadership responsibilities to staff.	4.00	Very High
5	Avoids micromanaging instructional activities.	4.00	Very High
6	Rarely enforces consequences for underperformance.	3.60	Very High
	Mean	3.93	Very High
	Weighted Mean	3.94	Very High

Legend: 3.26- 4.00 – Very High  
 2.51-3.25 – High  
 1.76- 2.50- Low  
 1.00-1.75- Very Low

This table presents the Extent of Leadership Styles, focusing on how school heads exhibit transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership in their administrative functions. The table

outlines various leadership indicators under each style, showing the weighted mean and interpretation for each item. It highlights the degree to which each leadership style is practiced within the school setting, as perceived by teachers, and provides a general overview of the prevailing leadership behaviors influencing educational outcomes.

In terms of transformational leadership, the data show that school heads were perceived to inspire commitment to shared goals, maintain professional integrity, foster collaboration, and celebrate achievements, with most items receiving a perfect score of 4.00. The lowest score in this set was 3.70 for supporting professional growth, but even this was interpreted as "Very High." The average for this leadership style was 3.93, indicating a consistently strong presence of transformational qualities in leadership.

For transactional leadership, the results also revealed a "Very High" extent, with all indicators—such as clearly communicating expectations, providing rewards, monitoring performance, and implementing structured supervision—receiving means close to or at 4.00. The lowest rating here was 3.80 for using data to inform instruction, but again, the average rating for this category was 3.96, showing that transactional leadership is highly observed among school heads.

With regard to laissez-faire leadership, all indicators except one received a mean of 4.00, indicating a strong perception of leader permissiveness and delegation. The only slightly lower score was 3.60 for "Rarely enforces consequences for underperformance." Despite this, the overall mean was still 3.93, suggesting that school heads also highly exhibit this leadership style, particularly in giving autonomy and avoiding micromanagement.

The results imply that school heads in the observed schools demonstrate a very high extent of all three leadership styles—transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire—with an overall average rating of 3.94. This result implies that a diverse leadership approach is employed, where heads both inspire and reward, give autonomy, and maintain clear structures. This combination of leadership styles may foster a flexible yet accountable educational environment, promoting both professional independence and institutional efficiency.

**Table 2**  
**Performance Rating of the Teachers**

A.	Performance Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	4.209	Outstanding
2	Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners	4.531	Outstanding
3	Curriculum and Planning, Reporting and Assessment	4.46	Outstanding
4	Community Linkages & Professional Engagement	4.458	Outstanding
5	Professional Growth and Development	4.208	Outstanding
	<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>4.37</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>

Legend: 4.21- 5.00 – Outstanding  
 3.41- 4.20 – Very Satisfactory  
 2.61-3.40 - Satisfactory  
 1.81- 2.60- Fairly Satisfactory  
 1.00-1.80- Needs Improvement

This table presents the Performance Rating of the Teachers, highlighting five key performance indicators assessed in the context of their instructional and professional responsibilities. These indicators include Content Knowledge and Pedagogy, Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners, Curriculum and Planning, Community Linkages and Professional Engagement, and Professional Growth and Development. The ratings reflect the teachers' effectiveness as perceived through the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF), a tool used in evaluating teacher performance across various domains.

The data show that teachers demonstrated Outstanding performance in all five indicators. The highest rating was in Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners (4.531), suggesting that teachers excel in managing inclusive and engaging classrooms that cater to diverse student needs. This was followed closely by Curriculum and Planning, Reporting and Assessment (4.460) and Community Linkages and Professional Engagement (4.458), indicating strong capabilities in organizing instruction and building relationships beyond the classroom. Meanwhile, Content Knowledge and Pedagogy (4.209) and Professional Growth and Development (4.208) received slightly lower—but still Outstanding—ratings, which demonstrates a consistent effort toward mastery of subject matter and commitment to continuous learning.

The results imply that teachers exhibit high levels of proficiency and commitment across all aspects of their professional duties. With an overall average rating of 4.37, the result implies that teachers are performing at an Outstanding level, reinforcing the effectiveness of current instructional practices, school support systems, and leadership approaches. It also reflects a high degree of teacher professionalism, effectiveness in content delivery, and engagement with both students and the broader community

**Table 3**  
**Academic Performance of Learners**

No.	Interpretation	Scale	Frequency	Percentage
5	Outstanding	90-100	20	24
4	Very Satisfactory	85-89	18	21
3	Satisfactory	80-84	31	37
2	Fairly Satisfactory	75-79	12	14
1	Did Not Meet Expectations	Below 75	3	4
	Total		84	100
	Average		84.21	Satisfactory

This table presents the Academic Performance of Learners, detailing the frequency and percentage distribution of student scores based on a five-point interpretive scale ranging from "Did Not Meet Expectations" to "Outstanding." The purpose of this table is to show how learners performed academically, providing a snapshot of their achievement levels as measured by their grades. The data also reflect the general academic standing of the learners during the assessment period.

The table reveals that the majority of learners achieved a Satisfactory performance level, with 31 students (37%) scoring within the 80–84 range. This is followed by 20 learners (24%) who reached the Outstanding level (90–100), indicating a significant group of high achievers. Additionally, 18 learners (21%) attained a Very Satisfactory performance (85–89), while 12 learners (14%) were rated Fairly Satisfactory (75–79). Only a small portion, 3 learners (4%), Did Not Meet Expectations, scoring below 75. These distributions suggest that most learners are performing at a satisfactory level or better, with room for improvement among the lower-performing group.

The implications of these results point to a generally acceptable academic performance among the learners, with a significant proportion showing high levels of understanding and mastery. The average performance rating is 84.21, which falls under the Satisfactory category. The result implies that while learners are meeting basic academic standards, there is a need to strengthen interventions, particularly for those at the lower end of the performance spectrum. The presence of 24% achieving Outstanding and another 21% in Very Satisfactory also suggests that with effective teaching and leadership strategies, even more students could achieve higher outcomes.

**Table 4**  
**Test of Relationship**

Variables Correlated	r	Computed value or t	Table Value @.05	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Leadership Style and IPCRF of Teachers	0.86	3.667	0.869	Reject Ho	Significant Relationship (Very Strong)
IPCRF of Teachers and Academic Performance of Learners	0.13	2.968	2.224	Reject Ho	Significant Relationship (Weak)

This table presents the Test of Relationship, which illustrates the statistical correlation between two sets of variables: Leadership Style and IPCRF (Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form) of Teachers, and IPCRF of Teachers and Academic Performance of Learners. The table provides statistical indicators including the correlation coefficient (r), computed t-values, the critical table value at the 0.05 significance level, the decision on the null hypothesis (Ho), and the interpretation of the strength of the relationship. The analysis aims to examine whether there are significant relationships between school leadership, teacher performance, and student academic outcomes.

The first relationship tested in the table is between Leadership Style and the IPCRF of Teachers. With a correlation coefficient of 0.86 and a computed t-value of 3.667 exceeding the table value of 0.869, the null hypothesis was rejected. This indicates a very strong and significant relationship between the leadership style of school heads and teacher performance. This means

that more effective and adaptive leadership practices positively influence how teachers perform, as reflected in their IPCRF ratings.

The second relationship is between the IPCRF of Teachers and the Academic Performance of Learners. The correlation coefficient here is 0.13, indicating a weak relationship, even though the computed t-value (2.968) is higher than the table value (2.224), resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis. This suggests that while the relationship is statistically significant, the strength of the connection between teacher performance and student academic performance is relatively low. Other factors beyond teacher performance may be influencing student outcomes.

These results have several implications. First, the very strong relationship between leadership style and teacher performance suggests that effective school leadership plays a critical role in enhancing the work performance of educators. Second, although the relationship between teacher performance and learner academic performance is weak, it is still statistically significant, implying that teacher effectiveness, as measured by the IPCRF, contributes—though modestly—to learners' academic achievements. The overall findings emphasize the importance of strengthening school leadership to elevate teacher performance, which in turn may have a ripple effect on student outcomes. The result implies that leadership development programs for school heads should be prioritized as a strategic step to indirectly support learner achievement.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

Based on the results of this study, the Test of Relationship, which illustrates the statistical correlation between two sets of variables: Leadership Style and IPCRF (Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form) of Teachers, and IPCRF of Teachers and Academic Performance of Learners, significant relationships were observed. The findings revealed a very strong correlation between the leadership styles of school heads and the performance of teachers, underscoring how effective leadership can directly enhance educator performance. On the other hand, the relationship between teacher performance and learners' academic performance, while statistically significant, was weak, suggesting that other variables may also be influencing student outcomes. These results imply that leadership practices within schools have a considerable impact on teacher effectiveness, which, although not solely responsible, plays a contributory role in student academic success. Strengthening instructional leadership, therefore, should be prioritized to elevate teacher performance and create more supportive conditions for improved learner achievement.

#### **V. Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed from the School head's Instructional Leadership Styles, in relation to the level to the performance of teachers and literacy performance of the KEY STAGE 1-2 learners among the ff:

The teacher should continue to seek opportunities for professional growth and align instructional strategies with the leadership direction of the school head to improve teaching practices and positively impact literacy outcomes among Key Stage 1 and 2 learners.

The school head should adopt and sustain effective instructional leadership styles—particularly transformational and transactional approaches—to motivate teachers, provide clear academic goals, and support consistent monitoring and feedback to enhance teacher performance and student literacy achievement.

The Public Schools District Supervisor should conduct regular instructional leadership training for school heads, ensure that leadership practices are aligned with national education goals, and monitor their implementation to ensure they effectively support both teacher and learner performance.

The parents should actively engage in their children's learning process by maintaining communication with teachers and supporting home-based literacy activities, which reinforce classroom instruction and promote higher literacy levels among young learners.

The researcher should further explore other variables that may affect the academic performance of learners, such as learner motivation, parental involvement, and availability of resources, to gain a broader perspective on what contributes to literacy success in Key Stage 1 and 2.

The future researchers should replicate or expand this study in other educational settings with larger populations to validate the findings, and also consider longitudinal studies to assess the long-term effects of school leadership styles on teacher performance and student achievement.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to praise and thank God, the almighty, who has granted countless blessing, knowledge, and opportunity given to me to be able to pursue the graduate studies.

I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the people who have been instruments in the successful completion of this thesis.

I wish to extend my special thanks to Dr. Bryant C. Acar, Dean of Graduate School, for his motivation and immense knowledge in helping to improve the study.

I would like to express my deep and sincere gratitude to my research adviser Dr. Elvin H. Wenceslao for his invaluable guidance, enthusiasm and support throughout this research and writing of this thesis. His insights and encouragement were instrumental in shaping this thesis.

I would like to thank the rest of the thesis committee Dr. Jasmine B. Misa and Dr. Annabelle A. Wenceslao for giving their assistance and recommendations toward the realization of this study.

I wish to acknowledge the help provided by my co-teachers on the distribution and retrieval of the Pre-test and Post Test to the pupils.

I would also like to show my deep appreciation to the pupils and the parents in guiding their children in answering the Activity Sheets.

Last but not least, I will forever be thankful to my family for their unfailing support and encouragement.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Aureada, (2021). The Instructional Leadership Practices of School Heads. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, Volume 2, Issue 2, pp. 75 - 89.
- [2] Balyer, A. (2018). The role of school leadership in fostering a positive school climate. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 18(2), 475-490. <https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2018.2.0555>
- [3] Garcia, R. L. (2020). Impact of principals' transformational leadership style on teacher job satisfaction: A study of public elementary schools in the Philippines.
- [4] Santos, M. M. (2019). Leadership styles of school principals and their impact on teacher job satisfaction in Philippine public elementary schools.

### AUTHOR'S PROFILE



**MAYBETH N. MODINA**

The author is born on October 03, 1988 at Baybay City, Leyte, Philippines. She finished with flying colours her Bachelor's degree in Elementary Education at Eastern Visayas State University – Ormoc Campus. In her high school and college days, she was really into the supervision field. She was a leader in different organizations when she was a student and that helped her decide to take administration and supervision as her field of specialization for her master's degree. She is currently finishing her Master's degree of Arts in Education major in Administration and Supervision at Western Leyte College of Ormoc City.

She is currently a Teacher III in the Department of Education and a Grade – VI Teacher at Ampihanon Elementary School at Barangay Ampihanon, Baybay City, Leyte, Philippines. She is a coordinator in two school organizations for learners namely, Supreme Elementary Learner Government and the Girl Scouts of the Philippines. She believes that supervising the young is the foundation of understanding how to supervise the old.