INSTRUCTIONAL COACHING COMPETENCE OF SCHOOL HEADS AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING BEHAVIOR TEACHERS

Leah Lee U. Elimino

Ernesto V. Bautista Elementary School
Davao Occidental Division, Region XI
DepEd Philippines

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56293/IJMSSSR.2025.5519

IJMSSSR 2025
VOLUME 7
ISSUE 2 MARCH – APRIL **ISSN: 2582 – 0265**

Abstract: This study aimed to determine which domain of instructional coaching competence of school heads best influence knowledge sharing behavior of teachers. This study utilized the non-experimental quantitative research design using descriptive technique involving teachers in one District of Davao Occidental Division, Philippines. The study was conducted on the second semester of school year 2021-2022. Research instruments on instructional coaching competence of school heads and knowledge sharing behavior of teachers were used as source of data. Using mean, pearson-r, and regression as statistical tools to treat the data, the study showed the following results: the level of instructional coaching competence of school heads is high, the level of knowledge sharing behavior of teachers is high, there is significance on the relationship between instructional coaching competence of school heads and knowledge sharing behavior of teachers, and no domain of instructional coaching competence of school heads that influence knowledge sharing behavior of teachers.

Keywords: Instructional Coaching Competence of School Heads, Knowledge Sharing Behavior of Teachers, Educational Management, Quantitative Research

1. Introduction

School heads hold several functions. Among the jobs of school heads is as an instructional coach. Coaching is an essential component of an effective professional development program in order for teachers to become proficient in teaching process. Likewise, coaching can build will, skill, knowledge, and capacity because it can go where no other professional development has gone before: into the intellect, behaviors, practices, beliefs, values, and feelings of an educator (Thomas, Bell, Spelman & Briody, 2015).

A coach can foster conditions in which deep reflection and learning can take place, where a teacher can take risks to change her practice, where powerful conversations can take place and where growth is recognized and celebrated. Similarly, a coach holds a space where healing can take place and where resilient, joyful communities can be built. With a good expertise in coaching, school heads can develop the knowledge sharing behavior of teachers (Johnson, 2016).

There have been several trainings implemented to improve the instructional coaching competence of school heads. However, there are school heads who are not proficient in coaching the teachers. Many school heads lack the skill to process the teacher as manifested in their poor scaffolding ability (Desimone & Pak, 2017).

In the local context, there are several school heads who do not provide opportunities for the leadership team to practice steps in the problem-solving. As a result, teachers are left with their own solving the problems at hand. Likewise, there are also school heads who cannot effectively engage team members and other faculty in reflecting upon their professional practices that teachers are not given appropriate attention in improving their pedagogical competence.

The problems presented are the experiences of the school heads in terms of instructional coaching competence. The need to address this issue will ensure better learning opportunities for the students. Hence the researcher is prompted to conduct this study to address the knowledge gap in terms of finding relevant evidence in the local context regarding the relationship between instructional coaching competence of school heads and knowledge sharing behavior of teachers as the researcher has rarely come across with the same study on the topic in the local setting.

Research Objectives

This study aims to find out which domain of instructional coaching competence of school heads best influences knowledge sharing behavior of teachers. Specifically, this study sought to answer the following objectives:

1. To describe the level of instructional coaching competence of school heads in terms of:
   1.1. Role of the Principal;
   1.2. Modeling of the Problem-Solving Process, and
   1.3. Interpersonal Skills.
2. To ascertain the level of knowledge sharing behavior of teachers in terms of:
   2.1 Intention Towards Knowledge Sharing;
   2.2 Attitude Towards Knowledge Sharing;
   2.3 Subjective Norm towards Knowledge Sharing;
   2.4 Perceived Behavioral Control,
   2.5 Perceived Organizational Incentives, and
   2.6 Perceived Reputation Enhancement.
3. To determine the significant relationship between instructional coaching competence of school heads and knowledge sharing behavior of teachers.
4. To determine which domain of instructional coaching competence of school heads best influences knowledge sharing behavior of teachers.

Hypothesis

The following hypothesis will be treated at 0.05 level of significance.

1. There is no significant relationship between instructional coaching competence of school heads and knowledge sharing behavior of teachers.
2. No domains of instructional coaching competence of school heads best influences knowledge sharing behavior of teachers.

2. Methods

This study used a correlational approach to conduct non-experimental quantitative research. A major portion of quantitative educational research is non-experimental because many critical factors of interest are uncontrollable. Because non-experimental research is such an important strategy for many researchers, it is necessary to establish a classification system for non-experimental methods that is both highly descriptive of what we do and allows us to communicate effectively in an interdisciplinary research context. Correlational research designs determine the type and extent of a relationship between two naturally occurring variables.

3. Results

Level of Instructional Coaching Competence

Presented in Table 1 is the level of *Instructional Coaching Competence* with the overall mean of 3.80 with a descriptive equivalent of *high* indicating that all enumerated indicators were oftentimes manifested. The overall mean was the results obtained from the mean of the indicators for the specific items from the questionnaire intended for this particular indicator which is appended in this study.

Among the enumerated indicators, *Role of the Principal* obtained the highest mean score of 3.95 or high. As presented in the appended table, the mean ratings of the following items under this indicator were as follows: provides opportunities for the leadership team to practice steps in the problem-solving process, works effectively with the school-based team to implement problem solving, works with the school-based team to gradually increase the team's capacity to function independently in implementing the problem-solving process in our school, provides timely feedback to members of the team and responds to requests for technical assistance in a timely manner.

The indicator Modeling of the Problem-Solving Process obtained the highest mean of 3.82 with a descriptive rating of high. As presented in the appended table, the mean ratings of the following items under this indicator were as follows: models problem identification, models data collection and interpretation, models problem analysis, models intervention development, and Models intervention support.

Interpersonal Skills obtained a mean score of 3.63 or high. As presented in the appended table, the mean ratings of the following items under this indicator were as follows: is an effective listener, communicates clearly with others, effectively engages team members and other faculty in reflecting upon their professional practices, is skilled in working collaboratively with diverse groups, and is skilled in facilitating productive work relationships with other individuals in the school setting.

Table 1. Level of Instructional Coaching Competence

Indicator	SD	Mean	Descriptive Level
Role of the Principal	0.78	3.95	High
Modeling of the Problem-Solving Process	0.12	3.82	High
Interpersonal Skills	1.54	3.63	High
Overall	**1.49**	**3.80**	**High**

Level of Knowledge Sharing Behavior Teachers

Presented in Table 2 is the level of *Knowledge Sharing Behavior Teachers.* Computations revealed an overall mean score of 3.23 or *high,* indicating that all enumerated indicators were oftentimes manifested. The overall mean was the results obtained from the mean of the indicators for the specific items from the questionnaire intended for this particular indicator which is appended in this study.

Among the enumerated indicators, *Perceived Behavioral Control* obtained a mean score of 3.38 or high. As presented in the appended table, the mean ratings of the following items under this indicator were as follows: I have enough time available to share knowledge with my co-teachers, I have the necessary tools to share knowledge with my co-teachers, I have the ability to share knowledge with my co-teachers, sharing knowledge with my co- teachers is within my control, and I am able to share knowledge with my co- teachers easily.

Perceived Reputation Enhancement engagement obtained a mean score of 3. 35 or high. As presented in the appended table, the mean ratings of the following items under this indicator were as follows: My co- teachers respect me, when I share knowledge with them, sharing knowledge with my co- teachers improves others recognition of me, My superiors praise me when I share knowledge with my co- teachers, I believe my status in the organization improves, when I share knowledge with my co- teachers, and Organizational members who share knowledge with others have more prestige.

Table 2. Level of Knowledge Sharing Behavior Teachers

Indicator	SD	Mean	Descriptive Level
Intention Towards Knowledge Sharing	0.28	3.12	High
Attitude Towards Knowledge Sharing	1.33	3.26	High
Subjective Norm Towards Knowledge Sharing	1.10	3.14	High
Perceived Behavioral Control	0.90	3.38	High
Perceived Organizational Incentives	1.15	3.18	High
Perceived Reputation Enhancement	0.90	3.35	High
Overall	**1.28**	**3.23**	**High**

Attitude Towards Knowledge Sharing obtained a mean score of 3.26 or high. As presented in the appended table, the mean ratings of the following items under this indicator were as follows: To me, sharing knowledge with my co-teachers is commendable, To me, sharing knowledge with my co-teachers is good, To me, sharing knowledge with my co-teachers is pleasant, To me, sharing knowledge with my co-teachers is worthless, and To me, sharing knowledge with my co-teachers is wise.

Perceived Organizational Incentives obtained a mean score of 3.18 or high. As presented in the appended table, the mean ratings of the following items under this indicator were as follows: Sharing knowledge with my co- teachers improves the likelihood of getting a better work assignment for me, Sharing knowledge with my co- teachers improves the likelihood of getting a promotion for me, Sharing knowledge with my co- teachers improves the likelihood of getting a higher salary for me, Sharing knowledge with my co- teachers improves the likelihood of getting a bonus for me, and I expect to get more job security when I share knowledge with my co- teachers.

The indicator *Subjective Norm Towards Knowledge Sharing* obtained a mean score of 3.14 or high. As presented in the appended table, the mean ratings of the following items under this indicator were as follows: My principal thinks that I should share knowledge with my co-teachers, My principal thinks that I should share knowledge with my co-teachers, My colleagues think I should share knowledge with my co-teachers, Generally speaking, I try to follow the principal's policy and intention, and Generally speaking, I accept and carry out my principal's decision even though it is different from mine.

Intention Towards Knowledge Sharing obtained a mean score of 3.12 or high. As presented in the appended table, the mean ratings of the following items under this indicator were as follows: If given opportunity, I would share factual knowledge (know-what) from work with my co-teachers, If given opportunity, I would share knowledge with my co-teachers, If given opportunity, I would share internal reports and other official documents with my co-teachers, If given opportunity, I would share work experiences with my co-teachers, and If given opportunity, I

would share know-how or tricks of the trade from work with my co-teachers.

Correlations between Measures

Illustrated in Table 3 were the results of the test of relationship between the variables involved in the study. The overall correlation had a computed r- value of 0.388 with a probability value of 0.03 which is significant at 0.05 level.

Doing an in-depth analysis, it could be gleaned that the indicators of *Instructional Coaching Competence* and *Knowledge Sharing Behavior Teachers* revealed a computed r-values ranging from .182 to .284 with probability values of 0.01 which is lesser than .05 level of significance. The significant relationship between the two variables is an indication that the increase in the level of *Instructional Coaching Competence* led to the increase in *Knowledge Sharing Behavior Teachers.*

Table 3. Significance of the Relationship between Instructional Coaching Competence and Knowledge Sharing Behavior Teachers

Instructional Coaching Competence	**Knowledge Sharing Behavior Teachers**		
	R	**p-value**	**Remarks**
Role of the Principal	.182	.001	Significant
Modeling of the Problem-Solving Process	.284	.010	Significant
Interpersonal Skills	.173	.000	Significant
Overall	**.388**	**.003**	**Significant**

*Significant at 0.05 significance level.

Significance of the Influence of the Domain of Instructional Coaching Competence on Knowledge Sharing Behavior Teachers

Presented in Table 4 is the regression analysis showing the predictive ability of *Instructional Coaching Competence* on *Knowledge Sharing Behavior Teachers*. The analysis shows that when *Instructional Coaching Competence* was regressed on *Knowledge Sharing Behavior Teachers*, it generated an F-value of 12.46 with 0.01.

The value of this regression is 12.46 with 0.01. It can be stated that *Instructional Coaching Competence* influenced *Knowledge Sharing Behavior Teachers*. There is no indicator of *Instructional Coaching Competence* that gives significant influence on *Knowledge Sharing Behavior Teachers.*

Table 4. Regression Analysis Showing the Extent of the Influence of Predictor Variables on Knowledge Sharing Behavior Teachers

Knowledge Sharing Behavior Teachers				
Instructional Coaching Competence	**β (Standardized Coefficients)**	**B (Unstandardized Coefficients)**	**t**	**Sig.**
Constant	1.6253	0.2851	2.18	0.000

Role of the Principal	-0.09276	0.07823	0.23	0.429
Modeling of the Problem-Solving Process	0.62824	0.05842	-1.24	0.001
Interpersonal Skills	0.07282	0.06182	0.36	0.284
R	0.273			
R^2	0.728			
F	12.46			
p	0.000			

Conclusion

With considerations on the findings of the study, conclusions are drawn in this section. The level of instructional coaching competence of school heads is high, the level of knowledge sharing behavior of teachers is high, there is significance on the relationship between instructional coaching competence of school heads and knowledge sharing behavior of teachers, and no domain of instructional coaching competence of school heads that influence knowledge sharing behavior of teachers.

The results of this study revealed that the level of instructional coaching competence of school heads is high. The researcher recommends that the District where the study is conducted in Schools Division Office of Davao Occidental may conduct training that will help improve the aspects of Interpersonal Skills.

Meanwhile, the study revealed a high level of d knowledge sharing behavior of teachers. The researcher recommends that the district office may provide Learning Action Cell among the teachers on the topic Intention Towards Knowledge Sharing.

The study found a significant relationship between instructional coaching competence of school heads and knowledge sharing behavior of teachers. The researcher therefore recommends that the District Office may consider the provision of trainings or activities relative to the variables under study to help the school heads and teachers enhance on the indicators which are among the lowest in the indicators of the variables under study.

REFERENCES

1. Desimone, L. M., & Pak, K. (2017). Instructional coaching as high-quality professional development. Theory into practice, 56(1), 3-12.
2. Johnson, K. G. (2016). Instructional coaching implementation: Considerations for K-12 administrators. The Journal of School Administration Research and Development, 1(2), 37-40.
3. Thomas, E. E., Bell, D. L., Spelman, M., & Briody, J. (2015). Johnson, K. G. (2016). Instructional Coaching Implementation: Considerations for K-12 Administrators. Journal of School Administration Research and Development, 1(2), 37-40.