

## Research Article

# TEACHERS' PROFILE, SCHOOL AUTONOMY AND DISTRIBUTED LEADERSHIP AS PREDICTORS OF INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

<sup>1</sup>Baylanie M. Dirampaten, <sup>2,\*</sup> Mark Raymond S. Tan, <sup>2</sup>Evelyn K. Montecalvo

<sup>1</sup>Teacher, Datu Ayob Memorial National High School, Lanao Del Sur, Philippines.

<sup>2</sup>Professor, Capitol University, Philippines.

Received 16<sup>th</sup> February 2024; Accepted 17<sup>th</sup> March 2024; Published online 25<sup>th</sup> April 2024

### ABSTRACT

This research delves into the influence of respondents' profiles, school autonomy, and distributed leadership on instructional strategies in an educational context. The study utilized a quantitative research design, explicitly employing simple and multiple regression analysis to determine the degree of influence of the independent variables on the dependent variable. The study sampled 122 teacher respondents and was conducted in a randomly stratified sample population. The study found that none of the demographic variables emerged as significant contributors to predicting instructional strategies. The coefficients associated with these predictors exhibited t-values and p-values that did not reach statistical significance, reinforcing that these variables do not play a meaningful role in predicting instructional strategies among the respondents. Regarding the influence of school autonomy on instructional strategies, the result indicates a strong link between school autonomy and the selection and application of teaching methods. This suggests that this autonomy can influence classroom practices, prompting further exploration of its power and other vital elements in guiding instructional strategies. The study reveals that distributed leadership in schools can influence teachers' teaching methods, although it may not directly influence classroom practices. Further investigation is needed to understand the impact of distributed leadership and other factors on instructional strategies. Furthermore, school autonomy and distributed leadership influence instructional strategies, but school autonomy is the highest predictor of instructional strategies in the context of this study. School autonomy can significantly affect teachers' instructional strategies. It allows schools to have the freedom to make decisions about their curriculum, assessment methods, resource allocation, and staffing, which can directly impact the teaching methods employed by the teachers. In conclusion, this study contributes valuable insights into the dynamics of educational practices among high school teachers, emphasizing the importance of fostering autonomy, distributed leadership, and instructional strategies in diverse academic settings.

**Keywords:** Appropriateness of Assessment, Collaborative Environment, Earned Autonomy, Feedback Mechanism, and Strategic Direction.

### INTRODUCTION

In the backdrop of the globally changing educational landscape, nations are striving to instill 21st century skills among their students to prepare them for an interconnected, technology-driven society (Voogt *et al.*, 2018). This has led to education systems worldwide reforming curricula, assessments, and teaching methods (WEF, 2020). The traditional teaching methods are increasingly viewed as inadequate to foster these skills, paving the way for innovative instructional strategies that cultivate a student-centered learning environment (Hermans *et al.*, 2018; Pellegrino and Hilton, 2012). In the Philippines, the introduction of the K-12 system has amplified the demand for inventive teaching methods that accommodate diverse learners while integrating 21st century competencies (Taladro and Bautista, 2019). To enhance the quality of education, the Department of Education in the Philippines has introduced policies promoting school autonomy and distributed leadership, recognizing them as potential facilitators for the integration of these competencies (DepEd, 2016; Magno *et al.*, 2018).

Despite these advances, there is limited research exploring the interplay between instructional strategies, school autonomy, distributed leadership and profile of teachers within the Philippine context (Magno *et al.*, 2018). Recognizing this knowledge gap, this dissertation aims to investigate the effect of school autonomy,

distributed leadership and profile on teachers' practice of instructional strategies in the Philippines. The insights drawn from this study could contribute to the ongoing discourse on the role of leadership and autonomy in driving innovative teaching practices, thereby shaping the future direction of education reforms in the country and beyond. The primary aim of this study is to understand how Teachers' Profile, School Autonomy, and Distributed Leadership as Predictors of Instructional Strategies.

### THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This study utilized the Autonomy-Supportive Theory (AST) by Deci and Ryan (1985) and the Distributed Leadership Theory (DLT) by Spillane (2006) as overarching theoretical lenses to comprehend the complex relationships among school autonomy, distributed leadership, and the implementation of instructional strategies by teachers. The AST posits that individuals are more likely to engage in self-directed behaviors when they perceive their environment as supportive of their autonomy. This theory pivots on two types of motivation: intrinsic and extrinsic. The intrinsic motivation, emanating from within, is driven by values, passions, and personal sense of morality, while extrinsic motivation is propelled by external rewards and recognitions such as grading systems, evaluations, and accolades (Deci and Ryan, 2008).

Further, DLT, on the other hand, emphasizes the shared nature of leadership responsibilities for effective management of organizations, including schools. The theory posits that leadership emerges from the interactions between leaders, followers, and the context, with an emphasis on collaborative efforts of various actors (Spillane, 2006).

\*Corresponding Author: Mark Raymond S. Tan,  
2Professor, Capitol University, Philippines.

In the context of this study, the DLT can shed light on how the distribution of leadership in schools can impact teachers' practices. A distributed leadership structure promotes a collaborative culture, encourages shared decision-making, and empowers teachers. It acknowledges and leverages the potential of all stakeholders in the school community, thus fostering an environment conducive for the adoption and implementation of instructional strategies.

To sum it up, the theoretical underpinnings of AST and DLT guide this research. They provide a framework suggesting that a school environment supportive of teacher autonomy and characterized by distributed leadership can enhance teachers practice of instructional strategies. These theories substantiate the potential role of autonomy and distributed leadership as pivotal elements in reshaping teacher practices for a more future-ready education system.

### Statement of the Problem

The study was focused on exploring the teachers' profile, school autonomy and distributed leadership on the respondents practice of instructional strategies.

Specifically, it will answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:
  - i. Sex;
  - ii. Age;
  - iii. Years in Service;
  - iv. Number of trainings attended
2. How do the respondents assess the practice of school autonomy in terms of:
  - i. Strategic direction;
  - ii. Appropriateness of training;
  - iii. Collaborative environment; and
  - iv. Efficiency of feedback mechanisms?
3. How do the respondents assess the practice of distributed leadership in terms of:
  - i. Earned autonomy;
  - ii. Accountability; and
  - iii. Capacity?
4. How do the respondents assess their instructional strategies in terms of:
  - i. Direct Instruction strategy;
  - ii. Interactive Instruction strategy; and
  - iii. Experiential Learning strategy?
5. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' practice of school autonomy when grouped according to their profile?
6. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' practice of distributed leadership when group according to their profile?
7. Is there a significant relationship between the school autonomy and instructional strategies?
8. Is there a significant relationship between distributed leadership and instructional strategies?
9. *Is there a significant relationship between school autonomy and distributed leadership?*
10. Does the respondents' profile predict instructional strategies?
11. Does the school autonomy predict instructional strategies?
12. Does distributed leadership predict instructional strategies?
13. Do school autonomy and distributed leadership predict instructional strategies?

## RELATED LITERATURE AND STUDIES

### School Autonomy

School autonomy, a salient subject in the educational landscape, merits a comprehensive examination. The discourse surrounding it revolves around the ability of schools to independently manage various aspects of their operation. A considerable body of research asserts that autonomy within schools, particularly in the realms of budgeting, textbook selection, and teacher hiring, leads to enhanced performance (Neeleman, 2019). Yet, it's worth noting that the translation of these autonomy-centric policies into actual practice is not always smooth or guaranteed.

According to a study by Hashim *et al.*, (2021), school actors perceive school autonomy positively and use autonomy to improve organizational performance. The study highlights the effectiveness of autonomy in fostering collaboration and decision-making processes. Also, a research project investigating the implications of school autonomy on social justice found that school principals perceive school autonomy positively and recognize its impact on leadership practices. This study, by Niesche *et al.*, (2021), emphasizes the importance of principals' perceptions in understanding the impacts of school autonomy. Furthermore, a study by Neeleman (2019) explores the scope of school autonomy in practice and highlights the crucial role of school leaders in decision-making processes. The study emphasizes the importance of understanding how schools and school leaders utilize school autonomy in practice.

### Indicators of School Autonomy

Strategic oversight is necessary across all educational systems to establish goals, directions, and standards for schools. National education systems should provide the framework for schools to implement their strategies, similar to a CEO setting corporate vision and performance indicators. Without this perspective, increased school autonomy could lead to inconsistent learning outcomes that conflict with national policy and worsen inequities between schools (Doumet, 2018). To ensure effective school autonomy, teachers and administrators need to make informed decisions based on knowledge of students' backgrounds, abilities, and pedagogical strategies.

Additionally, training programs and a strong collaborative culture can help improve their understanding of best practices. In addition, creating a collaborative environment and implementing appropriateness of feedback mechanisms are crucial in helping policymakers understand the challenges schools face and the resources needed to address them, beyond accountability and reporting results. This communication can help create a shared vision for learning (Doumet, 2018).

### Distributed Leadership

The concept of leadership within an educational context extends beyond the purview of formal positions. Distributed leadership brings a shift in perspective, underscoring the interactive relationships between leaders, followers, and the situational context, rather than solely focusing on individuals occupying leadership positions (Spillane, 2019). The potency of distributed leadership is evident in a myriad of research findings. This approach has been correlated with improved organizational conditions, enhanced teacher commitment, increased performance, and greater adaptability to challenges, such as those presented by the COVID-19 pandemic (Hallinger and Heck, 2010; Hulpia *et al.*, 2009; Yulo and Dioso, 2020; Kuswardhani, 2020). Research from the Philippines has also stressed the importance of

nurturing leadership qualities among teachers to fully reap the benefits of this leadership model (Oracion, 2014; Alegado, 2018).

Creating and communicating a shared vision that involves as many stakeholders as possible is crucial to prevent misunderstandings of educational reforms (Hermans *et al.*, 2018). Teachers and principals must be involved in decision-making and have the ability to exercise their autonomy to effectively communicate and implement the vision. Distributed leadership, where leadership is a result of interactions between school leaders, followers, and their circumstances, emphasizes interactions between people instead of focusing solely on those in formal leadership positions (Spillane, 2019). By stretching leadership practice over the involvement of two or more leaders, distributed leadership improves organizational conditions and student achievement (Hallinger and Heck, 2010; Louis *et al.*, 2018).

### Instructional Strategies

A transformation is underway in contemporary education as cutting-edge instructional strategies replace traditional, lecture-based teaching. These novel strategies aim to cultivate essential skills in students such as critical thinking and technology use (Starkey, 2019). However, implementing these strategies necessitates extensive teacher training and support (Hermans *et al.*, 2018). Current research has amplified the importance of facets such as technology integration, empowerment of teacher leadership, leadership capability enhancement, and professional development in propelling instructional practices forward (Huang *et al.*, 2021; Harris and Jones, 2019; Leithwood and Jantzi, 2006; Mandrikas *et al.*, 2021).

## METHODOLOGY

This study adapted a quantitative research design with multi regression analysis. A quantitative research design allowed us to model and analyze multiple variables. Multiple regression analysis was used as an instrument in understanding the extent of the influence of teachers' profile, school autonomy, and distributed leadership as predictors of teachers' practice of instructional strategies. This approach ultimately provided key insights into how these factors shaped educational practices in different school settings. The study was conducted in the Division of Lanao Del Sur II, Tubaran District. The place is semi-urbanized located north of the Province of Lanao Sur, Philippines, and the province's former capital. It has a land area of 813.37 sq. km and had 56 barangays with a total population of 239,927. It became a chartered province on June 16, 1960, per RA 526.

A total of 178 high school teachers from the target division's seven selected schools participated in the study. By applying the Cochran formula, it was determined that a sample size of 122 was required out of the 178 available. The responses of the respondents were crucial in understanding the dynamics of the study. The outcome of the study was relevant and useful in enhancing the teachers' practice of instructional strategies.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Profile of the respondents

The research reveals participants are female and most of respondents were either new to the workforce or in their early stages of employment. A significant number of participants have been employed for 0-10 years, with a moderate level of experience. The number of participants decreases as employment duration increases. Females constitute a larger proportion of the overall respondents,

indicating a predominantly female occupation. The study also highlights the varied age distribution and experience levels among participants, which could impact the understanding of the results. The differences in training received may also affect their ability to develop skills and acquire knowledge.

### How do the respondents assess the practice of school autonomy in terms of: strategic direction, appropriateness of assessment, collaborative environment, and efficiency of feedback mechanisms?

The study found high levels of consensus among participants regarding the school's schedules, formal structure for instructional decisions, and support for teachers in leadership positions. The school's practices regarding training and evaluation were deemed suitable, with a robust consensus suggesting efficient use of assessment methodologies, feedback systems, and professional development opportunities. The school also emphasized a cooperative atmosphere, with educators actively involved in leadership positions and exchanging resources and strategies. The feedback mechanism, overseen by the principle, was deemed effective and aligned with the school and district objectives. The implementation of school autonomy was observable and positively appreciated, with respondents expressing favorable opinions on strategic direction, appropriateness of training, collaborative environment, and effectiveness of feedback.

### How do the respondents assess the practice of distributed leadership in terms of: earned autonomy, accountability, and capacity?

The study highlights the school's strong culture of distributed leadership, teamwork, trust, and high expectations, which effectively generates accountability and valuing responsibility for student achievement. To enhance this, administrators should foster responsibility, maintain transparent communication, and offer professional growth opportunities aligned with the school's vision and objectives.

### How do the respondents assess their instructional strategies in terms of: direct instruction strategy, interactive instruction strategy; and experiential learning strategy?

The study found that the school effectively uses direct, interactive, and experiential learning methods. Participants believe the school uses these approaches effectively and frequently. To maintain these practices, administrators should facilitate professional development opportunities, foster teacher cooperation, allocate resources for various teaching approaches, and implement regular assessments and feedback methods. This will ensure a dynamic, engaging, and successful educational experience for students.

### Difference in the respondents' practice of school autonomy when grouped according to their profile

The study found no significant differences in school autonomy implementation among male and female participants, age groups, or years of service. Participants in various training groups achieved scores in strategic directions and earned autonomy. There was no significant difference in distributed leadership implementation based on respondents' profile. Age groups and years of service did not show significant differences in independence achieved. The study also found no significant differences in earned autonomy practice among different training attendance groups. Overall, there were no significant differences in school autonomy implementation across different age groups or years of service.

**Is there a significant difference in the respondents practice of distributed leadership when grouped according to their profile?**

The study found no significant gender differences in the practice of distributed leadership among respondents. Age did not significantly impact earned autonomy but did influence accountability, capacity, and overall practice. Years of service did not significantly impact earned autonomy and accountability, but capacity had a significant difference. Training attendance did not significantly impact distributed leadership practice, but the content and quality of training sessions could still shape effective practices.

**Is there a significant relationship between school autonomy and instructional strategies?**

This study emphasizes notable favorable associations between different aspects of school autonomy and particular instructional methodologies. These findings indicate that when educators perceive greater levels of strategic guidance, suitable training, collaborative settings, and effective feedback systems, they are more likely to utilize specific instructional strategies in their teaching methods. These insights can guide educational leaders in formulating initiatives to promote both school autonomy and instructional practices for enhanced teaching and learning outcomes.

**Is there a significant relationship between distributed leadership and instructional strategies?**

Table 1 presents the results of the correlation analysis examining the relationship between distributed leadership and instructional strategies among the respondents.

**Table 1 Test of Significant Relationship1 between Distributed Leadership and Instructional Strategies of the Respondents**

Variables	Instructional Strategies							
	Direct Instructional Strategy		Interactive Instructional Strategy		Experiential Learning Strategy		Total Measure	
Distributed Leadership	R-value (p-value)	Interpretation	R-value (p-value)	Interpretation	R-value (p-value)	Interpretation	R-value (p-value)	Interpretation
Earned Autonomy	.258** (.002)	S	.121 (.143)	NS	-.003 (.968)	NS	.169* (.040)	S
Accountability	.354*** (.000)	S	.127 (.123)	NS	.05 (.954)	NS	.218** (.008)	S
Capacity	.236** (.004)	S	.240** (.003)	S	-.109 (.189)	NS	.163* (.048)	S
Total Measure	.378*** (.000)	S	.221** (.007)	S	-.050 (.543)	NS	.245** (.003)	S

**Note:** 1analysis is based on Pearson Correlation S-Significant (\*\*p<.001, \*p<.01, p<.05) NS-Not Significant (p>.05)

The findings reveal significant associations between various dimensions of distributed leadership and specific instructional strategies. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between distributed leadership and instructional strategies of the respondents was rejected. In terms of earned autonomy, a significant positive correlation was observed between the use of direct instructional strategy ( $r=0.258, p=.002$ ) and the total measure of instructional strategies ( $r=0.169, p=.040$ ).

The accountability dimension of distributed leadership exhibited significant positive correlations with the use of direct instructional strategy ( $r=0.354, p<.001$ ) and the total measure of instructional strategies ( $r=0.218, p=.008$ ). This implies that a strong sense of accountability among educators is associated with a higher utilization of direct instructional strategies in teaching. In terms of capacity, significant positive correlations were found with both direct instructional strategy ( $r=0.236, p=.004$ ) and interactive instructional strategy ( $r=0.240, p=.003$ ). This indicates that as educators perceive a higher capacity in their leadership roles, there is an increased likelihood of employing both direct and interactive instructional strategies in teaching.

The total measure of distributed leadership displayed a significant positive correlation with the use of direct instructional strategy ( $r=0.378, p<.001$ ), interactive instructional strategy ( $r=0.221, p=.007$ ), and the total measure of instructional strategies ( $r=0.245, p=.003$ ). This overall positive association suggests that a comprehensive perception of distributed leadership is linked to an increased utilization of various instructional strategies. Thus, the results underscore the significant positive associations between different dimensions of distributed leadership and specific instructional strategies. These findings suggest that as educators perceive higher levels of earned autonomy, accountability, and capacity in their leadership roles, they are more likely to employ certain instructional strategies in their teaching practices. These insights can inform educational leaders in promoting effective distributed leadership practices that contribute to enhanced instructional strategies and, subsequently, improved teaching and learning outcomes.

**Is there a significant relationship between school autonomy and distributed leadership?**

Table 2 presents the results of the correlation analysis examining the relationship between school autonomy and distributed leadership among the respondents. The findings reveal significant associations between different components of school autonomy and distributed leadership.

**Table 2 Test of Significant Relationship between School Autonomy and Distributed Leadership of the Respondents**

Variables	Distributed Leadership							
	Earned Autonomy		Accountability		Capacity		Total Measure	
School Autonomy	R-value (p-value)	Interpretation	R-value (p-value)	Interpretation	R-value (p-value)	Interpretation	R-value (p-value)	Interpretation
Strategic Directions	.400*** (.000)	S	.295*** (.000)	S	.049 (.558)	NS	.328*** (.000)	S
Appropriate of Training	.340*** (.000)	S	.431*** (.000)	S	.445*** (.000)	S	.545*** (.000)	S
Collaborative Environment	.444*** (.000)	S	.209* (.011)	S	.235** (.004)	S	.398*** (.000)	S
Efficiency of Feedback Mechanism	.214** (.009)	S	.328*** (.000)	S	.462*** (.000)	S	.453*** (.000)	S
Total Measure	.438*** (.000)	S	.424*** (.000)	S	.501*** (.000)	S	.612*** (.000)	S

**Note:** <sup>1</sup>analysis is based on Pearson Correlation S-Significant (\*\* $p < .001$ , \* $p < .01$ ,  $p < .05$ ) NS-Not Significant ( $p > .05$ )

In terms of strategic directions, a strong positive correlation was observed with earned autonomy ( $r=0.400$ ,  $p < .001$ ), accountability ( $r=0.295$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and the total measure of distributed leadership ( $r=0.328$ ,  $p < .001$ ). This indicates that as educators perceive higher levels of strategic directions in school autonomy, there is a concurrent increase in the perception of earned autonomy, accountability, and overall distributed leadership. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between school autonomy and distributed leadership of the respondents was rejected.

Appropriateness of training displayed significant positive correlations with earned autonomy ( $r=0.340$ ,  $p < .001$ ), accountability ( $r=0.431$ ,  $p < .001$ ), capacity ( $r=0.445$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and the total measure of distributed leadership ( $r=0.545$ ,  $p < .001$ ). This suggests that when educators perceive that training is appropriate, there is a corresponding increase in the perception of earned autonomy, accountability, capacity, and overall distributed leadership. Collaborative environment in school autonomy exhibited strong positive correlations with earned autonomy ( $r=0.444$ ,  $p < .001$ ), accountability ( $r=0.209$ ,  $p = .011$ ), capacity ( $r=0.235$ ,  $p = .004$ ), and the total measure of distributed leadership ( $r=0.398$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The efficiency of the feedback mechanism in school autonomy displayed significant positive correlations with earned autonomy ( $r=0.214$ ,  $p = .009$ ), accountability ( $r=0.328$ ,  $p < .001$ ), capacity ( $r=0.462$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and the total measure of distributed leadership ( $r=0.453$ ,  $p < .001$ ). This indicates that a more efficient feedback mechanism is associated with higher perceptions of earned autonomy, accountability, capacity, and overall distributed leadership.

The total measure of school autonomy exhibited strong positive correlations with earned autonomy ( $r=0.438$ ,  $p < .001$ ), accountability ( $r=0.424$ ,  $p < .001$ ), capacity ( $r=0.501$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and the total measure of distributed leadership ( $r=0.612$ ,  $p < .001$ ). In summary, the study found strong positive links between various parts of school autonomy and distributed leadership. This means that when teachers see more strategic planning, better training, teamwork, and effective feedback in their schools, they also feel a greater sense of shared leadership, responsibility, ability, and overall group leadership. These findings can help school leaders come up with ways to improve both school autonomy and shared leadership, leading to better leadership effectiveness and results for the school.

**Does the respondents' profile predict instructional strategies?**

The study found that none of the demographic variables emerged as significant contributors to predicting instructional strategies. The coefficients associated with these predictors exhibited t-values and p-values that did not reach statistical significance, reinforcing that these variables do not play a meaningful role in predicting instructional strategies among the respondents. These results imply that the variation in instructional strategies adopted by respondents is not adequately explained by their demographic characteristics or training experiences. While the regression model presented lacks explanatory power, it provides valuable insights into the complexity of the relationship between individual characteristics and instructional practices, emphasizing the need for a holistic and context-specific understanding of factors influencing teaching strategies.

**Table 3 Linear Regression Analysis of Predicting Instructional Strategies by Respondents' Profile**

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Stand. Coeff. $\beta$	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
	B	S.E.			
(Constant)	3.176	.201	--	15.834(.000)	
X <sub>1</sub> : Sex	.000	.092	.000	-.002(.999)	Not significant
X <sub>2</sub> : Age	.078	.060	.173	1.303(.195)	Not significant
X <sub>3</sub> : Years of Service	-.109	.104	-.153	-1.052(.295)	Not significant
X <sub>4</sub> : Training	-.012	.052	-.022	-.222(.825)	Not significant

**Note:** Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> = -.012 ANOVA for Regression: F = .556,  $p > .05$ . Not significant ( $p > .05$ )

The overall model, however, did not demonstrate statistical significance ( $F = .556$ ,  $p > .05$ ), suggesting that the predictors collectively did not significantly contribute to explaining the variance in instructional strategies among respondents. The adjusted R<sup>2</sup> value of -.012 further reinforces the limited explanatory power of the model. Therefore, the null statement which states that the respondent's profile does not predict instructional strategies was accepted.

## Does the school autonomy predict instructional strategies?

The simple linear regression analysis in Table 4 aimed to predict instructional strategies based on the predictors of school autonomy, in terms of the indicators of Strategic Directions and Efficiency, Appropriateness of Training, Collaborative Environment, and Efficiency of Feedback Mechanism.

**Table 4 Linear Regression Analysis of Predicting Instructional Strategies by School Autonomy**

<b>Model 1</b>					
Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients $\beta$	t-value (p-value)	Remarks
	B	S.E.			
(Constant)	-.406	.224		-1.816(.007)	Significant
X <sub>1</sub> : Strategic Direction	.142	.047	.101	3.036(.003)	Significant
X <sub>2</sub> : Appropriateness of Training	.733	.088	.738	8.336(.000)	Significant
X <sub>3</sub> : Collaborative Environment	.511	.137	.505	3.738(.000)	Significant
X <sub>4</sub> : Efficiency of Feedback Mechanism	-.297	.132	-.298	-2.249(.026)	Significant

**Note:** Adjusted R<sup>2</sup>=.855 ANOVA for Regression: F=218.432, p=.000. Significant (p<.05) Not significant (p>.05)

### Fitted Regression Model:

#### *Instructional Strategie*

$$= -.406 + .142(\text{Strategic Direction}) + .733 (\text{Appropriateness of training}) + .511 (\text{Collaborative Environment}) - .297 (\text{Efficiency of Feedback})$$

### Model 2:

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients $\beta$	t-value (p-value)	Remarks
	B	S.E.			
(Constant)	.335	.122		2.749(.007)	Significant
School Autonomy	.885	.036	.896	24.379(.000)	Significant
Overall Measure					

**Note:** Adjusted R<sup>2</sup>=.801 ANOVA for Regression: F=594.339, p=.000. Significant (p<.05) Not significant (p>.05)

$$\text{Instructional Strategies} = .335 + .885(\text{School Autonomy})$$

The results in Model 1 revealed a statistically significant model (ANOVA  $F=218.432$ ,  $p=.000$ ), indicating that the variables under school autonomy do contribute to explaining the variance in instructional strategies among respondents. The adjusted R<sup>2</sup> value of .855 or 85.5% additionally supports the explanatory power of the model.

Based on the analysis, the fitted regression model 1 is expressed as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = -0.406 + 0.142 X_1 + 0.733 X_2 + 0.511 X_3 + -0.297 X_4$$

where:

$\hat{Y}$  = Instructional Strategies

$X_1$  = Strategic Direction

$X_2$  = Appropriateness of Training

$X_3$  = Collaborative Environment

$X_4$  = Efficiency of Feedback Mechanism

Notably, the negative beta coefficient in predicting instructional strategies by school autonomy based on the efficiency of the feedback mechanism implies that there is an inverse relationship between these variables. This means that as the efficiency of the feedback mechanism in school autonomy increases, the predicted level of instructional strategies decreases. Additionally, this negative beta coefficient suggests that a more efficient feedback mechanism in school autonomy may not necessarily lead to a higher implementation of instructional strategies by educators. It could indicate that other factors or components of school autonomy, such as strategic direction, appropriateness of training, or collaborative environment, have a stronger influence on the adoption of instructional strategies.

Moreover, the results in Model 2 revealed a statistically significant overall model (ANOVA  $F=594.339$ ,  $p=.000$ ), indicating that school autonomy do predict the variance in instructional strategies among respondents. The adjusted R<sup>2</sup> value of .801 or 80.1% supports the explanatory power of the model.

Based on the analysis, the fitted regression model 2 is expressed as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = 0.335 + 0.885 X_1$$

where:

$\hat{Y}$  = Instructional Strategies

$X_1$  = School Autonomy

Therefore, the null statement which states that the school autonomy does not significantly predict instructional strategies was rejected since the p-value is less than 0.001. This discovery prompts to explore deeper into the power of school autonomy and to consider other elements that could be even more pivotal in guiding instructional strategies. School autonomy is often viewed as a tool to make schools more receptive to local needs and specific contexts, and to provide school leaders and teachers with more control over the school's management and educational direction. If it's not visibly impacting teaching strategies, it could simply mean that it is yet to unlock the full potential of this autonomy (OECD, 2018).

**Does distributed leadership predict instructional strategies?**

Table 5 presents the linear regression analysis aimed at predicting instructional strategies based on the predictor of distributed leadership, in terms of its indicators Earned Autonomy, Accountability, and Capacity.

**Table 5 Linear Regression Analysis of Predicting Instructional Strategies by Distributed Leadership**

<b>Model 1</b>					
Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients $\beta$	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
	B	S.E.			
(Constant)	.052	.114		.458(.006)	Significant
X <sub>1</sub> : Earned Autonomy	.489	.090	.487	5.434(.000)	Significant
X <sub>2</sub> : Account ability	.295	.107	.293	2.755(.007)	Significant
X <sub>3</sub> : Capacity	.195	.064	.184	3.020(.003)	Significant

**Note:** Adjusted R<sup>2</sup>=.855 ANOVA for Regression: F=289.375, p=.000. Significant (p<.05) Not significant (p>.05)

**Fitted Regression Model:**

$$Instructional\ Strategies = .052 + .489 (Earned\ Autonomy) + .295 (Account\ Ability) + .195 (Capacity)$$

<b>Model 2</b>					
Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients $\beta$	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
	B	S.E.			
(Constant)	.290	.130		2.230(.027)	Significant
Distributed Leadership	.910	.039	.887	23.208(.000)	Significant
Overall Measure					

**Note:** Adjusted R<sup>2</sup>=.787 ANOVA for Regression: F=538.607, p=.000. Significant (p<.05) Not significant (p>.05)

$$Instructional\ Strategies = .290 + .910(Distributed\ Leadership)$$

The results in Model 1 indicated a statistically significant model (ANOVA F=289.375, p=.000), suggesting that variables under distributed leadership do significantly contributes to explaining the variance in instructional strategies among respondents. The adjusted R<sup>2</sup> value of .855 or 85.5% indicates a provision for the descriptive influence of the model.

Based on the analysis, the fitted regression model 2 is expressed as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = 0.052 + 0.489 X_1 + 0.295 X_2 + 0.195 X_3$$

where:

- $\hat{Y}$  = Instructional Strategies
- X<sub>1</sub> = Earned Autonomy
- X<sub>2</sub> = Accountability
- X<sub>3</sub> = Capacity

Furthermore, the results in Model 2 revealed a statistically significant overall model (ANOVA F=538.607, p=.000), indicating that distributed leadership do predict the variance in instructional strategies among respondents. The adjusted R<sup>2</sup> value of .787 or 78.7% supports the explanatory power of the model.

Based on the analysis, the fitted regression model 2 is expressed as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = 0.290+ 0.910 X_1$$

where:

- $\hat{Y}$  = Instructional Strategies
- X<sub>1</sub> = Distributed Leadership

Therefore, the null statement which states that distributed leadership does not significantly predict instructional strategies was rejected since the p-value is less than 0.001.

This study brings to light an interesting insight that distributed leadership approach within a school could influence how teachers design and implement their teaching methods. Despite the distribution of leadership responsibilities among various individuals in a school, it may not seem like this organizational structure is directly shaping teaching methods. However, this could be a gentle nudge that's influencing the classroom practices in ways yet to fully understand. This discovery invites to further investigate the power of distributed leadership and consider other factors that might have an even more considerable impact on instructional strategies.

Ideally, distributed leadership should empower principals to have a greater influence on instructional practices. If this influence isn't apparent, it could mean that the leadership responsibilities are yet to be fully grasped or shared by the team. This is supported by Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2008, 2020), who propose a significant link between distributed leadership and the use of innovative practices (O'Shea, 2021).

### Do school autonomy and distributed leadership predict instructional strategies?

Table 6 presents the linear regression analysis aimed at predicting instructional strategies based on the predictors school autonomy and distributed leadership.

**Table 6 Linear Regression Analysis of Predicting Instructional Strategies by School Autonomy and Distributed Leadership**

#### Model 1

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients $\beta$	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
	B	S.E.			
(Constant)	.174	.117		1.493(.013)	Significant
X <sub>1</sub> : School Autonomy	.510	.080	.516	6.361(.000)	Significant
X <sub>3</sub> : Distributed Leadership	.429	.083	.418	5.148(.000)	Significant

**Note:** Adjusted R<sup>2</sup>= .831 ANOVA for Regression: F=362.330, p=.000. Significant (p<.05) Not significant (p>.05)

#### Fitted Regression Model:

$$\text{Instructional Strategies} = .174 + .510 (\text{School Autonomy}) + .429 (\text{Distributed Leadership})$$

#### Model 2

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients $\beta$	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
	B	S.E.			
(Constant)	.335	.122		2.749(.007)	Significant
School Autonomy and Distributed Leadership	.885	.036	.896	27.379(.000)	Significant
Overall Measure					

**Note:** Adjusted R<sup>2</sup>= .801 ANOVA for Regression: F=594.339, p=.000. Significant (p<.05) Not significant (p>.05)

#### Fitted Regression Model:

$$\text{Instructional Strategies} = .335 + .885(\text{School Autonomy \& Distributed Leadership})$$

The results in Model 1 indicated a statistically significant model (ANOVA F=362.330, p=.000), suggesting that independent variables school autonomy and distributed leadership do significantly contribute to explaining the variance in instructional strategies among respondents. The adjusted R<sup>2</sup> value of .831 or 83.1% indicates a provision for the descriptive influence of the model.

Based on the analysis, the fitted regression model 1 is expressed as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = 0.174 + 0.510 X_1 + 0.429 X_2$$

where:

$$\hat{Y} = \text{Instructional Strategies}$$

$$X_1 = \text{School Autonomy}$$

$$X_2 = \text{Distributed Leadership}$$

This means that independent variables such as school autonomy and distributed leadership do influence the instructional strategies among respondents, however school autonomy showed a higher level of influence as a predictor of instructional strategies among respondents.

Furthermore, per-unit increase in school autonomy, there is a 0.510 increase in instructional strategies, and per-unit increase in distributed leadership, there is a 0.429 increase in instructional strategies. This means that school autonomy is the highest predictor of instructional strategies in the context of this study. School autonomy can significantly influence the instructional strategies of teachers. It allows schools to have the freedom to make decisions about their curriculum, assessment methods, resource allocation, and staffing, which can directly impact the teaching methods employed by the teachers. In addition to this, school autonomy can also influence the professional development of teachers. Goddard et al. (2007) stated that school autonomy can provide teachers with more opportunities for professional development, which can enhance their teaching skills, knowledge and instructional strategies.



## REFERENCES

- Alegado, P. J. E. (2018). The challenges of teacher leadership in the Philippines as experienced and perceived by teachers. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 6(6), 291-302. <https://www.academia.edu/download/62106201/2220200215-105715-hg3pi1.pdf>
- DepEd. (2016). Department of Education Order No. 42, s. 2016: Policy Guidelines on Daily Lesson Preparation for the K to 12 Basic Education Program. Department of Education. <https://search.informit.org/doi/abs/10.3316/informit.085730319385430>
- Harris, A., Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., & Hopkins, D. (2007). Distributed leadership and organizational change: Reviewing the evidence. *Journal of Educational Change*, 8, 337–347.
- Harris, A. (2004). Distributed leadership and school improvement: Leading or misleading? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 32(1), 11-24.
- Harris, A. (2016). *Distributed leadership matters: Perspectives, practicalities, and potential*. Sage. <https://sk.sagepub.com/books/distributed-leadership-matters>
- Harris, A., Jones, M., & Ismail, N. (2022). Distributed leadership: taking a retrospective and contemporary view of the evidence base. *School Leadership & Management*. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13632434.2022.2109620>
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2019). Teacher leadership and educational change. *School Leadership & Management*, 39(2), 123-137.
- Haris, I., & Ancho, I. (2020). *JOURNAL OF CRITICAL REVIEWS School Supervision Practice in Asean Countries: A Comparison Indonesia and the Philippines*. 7, 2020. <https://jcreview.com/admin/Uploads/Files/61c9bbfaa806c3.98742327.pdf>
- Herman, E. O. (2023). Teachers' Perceptions of the Influence of Teacher Evaluation Process Feedback on Improving Instructional Practice. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=15680&context=dissertations>
- Hermans, R., Tondeur, J., van Braak, J., & Valcke, M. (2008). The impact of primary school teachers' educational beliefs on the classroom use of computers. *Computers & Education*, 51(4), 1499-1509
- Huang, Z., Kougiannos, E., Ge, X., Wang, S.-P., Chen, P.-H., & Cai, L. (2021). A Systematic Interdisciplinary Engineering and Technology Model Using Cutting-Edge Technologies for STEM Education. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, 64(4), 390–397. <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/9374056/>
- OECD.(2009). School Evaluation, Teacher Appraisal and Feedback and the Impact on Schools and Teachers. In OECD, *Creating Effective Teaching and Learning Environments* (pp. 137–188). OECD. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264068780-7-en>
- OECD.(2019). TALIS 2018 results (Volume I) teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners: Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners. OECD Publishing.
- OECD.(2018). How to make school autonomy work – OECD Education and Skills Today. <https://oecdutoday.com/how-to-make-school-autonomy-work/>
- OECD.(2020). TALIS 2018 results (Volume II) teachers and school leaders as valued professionals: Teachers and school leaders as valued professionals. OECD Publishing.
- OECD.(2019). TALIS 2018 results (Volume I) teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners: Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners. OECD Publishing.
- O'Shea, C. (2021). Distributed leadership and innovative teaching practices. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 2, 100088–100088. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2021.100088>
- Pellegrino, J. W., & Hilton, M. L. (2012). Education for life and work: Developing transferable knowledge and skills in the 21st century. National Academies Press. <https://nap.nationalacademies.org/13398> <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2021.100088>
- Starkey, L. (2010). Supporting the digitally able beginning teacher. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(7), 1429-1438.

\*\*\*\*\*