Instructional Leadership Challenges of Selected Higher Institutions in Basilan During COVID-19 Pandemic

Al-basser S. Sappayani

College of Arts and Sciences, Basilan State College, Isabela City, Basilan, Philippines, 7300
Email address: albasser_sappayani@yahoo.com

Abstract— *This study primarily aimed to determine the instructional leadership challenges of selected higher institutions (HEIs) in Basilan Province. A quantitative-descriptive method was used and 114 faculty members were chosen as respondents. It was revealed that there are no significant differences on the level of instructional leadership problems between some demographic profile such as gender, ethnicity, highest educational attainment, and length of service of the faculty members. The perceptions of the male and female faculty members on the level of instructional leadership problems are the same. The perceptions of the faculty members regardless of their ethnicity on the level of instructional leadership problems are the same. The perceptions of the faculty members regardless of their highest educational attainment on the level of instructional leadership problems are the same. The perceptions of the faculty members regardless of their length of service on the level of instructional leadership problems are the same.*

Keywords— *Basilan State College, Instructional Leadership, Faculty, Higher Education Institutions, COVID-19.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Due to pandemics, technology becomes the center of learning processes in any educational institution. The State Colleges and Universities (SUCs) are presently implementing or applying blended learning on which technology is part of these learning environments. There are institutions on which blended learning is already part of their management strategies, while some still coping with this dilemma due to the non-availability of instructional materials during the normal situation [4]. Perhaps, even before the pandemic, problems in educational management emerge as part of its challenges. Accordingly, there are five commonly observed school management issues or challenges [5]. The first problem is about lending a hand to teachers to use social networking sites. Facebook is the most popular social network nowadays on which almost all educational managers using this site as means of communication for relatives, friends, and even school-related activities. However, in some aspects, this social networking is being used only for posting personal activities or posting participation in any school activities. The second problem is the absence of communication and collaboration. It is due to the lack of any platform that provides constant contact between students, administration, staff, and faculty. The third problem is about forecasting the academic achievement of the student. The institution failed to manage information on student academic achievement. Almost all

institutions focused on final achievements, such as posting final grades in their portal but not their progress. The fourth problem is about collaborating on priority. In theory, faculty needs to cooperate at all times for common goals. However, this is far from reality because faculty tend to work on his/her own, and some do not bite colleagues' ideas. The last problem is about modeling the behaviors you want to see in your institution. Management provides the list of good qualities that everyone must-have. But how well these qualities be achieved as part of the institutional culture when the top management is not an example of these qualities.

Problems emanate from various stakeholders. Dos, Sagir, and Cetin [2] differentiate educational managers' concerns as short, medium, and long term problems. Short-term problems consist of students' behaviors, teacher's attitudes, and technical issues like violence between students [3]. Staff-based disorders are a medium-term problem for educational managers. More complex topics such as organizational structure, education policies, and society's economic situation are long-term academic managers' problems.

The quality of leadership provides significant and excellent outcomes for the school and students. An educational institution requires effective managers to introduce educational reform for good delivery of learning outcomes. The government recently needed any institution to elevate the learning process to produce a highly-skilled workforce to pace the global economy. Educational management is centered or concerned with the institution's purpose because of school management's crucial direction. According to Bush [1], the heart of educational administration lies in deciding on its goals. For SUCs, the Board approved the Annual Investment Plan through the top and middle managers' recommendations.

During the COVID-19 Pandemic, existing problems accumulated with the new additional challenges for the faculty. One of the unique problems facing the instructional leadership during this time is the use of information technology (IT). The low internet connection and non-availability of gadgets or other IT equipment augmented the problems in delivering educational mandates. Moreover, the faculty is the leading actor in providing quality education and essential critical employees in promoting superb academic service delivery. Thus, recognizing the instructional leadership problems of teachers in selected higher institutions (HEIs) in

Basilan may provide a basis for the institution to formulate policies or guidelines that are suited for all situations.

II. METHODOLOGY

The respondents were selected from the different HEIs in Basilan. The distribution of the respondents is shown in table below:

TABLE I: Distribution of the Respondents

Name of HEI	Frequency
Basilan State College	56
Furigay College	10
Mindanao Autonomous College	25
Claret College of Isabela	13
TOTAL	**114**

A descriptive-quantitative research design was used and a self-administered quantitative survey instruments will be constructed based from the instrument designed by Alig-Mielcarek (2003) comprises of thirty-one items based on the three scopes of instructional leadership such as defining and communicating school goals, monitoring and providing feedback on the teaching and learning process, and promoting school-wide professional development. The 31-item instrument of Alig-Mielcarek (2003) will be shorten into 30-item by integrating two items in the first area and statement will be further reconstructed to suit with the the purpose of the study. The instrument will apply a five-point likert scale as follows:

1 – Not a Problem (NP). This is a rating given to statement where situation is not a problem as felt or observed by the respondent.

2 – Once in a While a Problem (OWP). This is a rating given to statement where situation is once in a while a problem as felt or observed by the respondent.

3 – Sometimes a Problem (SP). This is a rating given to statement where situation is sometimes a problem as felt or observed by the respondent.

4 – Fairly a Problem (FP). This is a rating given to statement where situation is fairly a problem as felt or observed by the respondent.

5 – Frequently if not always a Problem (FNP). This is a rating given to statement where situation is frequently if not always a problem as felt or observed by the respondent.

For the interpretation of the score, the following interval scale will be used as shown in Table 4.

TABLE II: Interval Scale and Interpretation

Rating	Qualitative Interpretation	Descriptive Meaning
1.00-1.49	NC (Not a Challenge)	Respondent felt/observed that a situation is not a challenge.
1.50-2.49	OWC (Once in a while a Challenge)	Respondent felt/observed that a situation is once in a while a challenge.
2.50-3.49	SC (Sometimes a Challenge)	Respondent felt/observed that a situation is sometimes a challenge.
3.50-4.49	FC (Fairly a Challenge)	Respondent felt/observed that a situation is fairly a challenge.
4.50-5.00	FNC (Frequently if not always a Challenge)	Respondent felt/observed that a situation frequently if not always a challenge

In addition, a qualitative response was also integrated to identify particular challenges as felt by the respondents.

III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The data gathered will be interpreted in this section. The discussions will be according to the objective of the study.

The first objective of the study was to determine the level of instructional leadership challenges as felt by the respondents (see TABLE II for the frequency distribution of the respondents).

TABLE III: Mean distribution of Instructional Leadership challenges under the area of vision, mission, and goals

Vision, Mission, and Goals	Mean	QI	SD
1. Promoting the school's academic goals to students during COVID-19 Pandemic	2.62	SC	1.22
2. Developing school goals during COVID-19 Pandemic which promote high standards and expectations for all students	2.54	SC	1.19
3. Checking the modules and other learning delivery to ensure that contents are align with the school goals	2.48	OWC	1.22
4. Communicating the school's academic goals to other faculty during COVID-19 Pandemic	2.47	OWC	1.19
5. Ensuring the curricular materials are consistent with school goals during COVID-19 Pandemic	2.53	SC	1.18
6. Using school goals during COVID-19 Pandemic when making academic decisions	2.52	SC	1.05
7. Developing school goals during COVID-19 Pandemic that are well defined (e.g. responsibilities, time frame and evaluation criteria)	2.63	SC	1.03
8. Using data on student achievement during COVID-19 Pandemic as a guide for discussion regarding the instructional program	2.74	SC	1.07
9. Setting high but achievable standards for all students at the time of COVID-19 Pandemic	2.71	SC	1.11
10. Developing data-driven academic school goals in collaboration with other faculty at the time of COVID-19 Pandemic	2.63	SC	1.14
Area Mean	**2.59**	**SC**	**0.85**

Legend: QI=Qualitative Interpretation; SD=Standard Deviation; SC=Sometimes a Challenge; OWC=Once in a while a Challenge

Under the area of vision, mission, and goals, data shows that the respondents observed or felt that the following situations/items "sometimes a challenge" as rank from highest to lowest mean rating:

Item 8: Using data on student achievement during COVID-19 Pandemic as a guide for discussion regarding the instructional program.

Item 9: Setting high but achievable standards for all students at the time of COVID-19 Pandemic.

Item 10: Developing data-driven academic school goals in collaboration with other faculty at the time of COVID-19 Pandemic.

Item 1: Promoting the school's academic goals to students during COVID-19 Pandemic.

Item 2: Developing school goals during COVID-19 Pandemic which promote high standards and expectations for all students

Item 5: Ensuring the curricular materials are consistent with school goals during COVID-19 Pandemic.

Item 6: Using school goals during COVID-19 Pandemic when making academic decisions.

However, the observed or felt that the following situations/items "once in a while a challenge" as rank from highest to lowest mean rating:

Item 3: Checking the modules and other learning delivery to ensure that contents are align with the school goals.

Item 4: Communicating the school's academic goals to other faculty during COVID-19 Pandemic.

Overall, the respondents observed or felt that defining and communicating school goals is "sometimes a challenge" during pandemic.

The following table shows the mean level of instructional leadership problems under the area of teaching and learning process.

TABLE IV: Mean distribution of Instructional Leadership challenges under the area of teaching and learning process

Teaching and Learning Process	Mean	QI	SD
11. Providing private feedback to student's effort using offline or online flat-form	2.49	OWC	1.15
12. Working with students on academic tasks through blended learning approach	2.70	SC	1.12
13. Providing data on school's progress to school community using offline or online flat-form	2.68	SC	1.09
14. Providing private feedback to other teacher effort through online or offline flat-form	2.52	SC	1.16
15. Ensuring instructional time is not interrupted during the COVID-19 Pandemic	2.68	SC	1.11
16. Providing public praise of outstanding student performance using online or offline flat-form	2.51	SC	1.05
17. Working on skeletal scheduling during the COVID-19 Pandemic either at home or at school	2.49	OWC	1.15
18. Evaluating the use of blended learning approach to improve instructional practice	2.57	SC	1.14
19. Working through offline or online flat-form to interpret assessment data for instructional implications	2.62	SC	1.22
20. Monitoring blended learning practice for alignment to curriculum	2.58	SC	1.15
Area Mean	2.58	SC	0.87

Legend: QI=Qualitative Interpretation; SD=Standard Deviation; SC=Sometimes a Challenge; OWC=Once in a while a Challenge

Under the area of teaching and learning process, data shows that the respondents observed or felt the following situations/items "sometimes a challenge" as rank from highest to lowest mean rating:

Item 12: Working with students on academic tasks through blended learning approach.

Item 15: Ensuring instructional time is not interrupted during the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Item 19: Working through offline or online flat-form to interpret assessment data for instructional implications.

Item 20: Monitoring blended learning practice for alignment to curriculum.

Item 18: Evaluating the use of blended learning approach to improve instructional practice.

Item 14: Providing private feedback to other teacher effort through online or offline flat-form.

Item 16: Providing public praise of outstanding student performance using online or offline flat-form.

However, the teachers observed or felt that the following situations/items "once in a while a challenge" as rank from highest to lowest mean rating:

Item 11: Providing private feedback to student's effort using offline or online flat-form

Item 17: Working on skeletal scheduling during the COVID-19 Pandemic either at home or at school.

Overall, the respondents observed or felt that teaching and learning process is "sometimes a problem" during pandemic.

The following table shows the mean level of instructional leadership problems under the area of professional development.

TABLE V: Mean distribution of Instructional Leadership problems under the area of professional development

Professional Development	Mean	QI	SD
21. Encouraging myself to use data analysis of student academic progress during the COVID-19 Pandemic	2.49	OWC	1.17
22. Providing for in-house professional development opportunities around instructional best practices during COVID-19 Pandemic	2.49	OWC	1.08
23. Encouraging myself to attend professional development activities that are aligned with school goals during COVID-19 Pandemic	2.53	SC	1.27
24. Furnishing useful professional materials and resources during COVID-19 Pandemic	2.46	OWC	1.23
25. Scheduling time on in-service days for collaboration with other teachers during COVID-19 Pandemic	2.42	OWC	1.14
26. Scheduling the school day for common planning time during COVID-19 Pandemic	2.38	OWC	1.04
27. Observing my professional development instead of evaluation during COVID-19 Pandemic	2.39	OWC	1.12
28. Planning my professional development around my needs and wants during COVID-19 Pandemic	2.24	OWC	1.16
29. Supporting my individualized professional development plans during COVID-19 Pandemic	2.39	OWC	1.29
30. Planning my professional development in-services for myself during COVID-19 Pandemic	2.32	OWC	1.23
Area Mean	2.41	OWC	0.90

Legend: QI=Qualitative Interpretation; SD=Standard Deviation; SP=Sometimes a Problem; OWP=Once in a while a Problem

Under the area of professional development, data shows that the respondents observed or felt that the following situation/item "sometimes a problem":

Item 23: Encouraging myself to attend professional development activities that are aligned with school goals during COVID-19 Pandemic.

However, the observed or felt that the following situations/items "once in a while a challenge" as rank from highest to lowest mean rating:

Item 21: Encouraging myself to use data analysis of student academic progress during the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Item 22: Providing for in-house professional development opportunities around instructional best practices during COVID-19 Pandemic.

Item 24: Furnishing useful professional materials and resources during COVID-19 Pandemic.

Item 25: Scheduling time on in-service days for collaboration with other teachers during COVID-19 Pandemic.

Item 27: Observing my professional development instead of evaluation during COVID-19 Pandemic.

Item 29: Supporting my individualized professional development plans during COVID-19 Pandemic.

Item 26: Scheduling the school day for common planning time during COVID-19 Pandemic.

Item 30: Scheduling the school day for common planning time during COVID-19 Pandemic.

Item 28: Scheduling the school day for common planning time during COVID-19 Pandemic

Overall, the respondents observed or felt that professional development is "once in a while a challenge" during pandemic.

TABLE VI: Mean distribution of Instructional Leadership Challenges

Instructional Leadership Problems	Mean	QI	SD
A. Vision, Mission, and Goals	2.59	SC	0.85
B. Teaching and Learning Process	2.58	SC	0.87
C. Professional Development	2.41	OWC	0.90
Overall Mean	**2.53**	**SC**	**0.73**

Legend: QI=Qualitative Interpretation; SD=Standard Deviation; SP=Sometimes a Problem; OWP=Once in a while a Problem

Generally, the respondents observed or felt that the instructional leadership as a whole is "sometimes a challenge". That is, a slight instructional leadership challenges have been observed by faculty members. Particularly, they slightly observed or felt a problem on defining and communicating vision, mission, and school goals, and monitoring and providing feedbacks on the teaching and learning process. Moreover, faculty members felt that promoting school-wide professional development is once in a while a challenge.

The next objective was to determine significant difference on the extent of instructional leadership challenges as felt/observed by the faculty of selected HEIs in Basilan during the COVID-19 Pandemic when they are grouped according to gender, highest educational attainment, and length of service?

Gender

The following table shows that significant difference on the level of instructional leadership problem under the area of vision, mission, and goals when respondents were grouped according to their gender.

Both males and females felt that defining and communicating vision, mission and school goals, are sometimes a problem. Using student t-test for two independent samples with significant level of 0.05, because the computed

value is less than the critical values, not enough evidenced to reject the hypothesis has been established on the area of vision, mission, and goals of the instructional leadership between males and females. That is, there is no significant difference according to gender on the level of problems on vision, mission, and goals of the instructional leadership. Thus, both male and female respondents felt the same on the vision, mission, and goals area of the instructional leadership during pandemic.

TABLE VII: Significant Difference on the Level of Instructional Leadership Challenges under the Area of Vision, Mission, and Goals of the Respondents when they are group according to Gender

Gender	Mean	t-Computed Value	t-Critical Value	Decision	Interpretation
Male	2.61	0.779	1.9753	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Female	2.57				

Alpha set at 0.05 level of confidence, 2-tailed test

The following table shows that significant difference on the level of instructional leadership problem under the area of teaching and learning process when respondents were grouped according to their gender.

TABLE VIII: Significant Difference on the Level of Instructional Leadership Challenges under the Area of teaching and Learning Process of the Respondents when they are group according to Gender

Gender	Mean	t-Computed Value	t-Critical Value	Decision	Interpretation
Male	2.59	0.129	1.9753	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Female	2.58				

Alpha set at 0.05 level of confidence, 2-tailed test

Both males and females felt that monitoring feedbacks on the teaching and learning process are sometimes a problem. Using student t-test for two independent samples with significant level of 0.05, because the computed value is less than the critical values, not enough evidenced to reject the hypothesis has been established on the area of teaching and learning process of the instructional leadership between males and females. That is, there is no significant difference according to gender on the level of problems on teaching and learning process of the instructional leadership. Thus, both male and female respondents felt the same on the teaching and learning process area of the instructional leadership during pandemic.

The following table shows that significant difference on the level of instructional leadership problem under the area of professional development when respondents were grouped according to their gender.

TABLE IX: Significant Difference on the Level of Instructional Leadership Challenges under the Area of Professional Development of the Respondents when they are group according to Gender

Gender	Mean	t-Computed Value	t-Critical Value	Decision	Interpretation
Male	2.47	0.597	1.9753	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Female	2.38				

Alpha set at 0.05 level of confidence, 2-tailed test

Both males and females felt that that promoting school-wide professional development are once in a while a problem. Using student t-test for two independent samples with significant level of 0.05, because the computed value is less than the critical values, not enough evidenced to reject the hypothesis has been established on the area of professional development of the instructional leadership between males and females. That is, there is no significant difference according to gender on the level of problems on professional development of the instructional leadership. Thus, both male and female respondents felt the same on the professional development area of the instructional leadership during pandemic.

TABLE X: Overall Significant Difference on the Level of Instructional Leadership Challenges of the Respondents when they are group according to Gender

Gender	Mean	t-Computed Value	t-Critical Value	Decision	Interpretation
Male	2.56	0.407	1.9753	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Female	2.51				

Alpha set at 0.05 level of confidence, 2-tailed test

Both males and females felt that that instructional leadership are sometimes a problem. Using student t-test for two independent samples with significant level of 0.05, because the computed value is less than the critical values, not enough evidenced to reject the hypothesis has been established on the instructional leadership between males and females. That is, there is no significant difference according to gender on the level of problems of the instructional leadership. Thus, both male and female respondents felt the same on the instructional leadership problems during pandemic.

Highest Educational Attainment

The following table shows that significant difference on the level of instructional leadership challenge under the area of vision, mission, and goals when respondents were grouped according to their highest educational attainment.

TABLE XI: Significant Difference on the Level of Instructional Leadership problems under the Area of Vision, Mission, and Goals of the Respondents when they are group according to Highest Educational Attainment (HEA)

HEA	Mean	F-Computed Value	F-Critical Value	Decision	Interpretation
BD	2.62	0.161	2.43	Accept Ho	Not Significant
MU	2.60				
MD	2.62				
DU	2.41				
DD	2.62				

Alpha set at 0.05 level of confidence, 2-tailed test
Legend: BD-Baccalaureate Degree; MU=Master's Unit; MD-Master's Degree; DU-Doctoral Units; DD-Doctorate Degree

Under the vision, mission and school goals, the respondents perceived the area as sometimes a problem regardless of their highest educational attainment except those respondents with doctorate degree on which they perceived that vision, mission, and goals is once in a while a problem. Using One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with significant level of 0.05, because the computed value is less

than the critical values, not enough evidenced to reject the hypothesis has been established on the area of vision, mission, and goals of the instructional leadership between highest educational attainment of the respondents. That is, there is no significant difference according to the highest educational attainment of the respondents on the level of problems on vision, mission, and goals of the instructional leadership. Thus, regardless of the respondents' highest educational attainment, they perceived the same on the vision, mission, and goals area of the instructional leadership during pandemic.

The following table shows that significant difference on the level of instructional leadership challenge under the area of teaching and learning process when respondents were grouped according to their highest educational attainment.

TABLE XII: Significant Difference on the Level of Instructional Leadership problems under the Area of teaching and Learning Process of the Respondents when they are group according to Highest Educational Attainment (HEA)

HEA	Mean	F-Computed Value	F-Critical Value	Decision	Interpretation
BD	2.30	0.901	2.43	Accept Ho	Not Significant
MU	2.58				
MD	2.73				
DU	2.41				
DD	2.92				

Alpha set at 0.05 level of confidence, 2-tailed test
Legend: BD-Baccalaureate Degree; MU=Master's Unit; MD-Master's Degree: DU-Doctoral Units; DD-Doctorate Degree

Under the teaching and learning process, those respondents with master's unit, master's degree, or doctorate degree perceived the area as sometimes a problem but those with baccalaureate degree or doctorate units perceived the area as once in a while a problem. Using One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with significant level of 0.05, because the computed value is less than the critical values, not enough evidenced to reject the hypothesis has been established on the area of teaching and learning process of the instructional leadership between highest educational attainment of the respondents. That is, there is no significant difference according to the highest educational attainment of the respondents on the level of problems on teaching and learning process of the instructional leadership. Thus, regardless of the respondents' highest educational attainment, they perceived the same on the teaching and learning process area of the instructional leadership during pandemic.

The following table shows that significant difference on the level of instructional leadership challenge under the area of professional development when respondents were grouped according to their highest educational attainment.

Under the professional development, those respondents with doctorate degree perceived the area as sometimes a problem but the rest they perceived the area as once in a while a problem. Using One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with significant level of 0.05, because the computed value is less than the critical values, not enough evidenced to reject the hypothesis has been established on the area of professional development of the instructional leadership between highest educational attainment of the respondents. That is, there is no

significant difference according to the highest educational attainment of the respondents on the level of problems on professional development of the instructional leadership. Thus, regardless of the respondents' highest educational attainment, they perceived the same on the professional development area of the instructional leadership during pandemic.

TABLE XIII: Significant Difference on the Level of Instructional Leadership problems under the Area of Professional Development of the Respondents when they are group according to Highest Educational Attainment (HEA)

HEA	Mean	F-Computed Value	F-Critical Value	Decision	Interpretation
BD	2.30				
MU	2.40				
MD	2.44	0.835	2.43	Accept Ho	Not Significant
DU	2.32				
DD	3.10				

Alpha set at 0.05 level of confidence, 2-tailed test
Legend: BD-Baccalaureate Degree; MU=Master's Unit; MD-Master's Degree; DU-Doctoral Units; DD-Doctorate Degree

The following table shows that significant difference on the level of instructional leadership problem as a whole when respondents were grouped according to their highest educational attainment.

TABLE XIV: Significant Difference on the Level of Instructional Leadership problems as a Whole of the Respondents when they are group according to Highest Educational Attainment (HEA)

HEA	Mean	F-Computed Value	F-Critical Value	Decision	Interpretation
BD	2.41				
MU	2.52				
MD	2.60	0.590	2.43	Accept Ho	Not Significant
DU	2.38				
DD	2.88				

Alpha set at 0.05 level of confidence, 2-tailed test
Legend: BD-Baccalaureate Degree; MU=Master's Unit; MD-Master's Degree: DU-Doctoral Units; DD-Doctorate Degree

Overall, those respondents with baccalaureate degree of doctorate units perceived the instructional leadership as once in a while a problem, while the rest perceived it as sometimes a problem. Using One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with significant level of 0.05, because the computed value is less than the critical values, not enough evidenced to reject the hypothesis has been established on the instructional leadership problem between highest educational attainment of the respondents. That is, there is no significant difference according to the highest educational attainment of the respondents on the level of problems of the instructional leadership. Thus, regardless of the respondents' highest educational attainment, they perceived the same on the instructional leadership during pandemic as a whole.

Length of Service

The following table shows that significant difference on the level of instructional leadership challenge under the area of vision, mission, and goals when respondents were grouped according to their length of service.

TABLE XV: Significant Difference on the Level of Instructional Leadership Challenges under the Area of Vision, Mission, and Goals of the Respondents when they are group according to Length of Service (LOS)

LOS	Mean	F-Computed Value	F-Critical Value	Decision	Interpretation
<=2 years	2.49				
3-5 years	2.71				
6-8 years	2.50	0.947	2.87	Accept Ho	Not Significant
>=9 years	2.74				

Alpha set at 0.05 level of confidence, 2-tailed test
Legend: <=2-2 years or less in service; 3-5 years-3 to 5 years in service; 6-8 years-6 to 8 years in service; >=9-9 years or more

Under the vision, mission and school goals, those respondents with at most 2 years in service perceived the area as once in a while a problem while those respondents with at least 3 years in service perceived it as sometimes a problem. Using One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with significant level of 0.05, because the computed value is less than the critical values, not enough evidenced to reject the hypothesis has been established on the area of vision, mission, and goals of the instructional leadership between the length of service of the respondents. That is, there is no significant difference according to the length of service of the respondents on the level of problems on vision, mission, and goals of the instructional leadership. Thus, regardless of the respondents' length of service, they perceived the same on the vision, mission, and goals area of the instructional leadership during pandemic.

The following table shows that significant difference on the level of instructional leadership problem under the area of teaching and learning process when respondents were grouped according to their length of service.

TABLE XVI: Significant Difference on the Level of Instructional Leadership Challenges under the Area of teaching and Learning Process of the Respondents when they are group according to Length of Service (LOS)

LOS	Mean	F-Computed Value	F-Critical Value	Decision	Interpretation
<=2 years	2.40				
3-5 years	2.84				
6-8 years	2.48	2.702	2.87	Accept Ho	Not Significant
>=9 years	2.70				

Alpha set at 0.05 level of confidence, 2-tailed test
Legend: <=2-2 years or less in service; 3-5 years-3 to 5 years in service; 6-8 years-6 to 8 years in service; >=9-9 years or more

Under the teaching and learning process, those respondents with at most 2 years in service or those with 6 to 8 years in service perceived the area as once in a while a problem while those respondents with 3 to 5 years or at least 9 years in service perceived the area as sometimes a problem. Using One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with significant level of 0.05, because the computed value is less than the critical values, not enough evidenced to reject the hypothesis has been established on the area of teaching and learning

process of the instructional leadership between length of service of the respondents. That is, there is no significant difference according to the length of service of the respondents on the level of problems on teaching and learning process of the instructional leadership. Thus, regardless of the respondents' length of service, they perceived the same on the teaching and learning process area of the instructional leadership during pandemic.

The following table shows that significant difference on the level of instructional leadership problem under the area of professional development when respondents were grouped according to their length of service.

TABLE XVII: Significant Difference on the Level of Instructional Leadership Challenges under the Area of Professional Development of the Respondents when they are group according to Length of Service (LOS)

LOS	Mean	F-Computed Value	F-Critical Value	Decision	Interpretation
<=2 years	2.31				
3-5 years	2.57	1.200	2.87	Accept Ho	Not Significant
6-8 years	2.25				
>=9 years	2.56				

Alpha set at 0.05 level of confidence, 2-tailed test
Legend: <=2-2 years or less in service; 3-5 years-3 to 5 years in service; 6-8 years-6 to 8 years in service; >=9-9 years or more

Under the professional development, those respondents with length of service of 3 to 5 years or at least 9 years, perceived the area as sometimes a problem while those respondents with length of service of at most 2 years or 6 to 8 years, perceived the area as once in a while a problem. Using One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with significant level of 0.05, because the computed value is less than the critical values, not enough evidenced to reject the hypothesis has been established on the area of professional development of the instructional leadership between length of service of the respondents. That is, there is no significant difference according to the length of service of the respondents on the level of problems on professional development of the instructional leadership. Thus, regardless of the respondents' length of service, they perceived the same on the professional development area of the instructional leadership during pandemic.

The following table shows that significant difference on the level of instructional leadership problem as a whole when respondents were grouped according to their length of service.

Overall, those respondents with length of service of at most 2 years or 6 to 8 years, perceived the instructional leadership as once in a while a problem, while the rest perceived it as sometimes a problem. Using One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with significant level of 0.05, because the computed value is less than the critical values, not enough evidenced to reject the hypothesis has been established on the instructional leadership problem between length of service of the respondents. That is, there is no significant difference according to the length of service of the respondents on the level of problems of the instructional

leadership. Thus, regardless of the respondents' length of service, they perceived the same on the instructional leadership during pandemic as a whole.

TABLE XVIII: Significant Difference on the Level of Instructional Leadership problems as a Whole of the Respondents when they are group according to Length of Service (LOS)

LOS	Mean	F-Computed Value	F-Critical Value	Decision	Interpretation
<=2 years	2.40				
3-5 years	2.71	2.128	2.87	Accept Ho	Not Significant
6-8 years	2.41				
>=9 years	2.67				

Alpha set at 0.05 level of confidence, 2-tailed test
Legend: <=2-2 years or less in service; 3-5 years-3 to 5 years in service; 6-8 years-6 to 8 years in service; >=9-9 years or more

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings enumerated in this study, the following were concluded:

A. Tested at 95% confidence interval, the findings of the study revealed that the hypothesis is ACCEPTED. Thus, on the basis of this findings, it shows that there are no significant differences on the level of instructional leadership problems between some demographic profile such as gender, ethnicity, highest educational attainment, and length of service of the faculty members.

1. The perceptions of the male and female faculty members on the level of instructional leadership problems are the same.

2. The perceptions of the faculty members regardless of their ethnicity on the level of instructional leadership problems are the same.

3. The perceptions of the faculty members regardless of their highest educational attainment on the level of instructional leadership problems are the same.

4. The perceptions of the faculty members regardless of their length of service on the level of instructional leadership problems are the same.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based from the findings and conclusion of this study, the following has been recommended:

1. Having sometimes a problem on the instructional leadership as felt or observed by the faculty members, it is recommended that the Basilan State College should look for a retooling mechanism that will boost or enhance the instructional leadership skills of the faculty members. Furthermore, other problems identified emanates in the absence of strategies or remedy provided by the present administration and hence, becomes a perennial problem in the future especially in adapting the new normal situation. The administration should provide alternative or enhance the internet connectivity for the use of online learning even after the pandemic. There is also a need to strategies the faculty development program so that quality education will be maintained or improved.

2. Having no significant differences on the level of instructional leadership problems of the faculty members according to gender, ethnicity, highest educational attainment, and length of service, the Basilan State College administrators should consider strengthening the instructional leadership skills of all faculty members regardless of their gender, ethnicity, highest educational attainment, and length of service.

3. Researchers may also conduct parallel studies with different research locale or different characteristics of the population.

REFERENCES

[1] Bush, T. (2007). Educational leadership and management: Theory, policy, and practice. *South African Journal of Education,* 27(3).

[2] Dos, I., Sagir, M., & Cetin, R.M. (2015). Classifying Daily problems of School Managers, *7th World Conference on Educational Sciences,* Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 197, 2040-2045.

[3] Hallinger, P., & Murpht, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional leadership behavior of principals. Elementary School Journal, 86(2), 217-248.

[4] Murphy, J. (1988). Methodological, measurement, and conceptual problems in the study of instructional leadership. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 10(2), 117–139.

[5] Vecaldo, R. T. (2019). Instructional leadership beliefs of Filipino pre-service teachers, *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education,* 8(4), pp. 596-603.