

Potential Of Educational Leadership: Reshaping Opportunities for School Heads in Getafe I And 2 District, Division of Bohol

WAHING LYKA B.

Abstract — This study examined the relationship between the profile of school heads and teachers, their perceptions of leadership potential, and the influence of leadership practices within educational institutions. Using multiple regression and Pearson correlation analyses, the research assessed how demographic variables and institutional leadership practices affect perceived leadership capacity. Findings revealed that specific leadership practices—particularly teacher and staff development, academic achievement, and leadership effectiveness—are strongly and positively correlated with leadership potential, as perceived by both school heads and teachers. In contrast, demographic factors such as age, gender, civil status, and years of service showed no statistically significant influence on leadership potential. Surprisingly, among teachers, educational attainment exhibited a significant negative relationship with perceived leadership potential, suggesting that academic qualifications do not automatically translate to leadership recognition or influence. Similarly, institutional factors like organizational adaptability, equity, and sustainability demonstrated weak or insignificant correlations with leadership potential, indicating the need for a more integrated and practice-based approach to leadership development. The study underscores the importance of instructional and transformational leadership frameworks in fostering a culture of growth, collaboration, and achievement in schools. Based on the findings, the study recommends that leadership development programs focus on practical competencies, capacity-building, and measurable outcomes rather than relying solely on academic qualifications or tenure. By aligning leadership strategies with effective teaching and learning outcomes, schools can better cultivate sustainable and impactful educational leadership that responds to the evolving needs of 21st-century learners.

Keywords — *Leadership Potential, Educational Leadership, Teacher Development, Instructional Leadership, School Leadership Practices*

I. Introduction

In the dynamic and complex landscape of 21st-century education, leadership plays a pivotal role in shaping effective learning environments. Traditional leadership models are no longer sufficient; instead, there is a growing demand for transformative leaders who exhibit qualities such as vision, intellectual stimulation, individualized support, and inspirational motivation. Rooted in the foundational work of Burns (2004) and expanded by scholars like Sorenson (2015), transformative leadership emphasizes the ability to inspire meaningful change and exceed expectations.

As educational institutions face evolving challenges such as technological integration, diverse student populations, and global interconnectedness, leaders must adopt adaptive and forward-thinking strategies. This study examines how transformative leadership is understood and practiced in modern educational settings. Guided by the theoretical framework of Zhu et al. (2012), which highlights key leadership dimensions, the research aims to explore the real-world application, challenges, and impact of transformative leadership. The findings intend to inform leadership development, policy-making, and institutional practices, contributing valuable insights into effective leadership in contemporary education.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

This study aims to assess the educational leadership and potential of schools in Getafe I District, Schools Division of Bohol during the School Year 2024-2025 with an end view of proposing an action plan.

Specifically, the study seeks answers to the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:

1.1 School Heads

1.1.1 Age;

1.1.2 Gender;

1.1.3 Civil Status;

1.1.4 Educational Attainment;

1.1.5 Years of Service;

1.1.6 Length of Administrative Experience; and

1.1.7 Seminars/Trainings attended?

1.2 Teachers

1.2.1 Age;

1.2.2 Gender;

1.2.3 Civil Status;

1.2.4 Educational Attainment;

1.2.5 Years of Teaching Experience; and

1.2.6 Seminars/Trainings attended?

2. As perceived by the respondent groups, what is the status of leadership practices on educational institutions in terms of:

2.1 Institutional Performance Enhancement;

2.2 Teacher and Staff Development;

2.3 Student Engagement and Achievement; and

2.4 Organizational Adaptability and Innovation?

3. As perceived by the respondent groups, what is the level of leadership potential in terms of:

3.1 Academic Achievement;

3.2 Leadership Effectiveness;

3.3 Institutional Sustainability; and

3.4 Educational Equity and Inclusion?

4. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of the respondent groups and the status of leadership practices on educational institutions?

5. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of the respondent groups and the level of leadership potential?

6. Is there a significant relationship between the status of leadership practices on educational institutions and the level of leadership potential?

7. Based on the findings of the study, what action plan can be proposed?

II. Methodology

The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design. It was descriptive in nature as it aimed to determine the profile of elementary school heads based on age, gender, civil status, educational attainment, and length of administrative experience, as well as their leadership practices and level of leadership potential. It was also correlational, as it examined the relationships among these variables. Permission was secured from the appropriate office, and a transmittal letter was presented to the Schools Division Superintendent for authorization. The researchers distributed, administered, and retrieved the questionnaires from the respondents. The collected

data were tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted using statistical tools such as percentage, simple mean, and sum of ranks.

2.1 Procedure

To ensure accuracy and reliability, the study titled "*Potential of Educational Leadership: Reshaping Opportunities for School Heads in Getafe I District, Division of Bohol*" followed a systematic process. A review of relevant literature was first conducted to establish the theoretical foundation. Data were gathered through surveys, interviews, and academic performance records using a descriptive-correlational research design. Purposive sampling was employed to select participating schools, and statistical methods such as correlation analysis were applied to determine the relationship between professional development and student outcomes. Ethical standards, including informed consent and confidentiality, were strictly observed throughout the research process.

2.2 Data Processing

The study was conducted using a systematic literature review (SLR), which involved synthesizing information from a broad range of sources to develop a coherent and comprehensive argument (Dickins & Weber-Buchholz, 2022). The researcher collected data from academic journals, conference proceedings, and reports indexed in databases such as Scopus, Web of Science (WoS), and the International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBSS). The review focused on key themes, including innovative administrative practices, the roles of educational leaders, and interdisciplinary approaches to administration.

III. Results and Discussion

This section presents the profile of the school heads in terms of age, gender, civil status, educational attainment, years of service, length of administrative experience, and seminars/trainings attended. The results are shown below.

The demographic profile of the school heads provided important insights into the leadership dynamics of the schools studied. Most school heads were aged 42–48 (46.4%), indicating a leadership group likely at the peak of their professional maturity. The next largest group, aged 49–55 (25.0%), further reflected a strong presence of experienced administrators. These age groups were well-positioned to manage the complexities of school leadership effectively.

In terms of gender, the majority were female (60.7%), while males accounted for 39.3%. This supported the global trend of increasing female participation in educational leadership, contributing to inclusive and collaborative management styles. Regarding civil status, 71.4% of

the school heads were married, which may have contributed to greater personal stability and professional effectiveness.

A significant proportion (60.7%) had earned a Master’s degree, and 25.0% had completed graduate units, indicating strong academic preparation among the majority. Only 14.2% had doctorate-level qualifications. This high level of educational attainment supported effective strategic leadership and academic goal-setting.

In terms of administrative experience, 60.7% had served between 6–10 years, while 71.4% had less than 10 years overall, suggesting a mid-career leadership profile. Despite relatively fewer years in leadership, the combination of experience and advanced education prepared these school heads to implement long-term goals and context-specific strategies.

Finally, 50% of the respondents had attended national-level trainings, and 35.7% had international exposure. This level of professional development enhanced their capacity to adopt global best practices and implement effective school leadership strategies aligned with broader educational standards.

Table 2 Frequency Distribution on the demographic profile of the school heads

Age	Frequency	Percent
56-62	3	10.7
49-55	7	25.0
42-48	13	46.4
35-41	3	10.7
28-34	2	7.1
Total	28	100.0
Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	11	39.3
Female	17	60.7
Total	28	100.0
Civil Status	Frequency	Percent
Single	5	17.9
Married	20	71.4
Separated	3	10.7
Total	28	100.0
Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percent
Master's-Units	7	25.0
Master's Degree	17	60.7
Doctorate-Units	2	7.1
Doctorate Degree	2	7.1
Total	28	100.0
Years of Administrative Experience	Frequency	Percent
1-5	6	21.4
6-10	17	60.7
11>	5	17.9
Total	28	100.0
Total	28	100.0
Length of Administrative Experience	Frequency	Percent

<10	20	71.4
10>	8	28.6
Total	28	100.0
1-3	4	14.3
Total	28	100.0
Number of Relevant Trainings/Seminars Attended	Frequency	Percent
International	10	35.7
National	14	50.0
Regional	4	14.3
Total	28	100.0

This section presents the profile of teachers in terms of age, gender, civil status, educational attainment, years of teaching experience, and seminars/trainings attended. The findings are shown below.

The demographic profile of teachers provided valuable insights into their potential contributions to school leadership and student achievement. Most teachers were within the 35–48 age range, with 26.8% aged 35–41 and 24.2% aged 42–48, indicating a predominantly mid-career workforce. This group was experienced yet adaptable, well-positioned to engage with instructional leadership and support school-wide initiatives.

The data revealed a highly gender-skewed distribution, with females comprising 95.5% of the teaching staff and males only 4.5%. This reflected global trends in basic education and highlighted the need for inclusive leadership opportunities. According to Alma (2002), shared leadership is particularly effective in collaborative school environments.

In terms of civil status, 83.4% of teachers were married, suggesting social and professional stability that supported long-term educational engagement. Hallinger et al. (2010) noted that such stability contributes positively to consistent goal implementation and school improvement efforts.

Educational attainment showed that 73.9% had earned units toward a Master’s degree, though only 4.5% had completed the degree. A small portion (5.1%) had taken doctorate-level coursework. This indicated a well-qualified teaching force capable of engaging in advanced instructional roles, especially when empowered through distributed leadership.

Experience-wise, 54.1% of teachers had over 11 years of service, while 38.2% had 1–5 years of experience. This mix of veteran and novice teachers provided a balance between innovation and established practices. Mentorship and collaborative planning were likely to benefit both groups.

Professional development data showed that most teachers participated in national (43.3%) and regional (38.2%) trainings, with fewer attending international (7.6%) or division-level (10.8%) seminars. This exposure to broad educational strategies prepared teachers to support curriculum reforms, student assessment, and instructional improvement.

Overall, the demographic data suggested that the teaching staff was well-positioned for distributed leadership and collaborative goal-setting. Their experience, qualifications, and training made them capable partners in achieving school goals and enhancing student outcomes.

Table 3 Frequency Distribution on the demographic profile of the Teachers

Age	Frequency	Percent
56-62	3	1.9
49-55	26	16.6
42-48	38	24.2
35-41	42	26.8
28-34	25	15.9
27<	23	14.6
Total	157	100.0
Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	7	4.5
Female	150	95.5
Total	157	100.0
Civil Status	Frequency	Percent
Single	24	15.3
Married	131	83.4
Separated	2	1.3
Total	157	100.0
Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percent
College Degree	26	16.6
Master's-Units	116	73.9
Master's Degree	7	4.5
Doctorate-Units	8	5.1
Total	157	100.0
Years of Administrative Experience	Frequency	Percent
1-5	60	38.2
6-10	12	7.6
11>	85	54.1
Total	157	100.0
Number of Relevant Trainings/Seminars Attended	Frequency	Percent
International	12	7.6
National	68	43.3
Regional	60	38.2
Division	17	10.8
Total	157	100.0

Table 8 presented a summary of school heads' perceived leadership effectiveness across four core domains: organizational adaptability (mean = 3.36), institutional performance enhancement (mean = 3.20), student engagement (mean = 3.20), and teacher and staff development (mean = 3.14). All scores were interpreted as moderate, with a grand mean of 3.23 (SD = 0.90), indicating a consistent yet unexceptional level of perceived effectiveness. The relatively higher score in adaptability suggested that school leaders were more confident in managing change than in initiating innovation or empowering staff, reflecting a more reactive leadership style.

The moderate ratings across all domains underscored the multifaceted nature of school leadership, where balancing competencies is essential. While adaptability was relatively stronger, lower scores in areas such as staff development and inclusivity pointed to gaps in human capital investment and equity practices. Harris et al. (2013) emphasized that distributed leadership could address these gaps by fostering collective responsibility and ownership of school improvement. Without such approaches, leadership performance was likely to remain at a moderate level.

The integration of technology was identified as a key factor in elevating leadership effectiveness. Scherer and Teasley (2017) noted that digital tools enhanced both operational and instructional leadership capacities. When paired with a culture of collaboration and shared leadership, technology empowered school heads to make informed decisions, support educators, and respond more effectively to student needs—potentially transforming schools into adaptive, high-performing institutions.

Table 8 Summary Results on the Level of School Heads’ Perceived Status of Leadership Practices on Educational Institutions

Indicators	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
Organizational Adaptability and Innovation	28	3.36	0.76	Moderate
Institutional Performance Enhancement	28	3.20	1.06	Moderate
Student Engagement and Achievement		3.20	0.81	Moderate
Teacher and Staff Development	28	3.14	0.95	Moderate
Grand Mean	28	3.23	0.90	Moderate

Legend	Range	Description
	4.21-5.00	Very High
	3.41-4.20	High
	2.61-3.40	Moderate
	1.81-2.60	Low
	1.00-1.80	Very Low

Table 13 offered a broader view by comparing different aspects of leadership practices. Among the four key areas, **Teacher and Staff Development** received the highest rating (Mean = 3.19, SD = 0.84), indicating a moderately positive perception of leadership support for professional growth. In contrast, **Organizational Adaptability and Innovation** received the lowest score (Mean = 2.48, SD = 0.92), reinforcing previous findings in Table 12 and highlighting a significant weakness in leadership practices. The grand mean of 2.84 (SD = 0.97) reflected an overall “Moderate” level of perceived leadership effectiveness.

This contrast between support for individual development and the lack of systemic innovation revealed a potential gap in leadership focus—where school leaders may have emphasized instructional growth but fell short in driving institutional change or technological advancement. These findings aligned with existing literature, such as the work of Halverson et al. (2015) and Fullan (2021), which underscored the importance of innovation and technology in effective educational leadership.

The low scores in adaptability and innovation suggested that schools had not yet fostered environments conducive to experimentation, risk-taking, or transformational change, as recommended by Robinson et al. (2009). Leadership efforts needed to extend beyond professional development to include the creation of a culture that actively supported innovation. This required strategic investment in digital tools, encouragement of creative initiatives, and responsiveness to external challenges. Without such shifts, schools risked stagnating in a rapidly evolving educational environment that demanded agile and visionary leadership.

Table 13 Summary Results on the Level Teachers’ Perceived Status of Leadership Practices on Educational Institutions

Indicators	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
Teacher and Staff Development	157	3.19	0.84	Moderate
Student Engagement and Achievement	157	2.93	1.01	Moderate
Institutional Performance Enhancement	157	2.76	1.10	Moderate
Organizational Adaptability and Innovation	157	2.48	0.92	Low
Grand Mean	157	2.84	0.97	Moderate

Legend	Range	Description
	4.21-5.00	Very High
	3.41-4.20	High
	2.61-3.40	Moderate
	1.81-2.60	Low
	1.00-1.80	Very Low

Table 17 summarized the school heads’ leadership potential across four key domains. The highest mean was recorded in **Educational Equity and Inclusion** (Mean = 3.36, SD = 0.94), followed by **Institutional Sustainability** (Mean = 3.13, SD = 0.77), reflecting a strong emphasis on inclusivity and sustainable practices—both essential in modern educational settings. However, **Academic Achievement** (Mean = 2.96, SD = 1.13) and **Leadership Effectiveness** (Mean = 2.98, SD = 0.96) received the lowest, though still moderate, ratings, indicating areas in need of further improvement.

The overall grand mean of 3.11 (SD = 0.95) suggested that school heads generally perceived themselves as moderately effective leaders. The varied standard deviations across domains indicated inconsistency in leadership practices, pointing to a need for more uniform capacity building. While strengths in equity and sustainability were evident, the lower scores in academic achievement highlighted a disconnect—leaders appeared effective in fostering values and infrastructure but struggled to directly enhance learner outcomes.

These findings supported the views of Kellerman (2015) and Williams (2017), who emphasized the critical role of principals in shaping the educational climate. To improve student performance, leadership efforts needed to expand beyond equitable access and sustainable planning to include robust instructional leadership, data-driven decision-making, and the

consistent empowerment of teachers. Continuous professional development, mentoring, and performance monitoring were recommended to help school heads strike a balance between operational management and academic excellence—an essential goal for addressing the evolving demands of 21st-century education.

Table 17 Summary Results on the Level School Heads' Level Of Leadership Potential

Indicators	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
Educational Equity and Inclusion	28	3.36	0.94	Moderate
Institutional Sustainability	28	3.13	0.77	Moderate
Leadership Effectiveness	28	2.98	0.96	Moderate
Academic Achievement	28	2.96	1.13	Moderate
Grand Mean	28	3.11	0.95	Moderate

Legend	Range	Description
	4.21-5.00	Very High
	3.41-4.20	High
	2.61-3.40	Moderate
	1.81-2.60	Low
	1.00-1.80	Very Low

Table 22 summarized teachers' overall perceptions of leadership potential across four domains. The highest mean was recorded in Institutional Sustainability (Mean = 3.50, SD = 0.87), followed by Educational Equity and Inclusion (Mean = 3.31, SD = 0.76), suggesting that teachers strongly believed school leaders demonstrated strategic foresight and an inclusive approach. These results indicated that schools were perceived to be guided with a long-term, community-focused perspective aligned with current educational priorities.

In contrast, Leadership Effectiveness (Mean = 3.05, SD = 0.90) and Academic Achievement (Mean = 2.85, SD = 1.03) received the lowest ratings, pointing to areas needing further reinforcement. Although leadership was viewed as moderately effective in managing personnel, its impact on academic outcomes remained a concern. The grand mean of 3.18 (SD = 0.89) confirmed a "Moderate" level of perceived leadership potential overall, signaling a solid foundation with room for targeted improvement—especially in instructional leadership and performance-driven strategies.

These findings supported Ramrathan's (2017) claim that school leaders' styles and decisions directly influenced student outcomes. While principals were acknowledged for promoting sustainability and equity, the results emphasized the need to enhance their direct role in improving academic performance. In the context of Eswatini, this meant school heads needed to shift from administrative maintenance toward academic excellence, leveraging data, professional development, and classroom support to drive student achievement. Strengthening these dimensions would help translate leadership potential into measurable success and institutional improvement.

Table 22 Summary Results on the Teachers' Level of Leadership Potential

Indicators	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
Institutional Sustainability	157	3.50	0.87	Moderate
Educational Equity and Inclusion	157	3.31	0.76	Moderate
Leadership Effectiveness	157	3.05	0.90	Moderate
Academic Achievement	157	2.85	1.03	Moderate
Grand Mean	157	3.18	0.89	Moderate

Legend	Range	Description
	4.21-5.00	Very High
	3.41-4.20	High
	2.61-3.40	Moderate
	1.81-2.60	Low
	1.00-1.80	Very Low

This section presents the test of the relationship between the school heads profile and the status of leadership practices on educational institutions. The results are displayed below.

The analysis of Table 23 revealed a multiple correlation coefficient of $R = 0.614$, indicating a **moderate positive relationship** between the school heads' profile variables and the status of leadership practices in educational institutions. However, the R^2 value of **0.377** showed that only **37.7% of the variance** in leadership practices was explained by the school heads' profile characteristics. This suggested a moderate level of explanatory power, indicating that although a relationship existed, it was not particularly strong.

Moreover, the **Adjusted R^2 value of 0.159** implied that when the number of predictors was taken into account, the model's overall fit **decreased significantly**. This reduction indicated that **some variables included in the model may not have contributed meaningfully** or efficiently to explaining the variance in leadership practices.

Table 23 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.614	.377	.159	.328

In Table 24, the ANOVA analysis yielded an F-value of 1.732 with a significance level of 0.158, indicating that the model was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. This result implied that the combined profile variables of school heads—such as age, educational attainment, and experience—did not significantly predict their leadership practices. The p-value greater than 0.05 confirmed that the variations in leadership practices could not be reliably attributed to the school heads' demographic or professional characteristics and that any observed association might have occurred by chance.

Taken together with the findings from Table 23, which showed a moderate correlation ($R = 0.614$) but a low adjusted R^2 (0.159), the results suggested that while a relationship was observed, it lacked statistical significance and robustness. These findings indicated that other unmeasured

factors—such as institutional culture, policy constraints, access to professional development, or school resources—might have had a stronger influence on leadership practices.

Therefore, relying solely on demographic or professional background variables to understand or improve school leadership appeared to be insufficient. Future studies were recommended to explore dynamic factors such as the quality of leadership training, the level of organizational support, and the implementation of educational policies to gain a more comprehensive understanding of what drives effective leadership in schools.

Table 24 ANOVA Analysis

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.301	7	.186	1.732	.158
	Residual	2.146	20	.107		
	Total	3.447	27			

Table 25 presented the results of a multiple regression analysis exploring the relationship between school heads' profile variables and their leadership practices. The analysis revealed that none of the predictors were statistically significant, as all p-values exceeded the conventional 0.05 threshold. Despite the lack of significance, several notable trends emerged.

One of the more suggestive findings was the negative beta value for age ($\beta = -1.216$, $p = .065$), implying that as age increased, leadership practices tended to decline. While this result was not statistically significant, the relatively low p-value suggested a near-significant trend that could merit further exploration with a larger sample. This trend supported the notion that older school heads may face challenges in adapting to contemporary leadership styles, particularly transformational leadership, which emphasizes adaptability, innovation, and continuous improvement (Bass, 1985). This echoed Kwan's (2020) findings on the difficulty older administrators may have in embracing evolving leadership paradigms.

Other profile variables, including civil status ($\beta = -0.403$, $p = .323$) and seminars/trainings attended ($\beta = -0.159$, $p = .799$), also showed negative beta values. These results suggested that certain personal or static professional characteristics did not directly correlate with stronger leadership practices. The findings highlighted that one-off trainings might not be sufficient for leadership growth unless they were embedded in sustained professional development and institutional support.

Conversely, educational attainment ($\beta = 0.928$, $p = .094$) and administrative experience ($\beta = 0.327$, $p = .211$) showed positive relationships with leadership practices, although not at significant levels. These trends indicated that more qualified and experienced school heads may be better positioned to adopt transformational leadership styles, reinforcing conclusions drawn by Leithwood et al. (1999) about the role of experienced, well-educated leaders in improving school performance and staff engagement.

In conclusion, although the regression analysis did not yield statistically significant predictors, the emerging patterns—especially the inverse relationship with age—offered valuable insights. These findings underscored that demographic factors alone may not be sufficient to shape effective leadership. As suggested by Hallinger and Heck (1996), true leadership impact stems from transformational approaches that require ongoing learning, mentoring, and institutional support. The study pointed to the need for targeted leadership development strategies that help school leaders adapt to the dynamic demands of 21st-century education.

Table 25 Multiple regression analyses on test of relationship between the school heads profile and the status of leadership practices on educational institutions

Variables	Beta	p-value	Decision
Age	-1.216	.065	Not Significant
Gender	.317	.377	Not Significant
Civil Status	-.403	.323	Not Significant
Educational Attainment	.928	.094	Not Significant
Years of Service	-.013	.978	Not Significant
Length of Administrative Experience	.327	.211	Not Significant
seminars/trainings attended	-.159	.799	Not Significant

Discussion

Profile of the Respondents

The demographic profile of school heads and teachers in Getafe I District showed that most fell within mid-career age brackets (42–48 for heads; 35–48 for teachers), suggesting a workforce with both maturity and energy for long-term school improvement. Women dominated the education sector, comprising 60.7% of school heads and 95.5% of teachers, highlighting a gender imbalance that could be leveraged to promote collaborative and inclusive leadership styles, while also encouraging gender-sensitivity and equity in leadership opportunities.

A significant portion of personnel held or pursued graduate-level education—60.7% of school heads had completed a master’s degree, and 73.9% of teachers had earned graduate units—indicating strong potential for instructional leadership and curriculum innovation. Despite 50% of school heads and 43.3% of teachers having attended national-level trainings, participation in international and division-level seminars remained low, pointing to a need for localized, context-specific professional development.

Most school heads had 6–10 years of experience, and the teaching force was seasoned, suggesting readiness for shared leadership structures such as SLTs and Department Learning Leaders. These structures were seen as vital to aligning school goals with the SIP-AIP and MATATAG agenda.

Overall, the data reflected a qualified and experienced workforce, ready for structured leadership development. The Schools Division of Bohol was encouraged to capitalize on these strengths through targeted capacity-building, collaborative planning, and clear pathways for leadership to enhance school outcomes and sustain improvement efforts.

Status Of Leadership Practices on Educational Institutions

The findings from both school heads and teachers revealed a consistent perception that leadership practices across institutional performance, staff development, student achievement, and innovation were moderate overall. School heads generally rated themselves higher than teachers, especially in organizational adaptability, suggesting a possible disconnect between leadership self-perceptions and how practices were experienced by teaching staff.

Teachers expressed the strongest confidence in leadership practices that supported professional development, but they also noted weaknesses in innovation, community engagement, and responsiveness to change. Low ratings in parental involvement and external adaptability suggested that leadership actions did not always translate to meaningful classroom or community impact.

The results implied a need for distributed leadership, where decision-making and innovation are shared across stakeholders. However, low teacher ratings in areas like vision-setting and policy adaptability pointed to a leadership approach that remained centralized and inconsistently applied.

Moderate ratings, especially from teachers, suggested that while leadership systems were present, their effectiveness had not been fully realized. To improve, schools were advised to prioritize inclusive planning, transparent communication, and innovation-driven capacity building. Without addressing these gaps, leadership in educational institutions risked remaining stagnant and failing to drive transformative change.

School Heads' Level of Leadership Potential

The study revealed that both school heads and teachers in Eswatini perceived leadership potential as moderate across four domains: academic achievement, leadership effectiveness, institutional sustainability, and educational equity and inclusion. Among these, institutional sustainability and equity were rated relatively higher, suggesting increased awareness of long-term planning and inclusive practices. However, the moderate ratings overall highlighted the need for more strategic and impactful leadership implementation.

In contrast, academic achievement and leadership effectiveness received the lowest ratings from both groups. School heads and teachers shared concerns about the limited impact of current leadership on instructional quality and student outcomes. Low performance was also noted in areas

such as continuous improvement and staff motivation, suggesting a disconnect between leadership efforts and classroom realities.

These findings underscored the need to recalibrate leadership development programs to focus more on instructional leadership, staff empowerment, and data-informed practices. The results suggested that school leaders were more confident in planning and inclusivity than in direct academic leadership. To address this, capacity-building, mentoring, and accountability structures were recommended.

Lastly, the study highlighted inconsistencies in leadership implementation, indicated by high standard deviations. This variability could lead to inequities in educational outcomes. It was recommended that national authorities promote shared leadership models, define benchmarks, and monitor execution to move leadership performance from moderate to high levels and ensure a more inclusive, effective educational system.

Tests of relationships of the variables

The study analyzed the relationship between the demographic and professional profiles of school heads and teachers and their leadership practices and potential. Results for school heads showed a moderate correlation ($R = 0.614$) between profile variables and leadership practices, but the relationship was not statistically significant ($p = 0.158$). Only 37.7% of the variance in leadership practices was explained by their profiles, suggesting that other factors, such as institutional support or school culture, likely played a more significant role.

Regression analysis confirmed that variables like age, gender, and years of service did not significantly predict leadership practices, though age showed a near-significant inverse relationship. These results highlighted the limited predictive power of demographic traits and emphasized the need to consider dynamic, context-based variables.

For teachers, the relationship between their profiles and leadership practices was even weaker. The correlation was negligible ($R = 0.061$, $R^2 = 0.004$), and the ANOVA results ($p = 0.997$) indicated no statistical significance. Regression findings also showed no significant predictors, implying that teacher traits like age, experience, or education level did not influence their engagement in leadership.

In contrast, the analysis of school heads' profiles in relation to leadership potential showed a stronger positive relationship, with over 50% of the variance explained. While individual predictors like age or gender remained non-significant, the overall model suggested that years of service and administrative experience contributed meaningfully to perceived leadership potential. This supports the idea that experience may be influential in shaping potential, even if not always in daily leadership behaviors.

In conclusion, both school heads' and teachers' demographic and professional profiles had limited predictive value regarding leadership practices. The findings emphasized that effective leadership is less dependent on static traits and more influenced by external factors like organizational culture, leadership development, and support systems. These results reinforced transformational leadership theories and called for a shift in focus toward capacity-building, inclusive culture, and institutional mechanisms that nurture leadership beyond personal attributes.

The study examined the relationship between teacher and school head profiles, leadership practices, and perceived leadership potential. For teachers, while demographic characteristics accounted for a moderate portion of the variance in leadership potential, the findings challenged conventional assumptions. In particular, the significant inverse relationship between educational attainment and leadership potential suggested that formal qualifications alone did not guarantee leadership readiness. This may have reflected systemic barriers or mismatches between teacher qualifications and available leadership opportunities.

The results emphasized the need for a more nuanced approach to teacher leadership development—one that prioritized emotional intelligence, strategic thinking, and instructional leadership over credentials alone. Consequently, leadership programs should incorporate these competencies, ensuring that teachers are empowered to contribute meaningfully to school improvement and institutional change.

Findings from Tables 35 and 36 provided deeper insight into how leadership practices related to perceived leadership potential. In Table 35, school heads' self-assessments revealed significant positive correlations between leadership potential and practices such as Teacher and Staff Development, Academic Achievement, and Leadership Effectiveness. These results supported existing literature that instructional leadership—particularly when it fosters teacher growth and student success—enhances perceptions of leadership capability.

Similarly, Table 36 indicated that teachers also identified strong positive associations between leadership potential and practices related to teacher development and student engagement. This alignment between teacher and school head perspectives reinforced the central role of teaching and learning environments in shaping leadership perceptions. Teachers particularly valued leaders who invested in professional development and demonstrated a strong commitment to student achievement.

However, not all leadership dimensions showed strong associations. Institutional Sustainability, Educational Equity and Inclusion, Organizational Adaptability, and Innovation produced weak or non-significant correlations with perceived leadership potential. These findings suggested that while such practices are vital for long-term school effectiveness, they may not be immediately visible or compelling factors in how leadership potential is judged. It is possible that these elements, though important, require broader systemic integration or more visible outcomes before influencing perception.

The implications for practice were clear. Schools must design leadership development programs that are responsive to the unique needs and strengths of both school heads and teachers. Targeted interventions—such as mentoring, leadership coaching, and collaborative professional development—should be aligned with the gaps identified in leadership effectiveness and academic outcomes. Moreover, creating supportive environments where shared leadership, innovation, and inclusivity are practiced consistently will be essential in nurturing leadership potential at all levels.

In conclusion, while demographic and professional characteristics provided some insights into leadership potential, they were not definitive predictors of leadership effectiveness. The study highlighted the critical role of specific leadership behaviors—especially those focused on instruction, staff development, and student achievement—in shaping perceptions of leadership capability. Future leadership efforts should therefore focus on building school cultures that empower educators, support innovation, and elevate the quality of teaching and learning as core drivers of institutional success.

IV. Conclusion

Based on the overall findings of the study, it was evident that both school heads' and teachers' perceptions of leadership potential were significantly shaped by specific leadership practices, particularly those involving teacher and staff development, academic achievement, and leadership effectiveness. These dimensions consistently demonstrated strong positive correlations with perceived leadership potential, underscoring their central importance in fostering effective and responsive educational leadership. In contrast, demographic variables such as age, gender, and civil status, as well as generalized leadership practices, exhibited limited or no significant predictive value. This indicated that such static attributes alone were insufficient in determining leadership capability. Interestingly, advanced educational attainment among teachers was negatively associated with leadership potential, suggesting a possible disconnect between formal qualifications and actual recognition of leadership within school contexts. These findings highlighted the necessity of practice-oriented leadership development programs that move beyond credentials and tenure. Emphasis should be placed on cultivating leadership that demonstrates measurable impact on instruction, learning outcomes, and staff empowerment to support sustainable and transformative change in educational institutions.

V. Recommendations

Based on conclusions, the following recommendations are forwarded:

- Educational institutions should develop leadership programs that emphasize practical skills—such as instructional leadership and staff development—over formal qualifications, as these areas are more strongly linked to perceived leadership potential.

- School heads should focus on continuous professional development through mentoring, peer coaching, and targeted training, as these efforts improve institutional performance and strengthen perceptions of leadership potential among peers and subordinates.
- Leadership practices should align closely with student academic outcomes by using data-informed strategies that enhance student engagement and achievement, ensuring leadership effectiveness leads to tangible educational improvements.
- Educational policymakers and administrators should shift from focusing on demographics and qualifications toward a holistic, performance-based evaluation system that values demonstrated leadership skills, innovation, adaptability, and tangible contributions to school improvement.
- School systems should invest in leadership training that embeds equity, sustainability, and innovation into everyday practices, ensuring these critical dimensions are applied practically rather than viewed as abstract concepts.

REFERENCES

- [1] Afsar, B., Badir, Y. F., Saeed, B. B., & Hafeez, S. (2017). Transformational and transactional leadership and employee's entrepreneurial behavior in knowledge-intensive industries. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(2), 307- 332.
- [2] Alahmad, Y. Y. (2016). Understanding the relationship between idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration and product innovation among manufacturing and services firms: the role of open system. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Toledo].
- [3] Baral, S., Kapoor, A., & Joshi M. (2019). Agile Administrative Practices: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Business and Management*, 21(1), 112-128.
- [4] Bason, C. (2017). *Leading public sector innovation: Co-creating for a better society*. Policy Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt9qgnsd>
- [5] Bhatti, Z. A. (2020). Artificial intelligence and the future of customer service. *Journal of International Technology and Information Management*, 29(4), 1-7.
- [6] Bojovic, I., & Jovanovic, S. S. (2020). Transformational leadership and psychological needs of employees. *Technium Soc. Sci. J.*, 7, 226.
- [7] Chan, T. C., Ho S. C., & Wu R. W. (2021). Leveraging predictive analytics for inventory management: A case study in retail. *International Journal of Information Management*, 61, 1-10.
- [8] Cohn, M. (2017). *Agile estimating and planning*. Pearson Education.
- [9]
- [10] Devanadera, C. & Ching D. (2023). School head's managerial roles as correlates of organizational performance. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 4 (3), 110-133. <https://doi.org/10.53378/353015>
- [11] Farrell, M. P. (2018). Innovating administrative justice: Enhancing efficiency, productivity, and legitimacy. *The Modern Law Review*, 81(3), 421-447.

- [12] Fullan, M. (2021). *Leading in a Culture of Change*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [13] Gedifew, M. T. (2014). Perceptions about instructional leadership: The perspectives of a principal and teachers of Birakat primary school focus. *Educational Research Reviews*, 9(16), 542–550.
- [14] Gronn, P. (2020). *The new work of educational leaders: Changing leadership practice in an era of school reform*. Sage Publications.
- [15] Halverson, R., Grigg, J., Prichett, R., & Thomas, C. (2015). The new instructional leadership: Creating data-driven instructional systems in schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 25(4), 709-735.
- [16] Katterfeld, K. (2013). Setting instructional expectations: Patterns of principal leadership for middle school mathematics. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 12(4), 337–373.
- [17] Kellerman, B. (2015). *Hard Times: Leadership in America*. Stanford University Press.
- [18] Kwan, P. (2020). Is transformational leadership theory passé? Revisiting the integrative effect of instructional leadership and transformational leadership on student outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(2), 321–349. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X19861137>
- [19] McBrayer, J., Akins, C., Gutierrez de Blume, A., Cleveland, R., & Pannell, S. (2022). Instructional leadership practices and school leaders' self-efficacy. *School Leadership Review*, 15(13), 67–89.
- [20] Meyers, C. V., Wronowski, M. L., & LaMonica, L. (2023). Evidence that in-service professional learning for educational leaders matters. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 18(1), 103–131. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19427751211042060>
- [21] Mpuangnan, K.N., & Dick-Segoe C. Adu A. G., & Ennim F., (2022). School improvement and support officer as curriculum leader in Pru East district- Ghana: roles, challenges, and the way forward. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(3), 1337–1351.
- [22] Msila, V. (2013). In search of a liberating practice: Leadership, teacher commitment, and the struggle for effective schools in South Africa. In T. Chou (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 2013 International Conference on the Modern Development of Humanities and Social Science* (pp. 447–450). Atlantis Press.
- [23] Nguyen, D. T., Nguyen, Q. H., Nguyen, T. D., & Nguyen, T. H. (2021). Impact of school leadership practices on teachers' job satisfaction and retention: Evidence from Vietnam. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 35(4), 825-841.
- [24] Noriey, M. I. (2023). Senior managers in the UK: The development of educational leaders in further education institutions. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 4 (3), 63-89. <https://doi.org/10.53378/353004>
- [25] Pardosi, J., & Utari, T. I. (2021). Effective principal leadership behaviors to improve teacher performance and student achievement [Version 2; peer review: 2 approved]. *F1000Research*, 10, 465.
- [26] Pawar, A. (2016). Transformational leadership: inspirational, intellectual and motivational stimulation in business. *International Journal of Enhanced Research in Management & Computer Applications*, 5(5), 14-21.
- [27] Pentang, J., Perez D., Cuanan K., Recla M., Dacanay R., Bober R., Dela C., C., Egger, S., Herrera R., Illescas C., Salmo J., Bucad J. M. L., Agasa J., & Abaca N. (2022). Tracer study of teacher education graduates of Western Philippines University - Puerto Princesa Campus: Basis for curriculum review and revision. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 3(3), 419-432. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.03.03.12>