



School Heads' Leadership Styles in Relation to Teachers' Performance

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11665973>

Mary-Ann C. Cadimas

Teacher III, Lower Capanun-an Elementary School, Department of Education, Philippines
<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-9923-431X>

Dr. Lisa C. Cañedo

Master Teacher 1, Manjuyod District 1, Department of Education, Philippines
<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-1800-4660>

Dr. Melba V. Mercado

School Principal 2, Manjuyod Central Elementary School, Department of Education, Philippines
<https://orcid.org/0009-0003-2804-2544>

Abstract:

This study investigated the leadership styles of school heads and their relationship with teacher performance in some public elementary schools in one of the districts in a large sized division in Central Philippines in the 2021-2022 school year. The sample size consisted of 136 respondents who completed a researcher-made survey questionnaire. Most respondents were older individuals with a high level of education, and many came from small schools. The study found that school heads' leadership styles, including authoritarian, participative, delegative, servant, transformational, and transactional leadership, were rated high by teachers. Teachers' performance levels were also excellent when grouped by age, highest educational attainment, and school type. However, there was a significant difference in school heads' leadership styles as assessed by teachers in authoritarian, servant, and transactional leadership, depending on the type of school. Similarly, a significant difference in teacher performance was observed based on age and highest educational attainment. No significant difference existed between school heads' leadership styles and teacher performance levels.

Keywords: School heads, leadership styles, teacher performance, authoritarian, participative, delegative, servant, transformational, transactional.

Introduction:

Nature of the Problem

Leadership is widely recognized as one of the most crucial and effective responses to the challenges and opportunities presented by the global context. It is essential in every organization to determine values, culture, change, tolerance, and employee motivation for the process or style that one uses to interact with other people, society in general, and the task environment. It is demonstrated that success is attributable, within an organization, to three critical factors, such as organizational performance, employee job satisfaction, and employee affective commitment (Drucker, 2007), wherein it is also revealed in the study of Lekhetho (2021) (Ramadhani(2019) and Gamala (2022) that there are many factors attributable to the success of school such as school heads leadership and teachers' and students' performance. In comparison, valuable studies suggested that leaders motivate employees to be competitive through charisma, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, or individual consideration. The role of a leader is now even more complicated because he will no longer act as someone who has "the absolute truth" and imposes his decisions on others. Instead, he must take on this role to ensure that the workplace environment allows employees to demonstrate their abilities and initiative to the fullest.

In this time of pandemic, it has turned out to be an unprecedented humanitarian crisis that has affected the entire world (WHO, 2020). The current period is characterized by uncertainty, volatility, ambiguity, and complexity that call for a high-impact type of leadership. Leaders have learned how to manage the abovementioned elements pick lessons along the way, and develop creative problem-solving strategies to ensure enterprises operate optimally. Employees of various organizations have not been spared the adverse effects of this disease, which has aggravated the situation and increased fear among staff members.

The researcher also observed that all members of an organization are in trouble and having a great adjustment as to how to perform their duties as classroom teachers and school heads to achieve organizational goals. In line with those mentioned above, this captures the researcher's attention to determine the relationship between school heads' leadership styles and teachers' performance. The researcher wants to investigate whether the leadership



style affects the teachers' performance and what leadership styles the school heads need to be improved and to be applied for the school. This study will address the problem of school leaders and the teachers' performance in some elementary schools in one of the districts in a large sized division in Central Philippines during the school year 2021-2022.

Current State of Knowledge

Leadership style is a vital component of an organization's capacity to prosper because of its effects on employee performance. Leadership is more important than ever for management in today's constantly changing social, economic, and technical environment (Aunga & Masare, 2017). While management is concerned with accumulating resources, developing plans, and organizing and supervising operations to achieve agreed-upon goals, leadership fulfills the management job of influencing. An excellent leadership style aids in efficient performance in educational institutions. The leadership style of many businesses has run into several issues because of its impact on organizational performance, departments, teams, work climate, and atmosphere (Farooq et al., 2022).

Leadership is seen as a big challenge in schools. Many people can become leaders if given the proper training because school leadership is significant. To carve a name for the institution, the all-around growth and progression of its members and the role of a leader are indispensable; therefore, leadership, in general, and at the school level, is considered one of the critical areas of research. Leadership at the school level is required to perform multi-dimensional roles, and a leader must be equipped with such abilities and skills to achieve the set targets (Lopez & Ensari, 2020). A school leader has to organize, supervise, plan, make decisions, perform managerial and financial tasks, and above all, has to be an effective instructional leader. The leadership style has also been found to influence a teacher's motivational level and job satisfaction, creating a learning environment, managing human resources, and creating a change process in the school (Waheed et al., 2018).

In the Philippine educational setting, public school heads could be the principal, head teacher, master teacher, or teacher In-charge assigned by the division superintendent. The school principal is the highest-ranking administrator in an elementary or high school. Principals, head teachers, master teachers, and others who are responsible for the overall operation of a school are often called school heads. In an era of shared decision-making and site-based management, the term school heads may also be used in reference to other school administrators and leaders within the school, such as assistant principals, head or lead teachers, master teachers, and others who participate in school leadership activities (Estacio, 2022). There shall be a school head for all public elementary and secondary schools or a cluster thereof, pursuant to Section 6.1, Rule VI of the Implementing Rules and Regulations of the Republic Acts No. 9155 (Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001). A school head is a person responsible for the administrative and instructional supervision of the school or cluster of schools. As such, a school head is expected to possess the appropriate leadership skills.

Hasbay and Altindag (2018) define the factors that affect the performance of teachers working in secondary-level education and investigate how those factors are reflected in their working environment. The study revealed that teacher performance was affected mostly by management factors, followed by working environment and wages. Hence, the wage factor did not show any effects that directly increase teacher performance. It is determined that the right attitude of school managers, with proper and efficient communication and career investments and developments for teachers, has to be increased. Also, it is supported by the results of the analysis that the performance of teachers is increased by providing them with working conditions in which they can feel comfortable and under no pressure.

According to the research findings of Ozgenel & Mert (2019), teachers' performances do not show significant differences according to their educational background and seniority; it shows according to their gender and school levels. The performance of female teachers is higher than male teachers. Primary and secondary school teachers' performances are higher than those of high school teachers. Teachers' performance decreases as the school level progresses from primary, secondary, and high school. A moderate and positive relationship was found between teachers' performances and school effectiveness ($r=.358$; $p<.01$), and teachers' performances were explained 12% of the total variance in school effectiveness. In other words, teachers' performances positively affect the effectiveness of the school.

Theoretical Underpinnings

This study is anchored on the Situational Leadership Theory of Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard (1969) and the Job Performance Theory of J. P. Campbell (1990). The situational leadership theory suggests that more than one leadership style is best. Instead, it depends on which leadership and strategies best suit the task. According to this theory, the most influential leaders can adapt their style to the situation and look at cues such as the type of task, the nature of the groups, and other factors that might contribute to getting the job done. Another perspective on the theory is that the situational leadership model focuses on flexibility so that leaders can adapt according to their followers' needs and the situation's demands. It also explains that this kind of leadership avoids the pitfalls of the single-style approach by recognizing that there are many ways of dealing with a problem and that leaders need to



be able to assess a situation and the maturity levels of subordinates to determine what approach will be the most effective at any given moment.

Moreover, Situational Leadership Theory considers the complexity of dynamic social situations and the many individuals acting in different roles who will ultimately contribute to the outcome. Thus, this theory will be deemed essential to support the present study since one objective is determining the school heads' leadership styles.

Another theory this study is anchored on is the Job Performance Theory, developed by J. P. Campbell in 1990. According to this theory, performance is the behavior or employee's actions that affect the goals and objectives of the organization. This behavior can be either positive or negative and can be provided as part of the work or outside the scope of the duties set forth.

Campbell (1990) defines job performance as behavior, which is something done by an employee. This concept differentiates performance from outcomes. Outcomes result partially from an individual's performance, but they are also the result of other influences. In short, there are more factors that determine outcomes than just an employee's behaviors and actions. According to Campbell, however, performance needs to be under the individual's control, regardless of whether the performance of interest is mental or behavioral.

Job Performance Theory can be linked to the present study for its deals with teachers' performance.

With the essence of this theory, the researcher finds it complete to support and justify the contents of the present study on the school heads leadership styles and teachers' performance. The researcher further believes that school heads' leadership styles have a great significant effect on the teachers' performance.

Objectives

This study aimed to determine the level of school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in relation to their performance in some elementary schools in one of the districts in a large-sized division in Central Philippines during the school year 2021-2022. Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions: 1) the level of school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers according to authoritarian, participative, delegative, servant, transformational and transactional; 2) the level of teachers' performance for the school year 2021-2022; 3) the significant difference in the level of school heads' leadership styles when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables; 4) the significant difference in the level of teachers' performance when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables; and 5) the significant relationship between the school heads leadership styles and the level of teachers' performance.

Research Methodology

This section presents the methodology of the study, which includes the research design, respondents, data gathering instrument and its validity and reliability, data gathering procedure, ethical considerations, analytical schemes, and statistical tools.

Research Design

This study utilized the descriptive research design in answering the objectives specified in this study using a survey questionnaire to determine the school heads' leadership styles in relation to teachers' performance in one of the municipalities in Central Philippines. According to Nachimas and De Ward (2015), descriptive research is fact-finding with adequate interpretation. It is more than just data-gathering; the latter is not reflective thinking or analysis. It describes and interprets what is concerned with conditions of relationships; practices, beliefs, a process that is going on; effects that are being felt, or trends that are developing. A descriptive research design is deemed appropriate to this study because it provides essential information about the present status of the study. This method applies to this study because of the current condition school heads have adjustments, especially during the pandemic. The relationship between school heads' leadership styles and teachers' performance will be investigated and analyzed to address the problem.

Respondents

The study's respondents were 136 teachers in some public elementary schools in one of the districts in a large sized division in Central Philippines. The researcher utilized purposive sampling. Purposive sampling is a form of non-probability sampling in which researchers rely on their judgment when choosing population members to participate in the study. The researcher used purposive sampling when they wanted to access a particular subset of people, as all survey participants were selected because they fit a specific profile (Ames, 2019).

Instruments

The researcher used a self-made questionnaire to gather data for this study. It was subjected to validity (4.33-excellent) and reliability (0.927-excellent). All of them were interpreted as worthy and good, respectively. It is



composed of two (2) parts. Part I was about the demographic profile of the respondents, which included age, highest educational attainment, and type of school. Part II of the questionnaire was on the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in authoritarian, participative, delegative, servant, transformational, and transactional. The questionnaire comprises 7 line questions per area for a total of 42 questions. The items in the questionnaire were developed with the help of various foreign and local studies. The researcher ensures that the items in every area answer the research questions. The respondents were given options for their answers. The assessment of the school heads leadership styles under the aforementioned areas was measured from the continuum of 5 to 1 using a Likert scale rating with 5 as always, 4 as often, 3 as sometimes, 2 as rarely, and 1 as almost never. Further, the level of teachers' performance was taken from the IPCRF during the school year 2021-2022 as secondary data.

Data Gathering Procedure

For the smoother conduct of the study, the researcher employed the following procedures. The researcher sent a letter of request for the conduct of the study to the Office of Schools Division Superintendent of Negros Oriental. Upon approval, a separate letter was also sent to the school heads of all component schools attached to the approved letter from the superintendent. After securing the approval for the second request, school heads of every school sent a soft copy of the research instrument to their respective school's Facebook group chats. The researcher also included her contact number and messenger account in the research instrument in case some teachers may need help answering the instrument. The researcher also utilized hard copies of the research instrument for those teachers who had difficulty answering the questionnaire. The data gathered from the respondents' responses was tallied and tabulated using the appropriate statistical tools. The raw data were transformed into numerical code guided by a coding manual. This will be allowed computer processing, statistical derivations, and tabular presentation. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used in the computer processing of the encoded data.

Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

Objective No. 1 also used the descriptive analytical scheme and mean to determine the school heads' leadership styles.

Objective No. 2 likewise used the descriptive analytical scheme and mean to determine the level of teachers' performance when grouped according to the aforementioned variables.

Objective No. 3 used the comparative analytical scheme and Mann-Whitney U test to determine the significant difference in the school heads' leadership styles when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables.

Objective No. 4 also used the comparative analytical scheme and Mann-Whitney U test to determine the significant difference in the level of teachers' performance when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables.

Objective No. 5 used the relational analytical scheme and the Spearman's rho to determine the relationship between the school heads' leadership styles and the level of teachers' performance.

Ethical Considerations

Several issues were considered during the research process to ensure respondents and institutions were not harmed and put to undue risk. Firstly, the name of the school and the respondents were not revealed in this study, consistent with the principle of anonymity. The data gathered from the survey, whether in writing as they answered the questionnaire or through the secondary data gathered, was used only for the study. Consequently, the researcher did not inject personal opinions and judgment regarding the result of the study, and all the data and information gathered were kept confidential.

Results and Discussion

This section presents the data gathered in connection with the objectives of the study and analyses of these data facilitated by the identified appropriate statistical tools. It interprets the results derived from the analyses.

Table 1
School Heads' Leadership Styles as Assessed by the Teachers in the Area of Authoritarian

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>My school head...</i>		
1. believes that subordinates must be supervised closely, for they will likely fail to do their work.	3.93	High Level



2. believes that employees must be given rewards or punishments to motivate them to achieve organizational objectives	3.76	High Level
3. is determined to push projects forward and get results	4.13	High Level
4. is the chief judge of the achievements of employees	3.97	High Level
5. gives orders and clarifies procedures	3.85	High Level
6. believes that most employees in the general population are lazy	2.79	Moderate Level
7. gives their subordinates complete freedom to solve problems on their own	3.90	High Level
Overall Mean	3.76	High Level

Table 1 presents the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of authoritarian. The respondents obtained an overall mean score of 3.76, which is a high level. This shows that most respondents perceived their school heads to exhibit an authoritarian leadership style. However, to deeper the analysis, the respondents assessed the highest mean of 4.13 on item No. 3, and interpreted as a high level. On the other hand, the lowest mean score of 2.76 on item No. 6 and interpreted it as a moderate level.

The result implies that the school heads firmly believed that not all employees in the general population are lazy. Most of the employees under them are competent and efficient with their jobs, as reflected in the yearly performance evaluation. However, the school heads still need to monitor and supervise them, especially those lazy subordinates under them, to ensure they perform correctly. This is because school heads are very particular about absences, tardiness, and obedience and compliance to the assigned work of their teachers. That is, when they give a task to their teachers, at the back of their minds, the teachers will do it obediently. Hence, some school heads implement rewards and punishments to intimidate their teachers to ensure compliance with the assigned tasks. The results are supported by the study conducted by Pizzolitto et al. (2023). The researchers found many specific conditions, such as job mobility and cognitive trust, wherein authoritarian styles can affect performance. The conditions of leadership are changing, and leaders should adapt and combine their styles to enhance performance. The degree of authority in their leadership styles must depend on the specific conditions of their workgroups. In a study by Chiang et al. (2020), authoritarian leaders use their authority to demand absolute obedience from their followers. Hence, authoritarian leadership styles are often associated with negative performance, complex leader-follower relationships, and high intentions of followers to leave.

Table 2
School Heads' Leadership Styles as Assessed by the Teachers in the Area of Participative

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>My school head...</i>		
1. encourages subordinates to participate in decision making	4.15	High Level
2. solicits subordinates' suggestions before making a decision	4.13	High Level
3. is receptive to ideas and advice from others	4.11	High Level
4. creates an environment where the employees take ownership of the project	4.15	High Level
5. allows subordinates to set priorities with their guidance	4.21	High Level
6. encourages subordinates to use their creativity and ingenuity to solve organizational problems	4.29	High Level
7. believes teams work best when everyone is involved in making decisions	4.42	High Level
Overall Mean	4.21	High Level

Table 2 discloses the results of the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in participative. Respondents considered an overall mean score of 4.21 and interpreted it as high. Table 4 shows that most respondents assessed their school heads as participative leaders. However, school heads must also be open to or welcome the ideas and advice of others. But for further investigation of the results, the respondents assessed a highest mean score of 4.42 on item No. 7, interpreted as "high level," while the lowest mean of 4.11 was on item No. 3 and interpreted as "high level." This implies that most respondents perceived that some school heads needed to be more receptive to the ideas and advice of others. This is because there are school heads that need to be more open to the suggestions and opinions of others, especially when the school heads do not have a good relationship with that person or the person is not directly connected with the school. In addition, if there are multiple people voicing different opinions, conflict is likely to happen; hence, school heads, as participative leaders, must be prepared when a disagreement arises.

The results contradict the findings of Alsubaie (2021), wherein he concluded that the participative leadership approach impacts the employees' performance in the Saudi public sector. The most crucial aspect of participative leadership that results in improved job performance is the employee's voice in opinions, ideas, and suggestions during the decision-making on issues affecting their well-being and work. This consultative behavior, delegation, and listening to employees' views by the leaders motivate employees who respond by putting effort into their work, thereby improving their productivity and job performance. However, Saleem et al. (2020) study supports the findings of this study by showing participative leadership to have the least effect on the performance of employees.



Table 3
School Heads' Leadership Styles as Assessed by the Teachers in the Area of Delegative

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>My school head...</i>		
1. let their subordinates work their problems out in their way	3.68	High Level
2. stays out of the way as their subordinates do their work	3.70	High Level
3. allows their subordinates to appraise their work.	3.89	High Level
4. let their subordinates think ahead and develop long-term plans for their areas	4.08	High Level
5. ensures that information systems are timely and accurate and that information is fed directly to employees	4.14	High Level
6. feels it's best to leave subordinates alone	3.60	High Level
7. emphasizes the importance of quality but allows subordinates to establish the control standards	4.10	High Level
Overall Mean	3.88	High Level

Table 3 summarizes the analysis of school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in delegative. Respondents assessed an overall mean score was 3.88 and interpreted it as a "high level." Table 5 shows that most respondents perceive the school heads as having delegative leadership skills, meaning they trust their employees to work independently and make decisions without micromanagement. However, some school heads may still need to fully trust their teachers and still want to closely supervise them to ensure accurate work implementation. Verifying the items further in Table 5, the respondents assessed a highest mean score of 4.14 on item No. 1, interpreted as "high level," while the lowest mean of 3.60 was on item No. 6 and interpreted as "high level." This implies that most of the school heads do not give all the freedom to the teachers to carry out their duties, but rather, they want direct supervision to ensure the accurate implementation of work. This means that not all heads have full confidence and trust in his/her teachers. Some school heads believe that if they give leave all the responsibilities to the teachers, some teacher makes take advantage of the limited supervision of them, which can impact their productivity and performance. In addition, some teachers may act upon their own self-interest, accumulating resources and directing decisions that may not lead to the best results for the school.

The results are supported by the study conducted by Perez (2021), wherein most of the woman administrators are hands-on administrators. They do not delegate everything. They reiterated that when they give a task to their subordinates, they know at the back of their mind how it should be done. They want to know what their subordinates are doing, and they do not just allow their people to do their jobs. However, the results contradict the article published by IMD (2022), wherein delegative leadership requires leaders to trust their employees and their skills. Delegative leadership is primarily hands-off and can only be successful and sustainable when there is complete trust between a leader and their employees. Delegative leaders refrain from micromanaging tasks and allow team members to rely on their judgment for the best actions and strategies.

Table 4
School Heads' Leadership Styles as Assessed by the Teachers in the Area of Servant

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>My school head...</i>		
1. can tell if something work-related is going wrong	4.08	High Level
2. emphasizes the importance of giving back to the community	4.14	High Level
3. cares more about others' success than his/her own	3.93	High Level
4. gives others the responsibility to make important decisions about their own jobs	4.08	High Level
5. makes others' career development a priority	3.97	High Level
6. takes time to talk to others on a personal level	3.91	High Level
7. holds high ethical standards	4.01	High Level
Overall Mean	4.02	High Level

Table 4 shows the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of servants. The results disclosed wherein the respondents assessed an overall mean score was 4.02 and interpreted as a high level. Table 6 revealed that the school heads have a high level of servant leadership skills, focusing on caring for others, providing support, and holding high ethical standards. However, some school heads may need more time to talk to their teachers personally. Examining the items further, the respondents assessed a highest mean score of 4.14 on item No. 1 interpreted as "high level," while the lowest mean of 3.91 was on item No. 6 and interpreted as "high level." The result implies that some of the school heads rarely take time to talk to the teachers on a personal level. Some school heads do this to avoid misunderstanding that some teachers might think he/she has favoritism among his/her subordinates. However, the school heads are willing to listen and seek the opinions and ideas of the teachers during meetings to form a relationship of respect. To become a dedicated servant leader, a school head must always be aware of the needs of the masses before their own needs, consider it as the top priority and increase cohesion in the organization, always being a listener and understanding, inspiring, attracting the participation and contribution of everyone, creating opportunities for teachers. Always have an ethical, simple lifestyle, and define teachers as an important factor to bring the prosperity of the school. The results are supported



by the study conducted by Sawan et al. (2021), wherein servant leadership is proven to have a tremendous and broad impact at the persona level and a massive effect on the attitudes and behaviors of subordinates.

Table 5
School Heads' Leadership Styles as Assessed by the Teachers in the Area of Transformational

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>My school head...</i>		
1. makes others feel good to be around him/her	4.26	High Level
2. has complete faith with his/her subordinates	4.29	High Level
3. is proud to be associated with his/her subordinates	4.29	High Level
4. expresses in a few simple words what we could and should do	4.15	High Level
5. provides appealing images about what we can do	4.15	High Level
6. gives personal attention to others who seem rejected	4.04	High Level
7. enables others to think about old problems in new ways	3.99	High Level
Overall Mean	4.17	High Level

Table 5 divulges the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of transformational. The respondents assessed an overall mean score was 4.17 and interpreted it as a high level. Table 7 shows that the school heads exhibit the skills of transformational leaders, inspiring and empowering their employees to reach their full potential. However, some school heads may not get involved in the problems of their subordinates. However, if to evaluate the items further, the respondents assessed a highest mean score of 4.29 on items No. 1 and 2 interpreted as "high level," while the lowest mean of 3.99 was on item No. 7 and interpreted as "high level." This implies that most of the respondents observed wherein there is a number of school heads do not get involved in the problems of their subordinates. This is because they are avoiding additional responsibilities that will add stress to them. Hence, the problems of their subordinate were their least concern. Giving simple advice and motivation is the best they can do. The results contradict the claims of Pasamar et al. (2019), wherein transformational leaders seek new methodologies to solve problems in different ways and to get the most out of their employees. One of the main attentions of transformational leaders is the ownership they give to employees by exploring multiple alternatives to solve problems from different angles. They focus on mentoring and coaching that generate intellectual stimulation and charismatic influence to help followers become more efficient without judging them.

Table 6
School Heads' Leadership Styles as Assessed by the Teachers in the Area of Transactional

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>My school head...</i>		
1. tells others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work	3.99	High Level
2. provides recognition/rewards when others reach their goals	3.90	High Level
3. calls attention to what others can get for what they accomplish	4.07	High Level
4. is always satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards	4.13	High Level
5. closely monitors the schedule to ensure a task or project will be completed in time	4.10	High Level
6. tells us the standards we have to know to carry out our work	4.13	High Level
7. is very professional in dealing verbally with employees	4.01	High Level
Overall Mean	4.05	High Level

Table 6 discloses the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of transactional. The respondents assessed an overall mean score was 4.05 and interpreted it as a high level. Table 8 illustrates that the school heads display high transactional leadership skills, focusing on setting clear guidelines, closely monitoring progress, and providing rewards and recognition. However, some school heads may only sometimes reward their subordinates for their achievements. But, for further examinations, the respondents assessed a highest mean score of 4.13 on items No. 4 and 6 interpreted as "high level," while the lowest mean of 3.90 was on item No. 2 and interpreted as "high level." The results imply that some school heads rarely practice the giving of recognition and rewards whenever his/her subordinates achieve an excellent performance. This is because some school heads find it difficult to look for the right rewards for his/her subordinates. Some prefer money as a reward, while others prefer a day-off work. Hence, to avoid misconceptions, school heads do the verbal recognition and compliment of his/her good work during school activities and meetings to raise the morale of the concerned teacher. The results are supported by the opinions of Sultana et al. (2015), wherein a transactional leader does not usually try to find out subordinates' good work, or they do not give compliments for expected good work. A transactional leader never feels the necessity to give compliments or praise his subordinates when they do well. Transactional leaders treat their followers as subordinates. Subordinates just need to obey their leader in the workplace; nothing more is essential. It is easy and effortless to give rewards and punishments; one only needs to observe how well the subordinate obeys.

Table 7



Level of Teacher's Performance for the School Year 2020-2021 When Grouped According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variables	Categories	Mean	Interpretation
Age	Younger	3.980	Very Satisfactory
	Older	4.200	Very Satisfactory
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	3.997	Very Satisfactory
	Higher	4.149	Very Satisfactory
Type of School	Small	4.108	Very Satisfactory
	Medium	4.021	Very Satisfactory
	Large	4.172	Very Satisfactory
Overall Mean		4.089	Very Satisfactory

Data showed that the level of teachers' performance based on their IPCRFs for the School Year 2021-2022 is very satisfactory. A deeper look into the categories of the variables revealed that younger respondents have a lower mean of 3.980 compared to older respondents, with a mean of 4.200. In the same manner, teachers with lower educational backgrounds have a lower mean of 3.997 compared to teachers with higher educational backgrounds, with a mean of 4.149. Moreover, teachers from small size schools registered a mean of 4.108, teachers from medium size schools registered a mean of 4.32, and teachers from large size schools got the highest mean of 4.021 compared to respondents with a higher income of 4.172. This implies that though they vary in numerical values, all groups of respondents, whether younger, older, with lower and higher educational backgrounds, and regardless of the school they came from, performed their job very satisfactorily. The results are supported by the findings of Castro and Jimenez (2022), wherein the teachers' performance was very satisfactory as assessed by their school heads regardless of their age, gender, position, educational attainment, years in service, and the division they came from.

Table 8
Difference in the Level of School Head's Leadership Styles in the Area of Authoritarian When Grouped and Compared According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	64	70.75	2160.00	0.528	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	72	66.50				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	47	67.09	2025.00	0.760		Not Significant
	Higher	89	69.25				
Type of School	Small	73	59.33	8.612	0.013		Significant
	Medium	37	79.27				
	Large	26	78.92				

Table 8 shows the statistics on the significant differences in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of authoritarianism when grouped and compared according to profile variables. As shown in Table 28, for variable age, the computed U is 2160.0 with a p-value of 0.528, which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as not significant. Therefore the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of authoritarian when they are grouped and compared according to age" is accepted.

For the variable highest educational attainment, the computed U is 2025.0 with a p-value of 0.760, which is greater than the 0.05 level, thus, interpreted as not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of authoritarian when they are grouped and compared according to highest educational attainment" is accepted.

However, for the variable type of school, the computed Kruskal-Wallis H-test is 8.612 with a p-value of 0.013, which is less than 0.05 level, thus, interpreted as significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states "there is



no significant difference in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of authoritarian when they are grouped and compared according to the type of school is rejected.

This implies that the authoritarian leadership skills of the school heads vary as assessed by the respondents when compared according to the type of school they are in. When compared according to age and highest educational attainment, they do not vary. This is because school heads who are handling bigger schools need to impose much authority since he/she will be supervising large groups of subordinates.

This is affirmed by the study conducted by Farooq et al. (2022). They found that there is a significant impact of authoritarian leadership style on teachers' performance with respect to experience in supervising different types of schools.

Table 9

Difference in the Level of School Head's Leadership Styles in the Area of Participative When Grouped and Compared According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	64	64.85	2070.50	0.304	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	72	71.74				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	47	64.32	1895.00	0.364	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	89	70.71				
Type of School	Small	73	63.37	4.801	.091	0.05	Not Significant
	Medium	37	66.99				
	Large	26	83.37				

Table 9 revealed the statistics on the significant differences in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of participative when grouped and compared according to profile variables. As divulged in Table 29, for variable age, the computed U is 2070.50 with a p -value of 0.304, which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as not significant. Therefore the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of participative when they are grouped and compared according to age" is accepted.

For the variable highest educational attainment, the computed U is 1895.00 with a p -value of 0.364, which is greater than the 0.05 level, thus, interpreted as not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of participative when they are grouped and compared according to highest educational attainment" is accepted.

Further, for the variable type of school, the computed Kruskal-Wallis H-test is 4.801 with a p -value of 0.091, which is greater than to 0.05 level, thus, interpreted as not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of participative when they are grouped and compared according to the type of school is accepted.

The results imply that the school heads' participative leadership styles, as assessed by the respondents, did not vary regardless of their age, highest educational attainment, and the school type they came from. This is because most of the school heads demonstrated the same level of participatory management, such as the sharing of power and decision-making allocation to their subordinates. The results contradict the findings of Farooq (2022), wherein there is a significant impact of participative or democratic leadership style on teachers' performance with respect to qualification and experience in managing the schools.

Table 10

Difference in the Level of School Head's Leadership Styles in the Area of Delegative When Grouped and Compared According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	64	69.51	2239.50	0.778	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	72	67.60				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	47	66.10	1798.50	0.604	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	89	69.77				
Type of School	Small	73	62.42	3.890	0.143	0.05	Not Significant
	Medium	37	76.89				
	Large	26	73.63				



Table 10 exposed the statistics on the significant differences in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of delegative when grouped and compared according to profile variables. For the variable age, the computed U is 2239.50 with a p -value of 0.778, which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as not significant. Therefore the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of delegative when they are grouped and compared according to age" is accepted.

Similarly, for the variable highest educational attainment, the computed U is 1798.50 with a p -value of 0.604, which is greater than the 0.05 level, thus, interpreted as not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of delegative when they are grouped and compared according to highest educational attainment" is accepted. Further, for the variable type of school, the computed Kruskal-Wallis H-test is 3.890 with a p -value of 0.143, which is greater than 0.05 level, thus, interpreted as not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of delegative when they are grouped and compared according to the type of school is accepted.

This implies that the school heads' delegative leadership styles, as assessed by the respondents, do not differ regardless of their age, highest educational attainment, and the school type they came from. This is because the majority of the school heads displayed the same level of delegative leadership skills. The result is supported by the finding of Perez (2021), wherein there is no significant difference in the delegative leadership styles of the women administrator educators when grouped according to civil status, educational attainment, academic rank, administrative rank, present and previous position, and in their length of service in the institution. However, there was a significant difference in their delegative leadership style when they were grouped according to age.

Table 11
Difference in the Level of School Head's Leadership Styles in the Area of Servant When Grouped and Compared According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	64	67.67	2251.00	0.816	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	72	69.24				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	47	63.35	1849.50	0.266	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	89	71.22				
Type of School	Small	73	60.29	7.664	0.022	0.05	Significant
	Medium	37	74.41				
	Large	26	83.13				

Table 11 displays the statistics on the significant differences in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of servant when grouped and compared according to profile variables. For the variable age, the computed U is 2251.00 with a p -value of 0.816, which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as not significant. Therefore the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of servant when they are grouped and compared according to age" is accepted.

In the same manner, for the variable highest educational attainment, the computed U is 1849.50 with a p -value of 0.266, which is greater than the 0.05 level, thus, interpreted as not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of servant when they are grouped and compared according to highest educational attainment" is accepted.

However, for the variable type of school, the computed Kruskal-Wallis H-test is 7.664 with a p -value of 0.022, which is less than 0.05 level, thus, interpreted as significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of servant when they are grouped and compared according to the type of school is rejected. This implies that the servant leadership skills of the school heads differ assessed by the respondents when compared according to the type of school they are in. Whereas when compared according to age and highest educational attainment do not differ. This is because school heads from small-size schools have the higher ability to serve and manage the school because of less number of subordinates than those large and medium size schools. According to Hai and Van (2021), a servant leadership style focuses primarily on the development and well-being of employees and associates where they belong and shared power in leadership decision-making. Servant leadership shares power, sets the needs of others into common values, helps people grow together, and creates the highest commitment to achieve the organization's common goals.



Table 12
Difference in the Level of School Head's Leadership Styles in the Area of Transformational When Grouped and Compared According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	64	67.46	2237.50	0.769	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	72	69.42				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	47	65.87	1968.00	0.566	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	89	69.89				
	Small	73	64.27				
Type of School	Medium	37	67.19	4.170	0.124	0.05	Not Significant
	Large	26	82.25				

Table 12 divulged the statistics on the significant differences in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of transformational when grouped and compared according to profile variables. For the variable age, the computed U is 2237.50 with a *p*-value of 0.769, which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as not significant. Therefore the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of transformational when they are grouped and compared according to age" is accepted.

Likewise, for the variable highest educational attainment, the computed U is 1968.00 with a *p*-value of 0.566, which is greater than the 0.05 level, thus, interpreted as not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of transformational when they are grouped and compared according to highest educational attainment" is accepted. Moreover, for the variable type of school, the computed Kruskal-Wallis H-test is 4.170 with a *p*-value of 0.124, which is greater than 0.05 level, thus, interpreted as significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of transformational when they are grouped and compared according to the type of school is accepted. This implies that regardless of respondents' age, highest educational attainment, and the type of school they came from, their perception of the school heads' transformational leadership styles did not differ. This is because most school heads displayed common transformational leader traits. The results contradict the findings of Oco (2020), wherein there is a significant difference in the transformational, autocratic, and democratic leadership styles as perceived by teachers according to gender, present position, and length of service.

Table 13
Difference in the Level of School Head's Leadership Styles in the Area of Transactional When Grouped and Compared According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	64	66.03	2146.00	0.487	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	72	70.69				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	47	65.38	1945.00	0.499	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	89	70.15				
	Small	73	60.77				
Type of School	Medium	37	70.49	9.024	0.011	0.05	Significant
	Large	26	87.38				

Table 13 shows the statistics on the significant differences in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of transactional when grouped and compared according to profile variables. For the variable age, the computed U is 2146.00 with a *p*-value of 0.487, which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as not significant. Therefore the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of transactional when they are grouped and compared according to age" is accepted.

Similarly, for the variable highest educational attainment, the computed U is 1945.00 with a *p*-value of 0.499, which is greater than the 0.05 level, thus, interpreted as not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of transactional when they are grouped and compared according to highest educational attainment" is accepted. However, for the variable type of school, the computed Kruskal-Wallis H-test is 9.024 with a *p*-value of 0.022, which is less than 0.05 level, thus, interpreted as significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states "there is



no significant difference in the school heads' leadership styles as assessed by the teachers in the area of transactional when they are grouped and compared according to the type of school is rejected. This implies that the transactional leadership styles of the school heads vary when the respondents' assessments are compared according to the type of school. When compared according to age and highest educational attainment, they do not vary. This is because school heads who are handling bigger schools have difficulty implementing micromanagement or classic management with a large number of subordinates to maintain control over them to avoid risks in projects or daily tasks.

Table 14
Difference in the Level of Teachers' Performance for the School Year 2021-2022 When Grouped and Compared According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean	t-value	P-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	64	3.98	-5.011	0.000	0.05	Significant
	Older	72	4.20				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	47	4.00	-3.121	0.002	0.05	Significant
	Higher	89	4.15				
Type of School	Small	73	4.108	2.413	0.093	0.05	Not Significant
	Medium	37	4.022				
	Large	26	4.172				

Table 14 disclosed the statistics on the significant differences in the level of teachers' performance when grouped and compared according to profile variables. For the variable age, the computed t is -5.011 with a p -value of 0.000, which is less than the 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as significant. Therefore the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the level of teachers' performance when they are grouped and compared according to age" is rejected. In the same manner, for the variable highest educational attainment, the computed t is -3.121 with a p -value of 0.002, which is greater than the 0.05 level, thus, interpreted as significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the level of teachers' performance when they are grouped and compared according to highest educational attainment" is rejected. However, for the variable type of school, the computed F is 2.413 with a p -value of 0.093, which is greater than to 0.05 level, thus, interpreted as not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the level of teachers' performance when they are grouped and compared according to the type of school is accepted.

The result implies that the teachers' performance varies when compared according to the type of school they are in. While they do not vary when compared according to their age and highest educational attainment. This is because large schools have a higher competitiveness among teachers with regard to their performance, duties, and responsibilities than small and medium size schools. The results support the findings of the study conducted by Pa-alisbo (2021), wherein the job performance of teachers does not necessarily differ in terms of educational attainment, length of service, and salary grade. However, the findings of Ozgenel and Mert (2019), teachers' performance does not show significant differences according to their gender and seniority; but according to their educational background and school type.

Table 15
Relation Between the Level of School Heads' Leadership Styles and the Level of Teacher's Performance

Correlates	N	rho	Level of Sig	p-value	Interpretation
Level of School Head's Leadership Styles	136	-0.059	0.495	0.05	Not Significant
Level of Teachers' Performance	136				

Data revealed that there was no significant relationship between the leadership styles of school heads and the level of teachers' performance, as indicated by the rho-value of -0.059 and p -value of 0.495, which is greater than 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis: "There is no significant relationship between the school heads' leadership styles and the level of teachers' performance," is accepted.

The results implied that the leadership skills performed by the school heads do not really influence the performance of teachers. The school head is a designated official who is saddled with the responsibility of steering the wheels of public schools' success. Hence, the leadership skills performed by school heads have a great impact on teachers' performance and the school as a whole. This may or may not be true, but the study simply revealed



that teachers are independent in performing their duties with additional inputs from their school heads. This result was supported by the study by Lai et al. (2020). Leadership skills have no direct effect on performance. They also stated that the leadership results do not directly affect performance, preferably through LMX and individual relationships. However, research carried out by Agarwal (2020) stated that leadership affects performance. Similarly, Ribeiro et al. (2018) stated that the better the leadership, the higher the work commitment, thereby leading to a significant increase in performance. Maamari and Saheb (2018) stated that a good leadership style followed by an organizational culture improves employee performance.

Conclusions

In conclusions, in authoritarianism, it is concluded that the school heads believe that not all employees in the general population are lazy. In the area of participative, it is concluded that 8% of the school heads need to be more receptive to the ideas and advice of others. In the area of delegative, it is concluded that 72% of the school heads do not give all the freedom to the teachers to carry out their duties; they still want direct supervision over their teachers. In the area of servants, it is concluded that the school heads need to take the initiative to talk personally about issues and concerns of the teachers. In the area of transformational, it is concluded that 21% of the school heads don't want to be entangled in the personal problems of their subordinates. In the area of transactional, it is concluded that the giving of rewards and recognition where rarely practiced by some school heads. Regardless of respondents' age, highest educational attainment, and type of school, they perceived the same observation on the leadership styles of their school heads. The teachers performed very satisfactorily regardless of their age, highest educational attainment, and the type of school they are in. The type of school may contribute to varying the leadership styles of the school heads, particularly authoritarian, servant, and transactional. Further, the school heads' leadership styles do not directly or indirectly influence teachers' performance ratings. Based on the study results, the following recommendation were formulated: 1) it is recommended that the SGOD Chief continue to initiate and provide a series of needs-based seminars such as school supervision, stress, crisis management, and financial and resource management to school heads; 2) School Heads conduct regular Focus Group Discussions to solicit and acknowledge their opinions and suggestions to maintain a quality working relationship among teachers; 3) School Head must initiate team building and work/synergy for the effective management of the school; 4) School Heads may conduct periodic one-on-one counseling with the teachers to address arising concerns that may occur between them, which may set barriers in their working relationships; 5) School Heads conduct regular mentoring and coaching that generate intellectual stimulation and charismatic influence to help teachers become more efficient; 6) school heads must conduct regular recognition and award activities; and 7) Lastly, future researchers may conduct similar studies with different areas not included in the study, such as instructional leadership and administrative leadership across diverse locations and localities that may support or contradict the present study.

Acknowledgement

This endeavor will not become successful without the concerted effort and support of the following personalities. Dr. Lisa C. Cañedo, the researcher's adviser who always extended her untiring guidance and assistance in the making of this research; Dr. Wilfredo O. Hermosura, Dr. Nicholas S. Caballero and Dr. Renith S. Guanzon, panel members during the final oral defense, for the abilities and skills being shared for the realization of this work; and to those who, in one way or another, have contributed to the realization of this work.

References

- Alsubaie, Thamer (2021). The influence of participative leadership on employee performance: a case of the public sector in Saudi Arabia. Dissertations. Pepperdine University. <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/etd/1192>
- Ames, H., (2019). Purposive sampling in a qualitative evidence synthesis: a worked example from a synthesis on parental perceptions of vaccination communication. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 19, 26. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-019-0665-4>
- Aunga, D. A. O. & Masare, O. (2017). Effect of leadership styles on teachers' performance in primary schools of Arusha district, Tanzania. *International Journal of Education Policy Research and Review*, 4(4), 42-52.
- Azucena Jr, J. A., Geroso, M. J. S., & Maguate, G. S. (2023). Contingent Educational Management Response: The Construction and Validation of Leadership scale in the Era of Change. *International Journal of Latest Research in Humanities and Social Science (IJLRHSS)*, 6(07), 315-327.
- Castro, Gely B. and Jimenez, Edward C. (2022). Influence of School Principal's Attributes and 21st-Century Leadership Skills on Teachers' Performance. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 52-63, August 2022. DOI: 10.36079/lamintang.jhass-0402.374
- Chiang JTJ, Chen XP, Liu H, Akutsu S, Wang Z (2020) We have emotions but can't show them! authoritarian leadership, emotion suppression climate, and team performance. *Human Relations Journal* 74:1082-1111. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726720908649>
- Drucker, P. F. (2007). *Management challenges for the 21st-century*. New York, NY: Harper Collins Publishers.



- Eliver, A., Abule, A., Cornel, M., & Maguate, G. (2023). Teachers research Perception, competence and Work Performance: Basis for A Capability Building Plan. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management (IJSRM)*, 11(10), 42-73.
- Estacio, M. R. & Estacio, D. L. (2022). Public School Heads' Leadership Style and Best Practices in the Department of Education in Bulacan, Philippines. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. 3 (9), 1622 – 1629. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.03.09.03
- Farooq, Amber, Dilshad Syeda Asma, and Qadir, Surriya (2022). A study of leadership styles and teachers' performance. *Competitive Educational Research Journal*. Vol. 3, Issue 1. <https://cerjournal.com>
- Gernalin, J., Bautista, M., & Maguate, G. (2023). Compliance with the code of Conduct and Teaching performance. *Valley International Journal Digital Library*, 3036-3062.
- Hai, Thanh G. and Van, Quang N. (2021) Servant leadership styles: A theoretical approach. *Emerging Science Journal*, Vol 5, No. 2. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.28991/esj-2021-01273>
- Hasbay, D., & Altindag, E. (2018). Factors That Affect The Performance Of Teachers Working In Secondary Level Education. *The Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 22, 1.
- Lopez, Edward & Ensari, Nurcan. (2020). The Effects of Leadership Style, Organizational Outcome, and Gender on Attributional Bias Toward Leaders. *Journal of Leadership Studies*. 8. 10.1002/jls.21326
- Nachimas, C. and De Ward, J. (2015). *Research methods in the social sciences*. New York: Worth Publishers
- Oco, Richard M. (2022) Leadership styles of school heads and its relationship to school performance. *Global Scientific Journal*, Vol 10, Issue 1. www.gobalscientificsjournal.com
- Özgenel, M. and Mert, P. (2019). The Role of Teacher Performance in School Effectiveness, *International Journal of Education Technology and Scientific Researches*, Vol: 4, Issue: 10, pp. (417- 434)
- Pa-alisbo, Mark Anthony C. (2021). The 21st century skills and job performance of teachers. *Journal of Education and Practice*. Vol 8 No. 32 pp7-12. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED578609>
- Pasamar, Susana, Mirta Diaz-Fernandez, and Maria Dolores de la Rosa-Navarro. 2019. Human capital: The link between leadership and organizational learning. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics* 28: 25–51.
- Perez, Emeteria Leonil A. (2021). Philippine women educators' leadership styles and managerial skills. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, Vol 10, No. 3, pp. 438-455, www.european-science.com
- Pizzolitto, Elia, Verna, Ida and Venditti, Michelina (2023). Authoritarian leadership styles and performance: a systematic literature review and research agenda. *Management Review Quarterly, Springer* 73:841–871 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-022-00263-y>
- Saleem, Atif, Sarfraz Aslam, Hong-biao Yin, and Congman Rao. (2020). Principal Leadership Styles and Teacher Job Performance: Viewpoint of Middle Management. *Sustainability* 12, no. 8: 3390. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12083390>
- Sawan, Fransiskus & Suryadi, Suryadi & Nurhattati, Nurhattati. (2021). Impact of Organizational Culture on Knowledge Sharing Behavior. 10.2991/assehr.k.210212.073.
- Sultana, Umme S., Darun, MOhf R. and Yao, Liu (2015). Transactional or transformation leadership: which works best for now? *International Journal of Industrial Management*, Vol. 20, pp. 20-30
- Tiauzon, M. J., Moyani Jr, G., Bautista, M., & Maguate, G. (2023). Management Skills of Department Heads in Relation to Employees Work performance. *Valley International Journal Digital Library*, 5327-5334.
- Waheed, Z., Hussin, S., & Bin Megat Daud, M. A. K. (2018). The best practices for school transformation: A multiple-case study. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 56(1), 88-103

Bio-profile:

Mary-Ann C. Cadimas, Master of Arts in Education degree holder, School Brigada Coordinator, School Math Coordinator, School L&D Coordinator. Her research interests are education, management, leadership, and other allied fields.

Dr. Lisa C. Cañedo, Master Teacher 1 and GMRC District Coordinator of Manjuyod District 1, Division of Negros Oriental. Her research interests are in reading and literacy, language education, leadership and management and other related fields.

Dr. Melba V. Mercado, School Principal 2 of Manjuyod Central Elementary School. President School Heads League of Manjuyod District 2. Her research interests are English, Filipino, MTB-MLE, Mathematics and Science.