

Leadership Styles of School Heads on Public Schools: Its Impact on Teachers Performance

LOZEL T. LISTONES

Allanaraiz- Marfil National High School
Masbate Colleges Graduate Studies and
Research SDO Masbate, DepEd Philippines
ORCID ID No.: 0009-0002-4746-9511
lozel.listones@deped.gov.ph

LITO E. VALENZUELA

Masbate Colleges Graduate Studies and
Research SDO Masbate, DepEd Philippines
ORCID ID No.: 0009-0002-3460-7727
valenzuelalito768@gmail.com

JEANA B. SALAZAR

Del Carmen Elementary School
Masbate Colleges Graduate Studies and
Research SDO Masbate, DepEd Philippines
ORCID ID No.: 0009-0002-2173-7637
jeana.salazar001@deped.gov.ph

KIMBERLY R. BALZA

Allanaraiz- Marfil National High School
Masbate Colleges Graduate Studies and
Research SDO Masbate, DepEd Philippines
ORCID ID No.: 0009-0003-4964-2223
kimberly.balza001@deped.gov.ph

MARY ANN T. BRILLO

Mayngaran Elementary school
Masbate Colleges Graduate Studies and
Research SDO Masbate, DepEd Philippines
ORCID ID NO.: 0009-0003-7332-5623
maryannbrillo@deped.gov.ph

SALDY R. LIBRE

Damaso R. Rubia Memorial High School
Masbate Colleges Graduate Studies and
Research SDO Masbate, DepEd Philippines
ORCID ID No: 0009-0005-7789-5986
srlibre24@gmail.com

IRENE D. BASAS

Matugnao Elementary School
Masbate Colleges Graduate Studies and
Research SDO Masbate, DepEd Philippines
ORCID ID No.: 0009-0006-5731-7940
irenedesabille.basas@deped.gov.ph

GEAVEL A. APLACADOR

Cataingan National High School
Masbate Colleges Graduate Studies and
Research SDO Masbate, DepEd Philippines
ORCID ID No.: 0009-0009-1740-7329
geavel.aplacador@deped.gov.ph

MARY JOY M. MAGNO

B. Titong Elementary School
Masbate Colleges Graduate Studies and
Research SDO Masbate, DepEd Philippines
ORCID ID No.: 0009-0002-6032-9425
maryjoimagno06@gmail.com

ROSA M. DIMEN

Masbate Colleges Graduate Studies School
ORCID ID NO.: 0009-0008-7502-4468
rosadimen49@gmail.com

Abstract — This study focuses on the impact of school leaders' leadership styles on public schools, specifically how these styles affect teacher performance. Data was acquired using a quantitative technique, using a self-created survey questionnaire delivered to 115 elementary to senior high school teachers in Masbate province, Philippines. Non-probability sampling (convenience sampling) was used to select participants based on availability. Using a Likert-type scale,

respondents were asked to rate their school principals' leadership styles and their impact on teacher performance.

The findings show that the majority of respondents believe their school leaders use democratic and transformational leadership methods, valuing teacher input and setting clear objectives for teaching responsibilities. These leadership styles are related with increased collaboration and teamwork among teachers, as well as fairness and transparency in decision-making processes. Furthermore, the majority of respondents think school leaders are good at meeting individual student needs and providing constructive comments for professional development.

Overall, the study emphasizes the role of good school leadership in influencing teacher performance and satisfaction in public schools. This study's findings can be used to develop measures to improve school leadership effectiveness, hence increasing educational outcomes and establishing a positive learning environment in public schools.

Keywords — School Leadership Styles, Teacher Performance, Principal's Leadership styles, Democratic & Transformational Leadership Methods, Collaboration and Teamwork

I. Introduction

In the field of education, school heads' leadership philosophies in public schools have a significant impact on how the workplace is shaped and how well teachers perform. The overall efficacy and morale of educators can be greatly impacted by the way these leaders engage with their teams, make decisions, and offer direction. It is imperative to comprehend the diverse leadership styles utilized by school heads and the impact they have for teacher performance if one hopes to improve student learning results and cultivate a healthy school culture. The purpose of this study is to examine the complex relationships between leadership philosophies and public-school environments, as well as the direct and indirect impact these relationships have on teachers' performance and work satisfaction. Through illuminating this crucial facet of educational administration, the research aims to offer significant perspectives for advancing leadership methodologies and ultimately augmenting the caliber of instruction in public schools

School leadership is critical in shaping the learning environment, supporting teacher efficacy and eventually improving student results. Within the landscape of public education system, school principal leadership is particularly important since it has a direct impact on teachers' daily experiences and professional growth. Understanding the impact of school principal leadership on teacher performance is critical for enhancing educational practices and creating a positive learning environment.

Numerous studies have looked into the relationship between school leadership and teacher effectiveness, providing light on different facets of this complex interaction. Smith and Andrews (2019) studied the impact of several leadership styles on teacher job satisfaction and discovered that transformational leadership was positively connected with better levels of teacher satisfaction and performance. Similarly, Johnson et al. (2020) found that distributive leadership is important

for increasing teacher collaboration and teamwork, which leads to enhanced instructional quality and student accomplishment.

Furthermore, research has investigated the impact of specific leadership approaches on teacher motivation and professional development. For example, Lee and Kim (2018) found that instructional leadership is critical in providing instructors with meaningful feedback and support for instructional growth. Similarly, Wang and Hallinger (2019) found that distributed leadership is critical for establishing a culture of continuous learning and creativity among instructors.

Furthermore, research has looked into the contextual elements that mediate the relationship between school leadership and teacher effectiveness. Garcia et al. (2021), for example, investigated how school environment and organizational culture impact the effectiveness of leadership strategies in public schools. Similarly, Chen and Choi (2020) examined the significance of teacher trust in school leaders as a critical element in affecting teacher attitudes and behaviors toward their work.

Overall, these studies emphasize the multifaceted nature of school leadership and how it affects teacher effectiveness in public schools. Based on previous research, this study intends to provide more insights into school principals' leadership strategies and their consequences for teacher performance, contributing to the continuing discussion about effective educational leadership in public schools.

II. Methodology

The purpose of this study is to investigate the impact of leadership styles of school heads on public schools; this study utilized a quantitative method designed to collect data, the researchers used a self-made survey questionnaire to measure the leadership of school heads and how they affect the performance of the teachers. To determine the participants of this study the researchers used a non-probability sampling, (convenience sampling) randomly selecting a sample based on availability of the respondents. The research instrument (survey form) was distributed among 115 respondents of elementary to senior high school teachers from different schools of Masbate province, however the participants will be assured of the anonymity of their identities and their data.

The questionnaire was developed related to the teacher on how their school head affects their performance. Participants of this research gave their opinion on a Likert type scale that will rate their school head's performance and their performance. To interpret the data of the study, researchers used the following statistical tool.

Simple percentage; used to describe the demographic information of the respondents.

Formula:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100$$

P= Percentage

f= Frequency

N= Population

III. Results and Discussion

Demographic Information of the Respondents

Table 1.1
Respondents Profile as to Age

AGE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)	RANK
20-24 years old	6	5.2%	6.1
25-29 years old	34	29.6%	1
30-34 years old	23	20.0%	2
35-39 years old	12	10.4%	4
40-44 years old	19	16.5%	3
45-49 years old	10	8.7%	5
50-54 years old	6	5.2%	6.1
55 years old above	5	4.3%	7
TOTAL	115	100%	

Table 1.1 above represents the demographic information of the respondents based on their age. The table provides the information on the frequency, percentage, and rank of each group. Among the respondents, ages that range from 25-29 years old with a frequency of 34(29.6%) ranks first. Followed by ages ranges from 30-34 years old with a frequency of 23 (20.0%). Next are ages from 40-44 years old with a frequency of 19 (16.5%). Ages that range from 35-39 years old are in the fifth rank with a frequency of 12 (10.4%). Followed by age ranging from 45-49 years old above with a frequency of 10 (8.7%). Age ranges from 50-54 years old and 20-24 share the sixth rank

with a frequency of 6 (5.2%). Ages 55 years old and with a frequency of 5 (4.3%). Overall, there are 115 respondents in total, contributing to the demographic information.

Table 1.2
Respondents Profile as to Sex

GENDER	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)	RANK
MALE	54	47.0%	2
FEMALE	61	53.0%	1
TOTAL	115	100%	

The given data from table 1.2 represents the gender distribution of the respondents. The table provides information of the frequency, percentage and rank of each gender. It shows that female respondents ranked first with a frequency of 61(53.0%) followed by male respondents with a frequency distribution of 54(47.0%). In total, there are 115 respondents that contributed to this study.

Table 1.3
Respondents Profile as to Civil Status

CIVIL STATUS	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)	RANK
SINGLE	53	46.1%	1
MARRIED	43	37.4%	2
SEPARATED	4	3.5%	4
WIDOWED	15	13.0%	3
TOTAL	115	100%	

Table 1.3 above represents the civil status of the respondents. The table provides information of the frequency, percentage and rank of each civil status of the respondents. It shows that 53(46.1%) of the respondents are single which ranks first. Followed by respondents that are married with a frequency of 43(37.4%). Next are respondents that are widowed that have a frequency of 15(13.0%). Lastly, are respondents that are widowed with a frequency of 4(3.5%).

Table 1.4
Respondents Profile as to Length of Service

LENGTH OF SERVICE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)	RANK
0-4 years	26	22.6%	2
5-9 years	45	39.1%	1
10-14 years	22	19.1%	3
15-19 years	8	7.0%	4
20-24 years	3	2.6%	6.1
25-29 years	2	1.7%	7.1
30-40 years	2	1.7%	7.1
35-39 years	4	3.5%	5
45 years above	3	2.6%	6.1
TOTAL	115	100%	

The given data from table 1.4 above represents the length of service of the respondents. The table provides information of the frequency, percentage and rank of the length of service of the respondents. Most of the participants of this research spent 5-9 years in service with frequency distribution of 45(39.1%). Followed by participants who served within 0-4 years with a frequency distribution of 26(22.6%). Participants who served within 10-14 years come in third with a frequency distribution 22 (19.1%). Next are the respondents who served within 15-19 years with a frequency distribution of 8 (7.0%). Next are respondents who served 35-39 years with a frequency distribution of 4 (3.5%). Respondents who served 20-24 years and 45 years above share the sixth ranking with a frequency distribution of both 3 (2.6%). Respondents who served 25-29 years and 30-40 years shared the last rank with frequency distribution of both 2 (1.7%).

Table 1.5
Respondents Profile as to Position Title

POSITION TITLE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)	RANK
TEACHER I	33	28.7%	2
TEACHER II	19	16.5%	3
TEACHER III	39	33.9%	1
MASTER TEACHER I	9	7.8%	4
MASTER TEACHER II	6	5.2%	5
MASTER TEACHER III	4	3.5%	7
MASTER TEACHER IV	5	4.3%	6
TOTAL	115	100%	

The given data from table 1.5 above represents the length of service of the respondents. The table provides information of the frequency, percentage and rank of the position title of the respondents. Respondents who are Teacher III ranked first with a frequency distribution of 39 (33.9%). Respondents who are Teacher I ranked second with a frequency distribution of 33(28.7%). Teacher II respondent ranked third with a frequency distribution of 19 (16.5%). Next are the respondents who are Master Teacher I with a frequency distribution of 9 (7.8%) followed by respondents who are Master Teacher II with a frequency distribution of 6 (5.2%). Respondents who are Master Teacher IV come next with a frequency distribution of 5 (4.3%) and lastly, respondents who are Master Teacher III with a frequency distribution of 4 (3.5%).

Table 1.6
Respondents Profile as to Educational Attainment

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)	RANK
CAR for Doctorate	3	2.7%	6
MA with Doctorate/unit	4	3.5%	5
MA Degree	20	17.7%	3
CAR for MA Degree	6	5.3%	4
Bachelor's Degree with MA units	57	50.4%	1
Bachelor's Degree	23	20.4%	2

The given data from table 1.6 above represents the length of service of the respondents. The table provides information of the frequency, percentage and rank of the Educational Attainment of the respondents. Respondents with Bachelor's Degrees with MA units ranked first with a frequency distribution of 57 (50.4%). Respondents with Bachelor's Degrees ranked second with a frequency distribution of 23 (20.4%). Next in rank are the respondents with MA Degree with a frequency distribution of 20 (17.7%), followed by respondents with CAR for MA Degree with a frequency distribution of 6 (5.3%). Respondents with MA with Doctorate/unit ranked fifth with a frequency distribution of 4 (3.5%). Respondents with CAR for Doctorate ranked last with a frequency distribution of 3 (2.7%).

Leadership Styles Assessment

Question 1

How would you describe the leadership styles of your school head?

RESPONSES	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)	RANK
AUTHORITATIVE	11	9.6%	3
TRANSACTIONAL	5	4.3%	4
TRANSFORMATIONAL	28	24.3%	2
DEMOCRATIC	71	61.7%	1
TOTAL	115	100%	

The given data from above represents the response to question 1 under the Leadership Styles Assessment. Statement 1 reads "How would you describe the leadership styles of your school head?" Out of 100%, a frequency distribution of 71 (61.7%) of the respondents said that

their school head has a democratic style of leadership and ranks first. Respondents who think that their school heads have transformational leadership styles, ranked second and have a frequency distribution 28 (24.3%), third in rank are respondents who think that their school heads have an authoritarian leadership style, having a frequency distribution of 11 (9.6%). Last in rank are respondents who think that their school head’s leadership style is transactional and have a frequency distribution of 5 (4.3%).

Question 2

How much do you think the head of your school values your opinions and input?

RESPONSES	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)	RANK
NOT AT ALL	10	7.5%	5
SLIGHTLY	18	13.4%	4
MODERATELY	31	23.1%	2
EXTREMELY	25	18.7%	3
VERY MUCH	50	37.3%	1
TOTAL	115	100%	

The given data above represents the response to question 2 under the Leadership Styles Assessment. Question 2 reads “How much do you think the head of your school values your opinions and input?” Out of 100%, a frequency distribution of 50 (37.3%) of the respondents responded ‘very much’ and ranked first. Second in rank are respondents who responded ‘moderately’ with a frequency distribution of 31 (23.1%), third in rank are respondents who responded ‘extremely’ with a frequency distribution of 25 (18.7%), in forth rank are respondents who responded ‘slightly’ with a frequency distribution of 18 (13.4%) and last in rank, are respondents who responded ‘not at all’ with a frequency distribution of 10 (7.5%).

Question 3

How frequently does your school head provide clear expectations and goals for your teaching role?

RESPONSES	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)	RANK
RARELY	6	5.4%	4
ALWAYS	12	10.8%	3
FREQUENTLY	22	19.8%	2
OCCASIONALLY	71	64.0%	1
TOTAL	115	100%	

The given data above represents the response to question 3 under the Leadership Styles Assessment. Question 3 reads “How often does your school head provide clear goals and expectations for your role as a teacher?” Out of 100%, a frequency distribution of 71 (64.0%) of the respondents ‘occasionally’ and ranks first. Respondents who answered ‘frequently’ with the question ranked second and have a frequency distribution 22 (19.8%), third in rank are respondents who answered ‘always’ with the question having a frequency distribution of 12 (10.8%). Last in rank are respondents who answered ‘rarely’ and have a frequency distribution of 6 (5.4%).

Impact on Teacher – Performance

Question 1

How frequently does your school head communicate expectations regarding your job responsibilities?

RESPONSES	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)	RANK
RARELY	13	11.3%	4
ALWAYS	14	12.2%	3
FREQUENTLY	40	34.8%	2
OCCASIONALLY	48	41.7%	1
TOTAL	115	100%	

The given data above represents the response to question 1 under the Impact on Teacher - Performance. Question 3 reads “How frequently does your school head communicate expectations regarding your job responsibilities?” Out of 100%, a frequency distribution of 48 (41.7%) of the respondents said ‘occasionally’ and ranked first. Respondents who answered ‘frequently’ with the statement ranked second and have a frequency distribution 40 (34.8%), third in rank are respondents who answered ‘always’ with the statement having a frequency distribution of 14 (12.2%). Last in rank are respondents who said ‘rarely’ and have a frequency distribution of 13 (11.3%).

Question 2

To what extent does your department head encourage collaboration and teamwork among the teaching staff?

RESPONSES	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)	RANK
NOT AT ALL	2	1.7%	5
SLIGHTLY	10	8.7%	4
MODERATELY	11	9.6%	3
EXTREMELY	35	30.4%	2
VERY MUCH	57	49.6%	1
TOTAL	115	100%	

The given data above represents the response to question 2 under the Impact on Teacher - Performance. Question 2 reads “To what extent does your department head encourage collaboration and teamwork among the teaching staff?” Out of 100%, a frequency distribution of 57 (49.6%) of the respondents responded ‘very much’ and ranked first. Second in rank are respondents who responded ‘extremely’ with a frequency distribution of 35 (30.4%). third in rank are respondents who responded ‘moderately’ with a frequency distribution of 11 (9.6%), in fourth rank are respondents who responded ‘slightly’ with a frequency distribution of 10 (8.7%) and last in rank, are respondents who responded ‘not at all’ with a frequency distribution of 2 (1.7%).

Question 3

How well does your school head demonstrate fairness and transparency in decision-making processes?

RESPONSES	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)	RANK
NOT AT ALL	9	7.8%	5
SLIGHTLY	20	17.4%	4
MODERATELY	21	18.3%	3
EXTREMELY	24	20.9%	2
VERY MUCH	41	35.7%	1
TOTAL	115	100%	

The given data above represents the response to question 3 under the Impact on Teacher - Performance. Question 3 reads “How well does your school head demonstrate fairness and transparency in decision-making processes?” Out of 100%, a frequency distribution of 41 (35.7%)

of the respondents responded ‘very much’ and ranked first. Second in rank are respondents who responded ‘extremely’ with a frequency distribution of 24 (20.9%), third in rank are respondents who responded ‘moderately’ with a frequency distribution of 21 (18.3%), in forth rank are respondents who responded ‘slightly’ with a frequency distribution of 20 (17.4%) and last in rank, are respondents who responded ‘not at all’ with a frequency distribution of 9 (7.8%).

Ability to Meet Individual Needs of Students

RESPONSES	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)	RANK
NOT AT ALL	8	7.0%	5
SLIGHTLY	16	14.0%	4
MODERATELY	21	18.4%	2
EXTREMELY	18	15.8%	3
VERY MUCH	51	44.7%	1
TOTAL	115	100%	

The given data above represents the response to question 4 under the Impact on Teacher - Performance. Question 4 reads “1. How effective is your school head in providing constructive feedback and guidance for your professional development?” Out of 100%, a frequency distribution of 51 (44.7%) of the respondents responded ‘very much’ and ranked first. Second in rank are respondents who responded ‘moderately’ with a frequency distribution of 21 (18.4%), third in rank are respondents who responded ‘extremely’ with a frequency distribution of 18 (15.8%), in fourth rank are respondents who responded ‘slightly’ with a frequency distribution of 16 (14.0%) and last in rank, are respondents who responded ‘not at all’ with a frequency distribution of 8 (7.0%).

IV. Conclusion

Several inferences about the respondents' demographics, how they perceived different leadership philosophies, and how school leadership affected teacher effectiveness may be made based on the data presented. On the demographic characteristics, approximately 50% of all respondents are between the ages of 25 and 34, which makes up the majority of respondents. Gender distribution among the responders is approximately even, with slightly more women than men.

A lesser proportion of responders are widowed or separated, whereas the majority are single or married. In terms of duration of service, the majority of participants have served for 5–9 years, with 0–4 years and 10–14 years following closely behind.

On perception of leadership, the majority of respondents believe that the heads of their schools have a democratic leadership style, which suggests that they take an inclusive and participatory approach to making decisions. A sizable percentage of responders also acknowledged transformational leadership, emphasizing its focus on vision and inspiration. Fewer respondents indicated that they preferred transactional or authoritative leadership styles, which suggests that these methods are less common in school leadership.

On the impact of teacher - performance, Respondents generally perceive their school heads positively in terms of valuing their opinions and providing clear expectations for their teaching roles.

There is a strong indication that school heads encourage collaboration and teamwork among teaching staff, which can positively influence performance and morale. Fairness and transparency in decision-making processes are perceived to be generally high, contributing to a positive work environment. The ability of school heads to meet individual needs of students, particularly in providing constructive feedback and guidance for professional development, is perceived positively by the majority of respondents.

Overall, the data show that school leaders' perceived leadership styles, as well as their communication tactics and support for teacher development, have a significant impact on teacher performance and happiness in the classroom. These insights can help improve school leadership methods and educational outcomes.

V. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, public schools should promote the development and enhancement of democratic and transformational leadership styles among school leaders. These leadership approaches, which stress inclusion, cooperation, and vision-setting, have been linked to improve teacher performance and satisfaction.

Furthermore, school leaders should maintain open communication and transparency in decision-making processes in order to create a supportive and empowered work environment for teachers. Encouraging collaboration and teamwork among teachers can help to improve overall school performance and morale.

Furthermore, school administrators should prioritize focused support and guidance to address specific student needs, as well as providing instructors with constructive feedback for professional growth. Investing in continuous professional development opportunities for school leaders can help them improve their leadership abilities and methods.

Additionally, policymakers and education authorities should think about implementing training programs and resources to promote successful school leadership into existing education policies and initiatives. Educational institutions can improve their performance and provide a good

learning environment for all stakeholders in public schools by promoting effective school leadership practices.

REFERENCES

- [1] Smith, J., & Andrews, L. (2019). The impact of leadership styles on teacher job satisfaction: A comparative study. *Educational Leadership Review*, 20(1), 75-89.
- [2] Johnson, R., et al. (2020). Distributive leadership and its effects on teacher collaboration and instructional quality. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(3), 321-336.
- [3] Lee, H., & Kim, S. (2018). The role of instructional leadership in teacher professional development: A qualitative study. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(5), 741-758.
- [4] Wang, Y., & Hallinger, P. (2019). Distributed leadership and teacher learning: A conceptual framework and research agenda. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 55(5), 809-832.
- [5] Garcia, R., et al. (2021). School climate, organizational culture, and leadership effectiveness: A multilevel analysis. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research*, 43(2), 256-273.
- [6] Chen, L., & Choi, J. (2020). Teacher trust in school leaders: Its antecedents and implications for teacher attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(4), 421-437.