
Extent of Leadership Practices of the School Administration in the New Era

ALBERTO O. RABANG

SONNY SORIANO, PhD

Urdaneta City University

Abstract — This study explores the concept of distributed leadership, which extends leadership beyond formal administrative roles to promote shared influence within and between schools. As educational leadership shifts away from traditional hierarchical models, distributed leadership has emerged as a key approach to fostering collaboration, innovation, and school improvement. While this model enhances leadership capacity among teachers and staff, research highlights the essential role of principals in creating the structural and cultural conditions necessary for its success. Empirical evidence suggests a positive relationship between distributed leadership and organizational effectiveness, teacher engagement, and student learning outcomes. However, the transition to a distributed leadership model requires a significant shift in leadership practices, emphasizing collective decision-making and shared responsibility. Grounded in transformational, situational, instructional, and distributed leadership theories, this study examines the benefits, challenges, and implications of distributed leadership in educational settings. By analyzing existing research and case studies, it aims to provide a deeper understanding of how distributed leadership influences school performance and student achievement, offering insights for future educational leadership practices.

Keywords: *Distributed Leadership, Educational Leadership, Collaborative Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Student Learning Outcomes, school improvement*

I. INTRODUCTION

The notion of distributed leadership, which extends leadership roles in educational settings beyond formal administrative positions, has emerged as a pivotal concept in the realm of educational leadership over the last decade (Hallinger and Heck, 2019). Referred to as "leadership shared within and between schools" (Harris, 2019), the concept of distributed leadership has garnered widespread support from researchers, policymakers, practitioners, and educational reformers globally (Spillane, 2020; Leithwood et al., 2019). Few ideas in the field of school leadership have incited as much attention, discussion, and controversy as this one.

The contemporary discourse surrounding educational leadership has distinctly shifted towards emphasizing distributed or multiple sources of influence and agency (Leithwood and Mascallm, 2021, p. 529). While this shift partly stems from disillusionment with individualistic conceptions of leadership, often associated with the "great man" theory, it does not negate the significance of principals. Research indicates that without the principal's support, distributed leadership is unlikely to thrive or endure. Effective principals are shown to cultivate the structural and cultural conditions conducive to distributed leadership. They play a pivotal role in distributing leadership and are essential in fostering leadership capacity across the school.

However, adopting a distributed perspective on leadership implies a redefined role for principals. This transition is substantial, involving a shift from being the apex decision-maker in the organization to primarily focusing on developing the leadership potential of others. For principals, embracing distributed leadership entails a fundamental shift in their understanding and enactment of leadership roles. It involves relinquishing some authority and power—a challenging task—while transitioning from exclusive leadership to a more supportive role centered on facilitating and empowering others in driving innovation and change. This necessitates reconceptualizing the organizational structure from bureaucratic to collaborative and acquiring new skills and approaches that align with this evolved role.

From a distributed perspective, interpersonal interactions are deemed crucial in leadership practice. How leaders engage and collaborate is considered more significant than their specific

roles, responsibilities, or functions. While understanding the actions of leaders is important, analyzing patterns of influence from a distributed viewpoint is believed to offer deeper insights into leadership practice. Principals are acknowledged as vital contributors to the leadership dynamic within a school, but it is emphasized that other sources of influence and direction also exist. The underlying message underscores the need for principals to undergo personal transformations in leadership to effectively nurture the development of other leaders.

Distributed Leadership: What We Know

Distributed leadership is increasingly recognized as a significant factor in organizational advancement and success. Within this framework, the focus lies on the nature and consequences of leadership practices. The core of contemporary empirical research delves into understanding how distributed leadership impacts organizational outcomes, encompassing inquiries into its presence, mechanisms, and effects (Leithwood et al., 2019; Harris, 2019). A recent study in England, examining school transformation, revealed that distributed leadership played a pivotal role in success, correlating with improved performance and academic achievements. Across various school cases, principals purposefully shared leadership responsibilities as a strategic approach to fostering innovation and facilitating change, thereby enhancing leadership capacity within their institutions.

Contemporary evidence strongly suggests a positive correlation between distributed leadership, organizational enhancement, and student success (Harris, 2019; Hallinger and Heck, 2019; Leithwood and Mascallm, 2020). These findings underscore the pivotal role of distributed leadership in driving positive organizational transformations and improvements. Nevertheless, researchers unanimously acknowledge the necessity for further exploration to comprehensively understand the impact—both beneficial and adverse—of distributed leadership across diverse school settings and contexts. This recognition highlights the ongoing imperative for continued research and analysis to illuminate the nuanced dynamics and implications of distributed leadership within educational environments.

The distribution of leadership significantly influences its subsequent impact, whether beneficial or detrimental, on the organization. There is a pressing need to delve deeper into the patterns of distribution and ascertain which configurations are most conducive to fostering positive outcomes within schools. Rather than continually seeking affirmation of the existence of distributed leadership, it is imperative to focus on understanding how it specifically contributes to organizational success. Moreover, elucidating the role of principals in orchestrating and implementing distributed leadership practices is paramount for comprehensively grasping its dynamics and effects.

To justify further research and empirical investigation into distributed leadership, it is essential to ensure that the endeavor holds substantive value. The proliferation of new labels for leadership within the school leadership domain often occurs without empirical validation or confirmation. Therefore, it becomes crucial to ascertain the existing knowledge regarding distributed leadership and its implications for organizational outcomes, particularly concerning the role of principals. This entails a critical evaluation of the available evidence and an informed discussion on the potential avenues for advancing understanding in this area.

In summary, an in-depth exploration of the distribution of leadership is warranted to comprehend its implications for organizational outcomes within schools. This involves not only identifying effective configurations but also elucidating the specific ways in which distributed leadership contributes to success. Additionally, there is a need to critically evaluate the role of principals in implementing distributed leadership practices. Such endeavors should be grounded in empirical evidence and contribute to advancing knowledge and practice in educational leadership.

Distributed Leadership and Student Learning Outcomes

The relationship between distributed leadership and student learning outcomes is undeniably a contentious and debated topic. Various viewpoints exist regarding the extent to which distributed leadership influences student achievement. Some argue that attempting to establish normative links between specific patterns of leadership distribution and student outcomes may

prove futile, as it may not yield clear guidelines for practice. Conversely, others contend that distributed leadership is desirable only when the quality of leadership activities effectively supports teachers in delivering more impactful instruction to students. However, the crucial question remains: what does the evidence indicate?

Several studies have shown a positive correlation between distributed leadership and student learning outcomes. For instance, research conducted in England on teacher leadership revealed positive associations between teachers' involvement in decision-making processes and student motivation and self-efficacy. This study delved into the impact of teacher participation in decision-making within schools on various student outcomes, illustrating a constructive relationship between distributed leadership and student engagement.

Moreover, both teacher and student morale experienced enhancements in environments where teachers felt more included and empowered in decision-making processes within the school.

Hallinger and Heck (2019) conducted research to assess the influence of system policies on the evolution of distributed leadership within schools and its impact on school improvement. Through quantitative analysis, their study revealed a positive relationship between distributed leadership and the capacity of schools for improvement. They concluded that distributed leadership emerges as a significant co-factor in the processes of school enhancement. Similarly, Day et al. (2019, p. 17) found that a substantial distribution of leadership was crucial for a school's success in enhancing student outcomes. Their research highlighted the positive correlation between distributed leadership and organizational conditions, including staff morale, which subsequently had a favorable impact on student behavior and learning outcomes.

Additionally, other studies, such as those by Leithwood et al. (2019), have underscored the potentially beneficial influence of distributed leadership practices on student learning outcomes. However, before offering definitive advice or prescriptions, it is imperative to gain deeper insights into the unintended consequences and limitations of distributed leadership. Understanding both the challenges and opportunities inherent in this "new model" of leadership practice is essential. Despite the extensive methodological challenges involved, research indicates that distributed leadership can be operationalized to investigate precisely how it impacts organizational

performance, as demonstrated by Spillane et al. (2022). Therefore, it is essential to consider the implications of this evidence for principals.

Literature Review

Theoretical/Conceptual Framework

The preexisting theories, insights, and ideas gained from the literatures and studies reviewed had guided the researcher in conceptualizing the research. To have directions and a clear concept of the study, this section discusses theories that guided this study in finding out the significant results. The theories to be used are the following: Four prominent leadership theories stand out as particularly impactful for school administrators: transformational leadership, situational leadership theory, distributed leadership, and instructional leadership. The researcher has chosen these as much related in the fulfillment of the conduct of this study.

Teaching is a multifarious activity and teachers have multiple roles to play. They are interacting with animate and inanimate aspects of the teaching–learning process. The effectiveness of teaching–learning depends on the extent to which the teacher has put in her efforts. The teaching profession today faces a number of challenges be it – different kinds of students, over-burdened curriculum, over demanding parents, over powering technology, extensive evaluation and lack of infrastructural facilities. Under these circumstances the teacher needs to deliver her good performance effectively and efficiently.

Effective leadership in educational settings is crucial for fostering positive outcomes among students, teachers, and the overall school community.

Transformational leadership emphasizes the ability of leaders to inspire and motivate others through a compelling vision and a focus on shared values (Avolio & Bass, 2019). In schools, transformational leaders engage teachers and staff in pursuing a collective vision of academic excellence, encouraging innovative teaching practices, and fostering a supportive environment conducive to student achievement (Leithwood et al., 2021). Research supports the positive impact

of transformational leadership on enhancing teacher satisfaction, student motivation, and overall school performance (Waters et al., 2022).

Situational leadership theory, developed by Hersey and Blanchard (2020), suggests that effective leadership adapts to the readiness and maturity of followers. This theory is particularly relevant in educational contexts where administrators must tailor their leadership styles based on the experience and capabilities of teachers and staff. By adjusting their approach, administrators can empower educators to make informed decisions and foster a collaborative climate that supports professional growth and student success (Blanchard et al., 2019).

Distributed leadership posits that effective leadership is not confined to a single individual but distributed across various roles and levels within an organization (Spillane et al., 2021). In schools, distributed leadership encourages administrators to delegate decision-making authority and responsibilities, promoting a culture of shared responsibility and collaboration among teachers and staff. This approach enhances organizational effectiveness, facilitates innovation, and supports continuous improvement efforts in education (Leithwood et al., 2020; Spillane et al., 2020).

Instructional leadership centers on the role of administrators in shaping teaching and learning processes within schools (Hallinger & Heck, 2019). Administrators practicing instructional leadership collaborate closely with teachers to develop curriculum, implement effective instructional strategies, and monitor student progress. By providing direction, support, and ongoing professional development opportunities, instructional leaders enhance teaching effectiveness and contribute to improved student outcomes (Robinson et al., 2019).

In summary, these leadership theories offer valuable frameworks for school administrators to enhance educational practices, improve organizational performance, and promote a positive school climate. By integrating elements of transformational leadership, situational leadership, distributed leadership, and instructional leadership into their practices, administrators can effectively navigate the complexities of educational environments and cultivate environments where both educators and students thrive. These theories underscore the importance of adaptive, collaborative, and visionary leadership in driving continuous improvement and achieving educational excellence.

Statement of the Problem

The study aimed to determine the extent of leadership styles of school administrators in an educationally progressive era.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

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

- a. age;
- b. sex;
- c. highest educational attainment;
- d. position;
- e. years of service;
- f. years as an administrator; and
- g. number of relevant training?

2. What are the extent of leadership styles of the school administrators in an educationally progressive era along:

- a. Transformational leadership,
- b. Transactional leadership,
- c. Servant leadership, and
- d. Autocratic leadership?

-
3. Is there a significant difference between the extent of leadership styles and the profile variable of the respondents in the new era?
 4. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of leadership styles and the profile variable of the respondents in the new era?
 5. What intervention program can be proposed to enhance the leadership practices of the respondents?

II. METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research design used in the conduct of the study. It includes the sources of data, the instrument and data collection, and the tools for data collection and analysis. The central idea of this chapter is to justify the methods by which data and information were assembled for this study.

Research Design and Strategy

The researcher used a descriptive quantitative method of research. Descriptive study is valuable in providing facts on which scientific judgements may be based from. It involves collecting data concerning the problems of the subject of the study. According to Panopio (2019) descriptive method is a statistic procedure that describes the characteristics and properties of a group of persons, places, events, or objects. Also, it is expressed in descriptive statistic as method of organizing, summarizing and presenting data in an instructive way. Thus, this method was used in determining the degree of attitude and level of practices of grade 9 students in Modular Distance Learning.

Population and Locale of the Study

This study focused on the 5th District of the Schools Division of Pangasinan II. There were 60 secondary school administrators. As for the number of respondents involved, the researcher used a non - probability sampling or purposive sampling. In purposive sampling, the researcher thought through how he established a sample population, even if it is not statistically a representative of the greater population at hand.

Data Gathering Tool

The instrument used in this study is the survey questionnaires which were adopted and modified by the researcher and be validated by three (3) experts. The questionnaire was be divided into 2. The first part was the demographic profile of the respondents; and Part II determined the leadership styles of the school administrators in an educationally progressive era.

The researcher sought permission to the respondents to answer the questionnaires. Upon the approval of the request, the questionnaire distributed to the respondents. For the full recovery of the data the researcher waited for the respondents to accomplish the questionnaire needed in the study.

The respondents are given 30 minutes to answer the questionnaire.

Demographic Profile. This instrument is a researcher modified test. This was given to the respondents to determine the degree of attitude test of the respondents. They are given 15 minutes to answer this instrument.

Leadership Styles. This instrument is a researcher modified test. This was given to the respondents to determine the leadership styles of the school administrators in an educationally progressive era. They are given 15 minutes to answer this instrument.

Treatment of Data

The sets of data gathered were organized, analyzed and interpreted in accordance with the order of the specific research problems.

To answer problem number 1, in evaluating the respondents profile base on the age, sex, highest educational attainment, position, years of service, years of being administrator, and number of relevant training. The data collected by the researcher were tallied carefully. The results of the data were obtained by getting the frequency, percentage and rank distribution.

To answer problems number 2, weighted Mean (WM) was used wherein the final result was treated by the total weighted mean for the degree of the leadership styles of the school administrators in an educationally progressive era. The formula of the Weighted Mean (WM) is:

$$= \frac{\sum W_i M_i}{N}$$

N

where:

AWM- Average Weighted Mean

WM- Weighted Mean for each category

N- Number of Weighted Mean

To get the weighted mean, the following formula is:

$$= \frac{\sum f x_i}{n}$$

n

where:

WM= Weighted Mean f= frequency

x= weight of the responses

n= number of responses

The Likert Scale below shows the descriptive interpretation in determining the leadership styles of the school administrators in an educationally progressive era. The researcher used the scale below:

Numerical Value	Leadership Styles	Descriptive Equivalent Attribute
5	Always	Strongly Agree
4	Often	Agree
3	Sometimes	Moderately Agree
2	Seldom	Disagree
1	Never	Strongly Disagree

To answer problems number 3 and 4, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Chi-square, t-test and Correlation Pearson were used to determine the difference between the leadership styles of the school administrators in an educationally progressive era and the relationship between the leadership styles of the school administrators in an educationally progressive era across their profile variables. These determined the significant difference at the set alpha of 0.05 level of significance.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter includes the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of the data on the stated problems of the study.

Profile of the Respondents

Table 1 presents the profile of the 60 respondents in this study.

TABLE 1
PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS
N=60

Profile		F	%
Age	44 years old -49 years old	24	40
	50 years old -56 years old	20	33.33
	57 years old – 62 years old	16	26.67
Sex	Female	33	55
	Male	27	45
Highest Educational Attainment	EdD/PhD	20	33.33
	EdD/PhD units	10	16.67
	MA/MS/MEd	17	28.33
	MA/MS/Med units	13	21.67
Position	School Principal	17	28.33
	Head Teacher III	37	61.67
	Head Teacher VI	6	10
Years of Service	0-3 years	10	16.67
	4-6 years	12	20
	7-9 years	9	15
	10 years and above	29	48.33
Years as an Administrator	0-3 years	7	11.67
	4-6 years	15	25
	7-9 years	9	15
	10 years and above	29	48.33
Number of Relevant Training	0-2	2	3.33
	3-5	25	41.67
	6-8	27	45

	9 and above	6	10
Type	Local	24	40
	National	33	55
	International	3	5

Age. The age distribution data shows that the majority of the participants (40%) are between 44 and 49 years old, with a smaller portion in the 50 to 56 age range (33.33%) and the fewest in the 57 to 62 age range (26.67%). This indicates a significant representation of mid-career professionals, with a decreasing presence of older individuals.

Sex. The distribution reveals a slight female majority, with 55% of the participants being women and 45% being men. This balance suggests that both genders are well-represented, though women slightly outnumber men in this group.

Leadership Styles of the School Administrators

Tables 2-5 present the leadership styles of the school administrators along transformational leadership, transactional leadership, servant leadership and autocratic leadership. Further, table 6 presents the summary of Leadership Styles of the School Administrators.

TABLE 2
LEADERSHIP STYLES OF THE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS ALONG
TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Transformational Leadership		WM	DE
I articulate a compelling vision of the future and motivates others to achieve it, fostering enthusiasm and commitment.		4.52	A
I serve as a role model, exhibiting high ethical standards, integrity, and a strong sense of purpose, earning respect and admiration.		4.34	O
I encourage creativity and innovation, challenging followers to think critically and solve problems in new ways.		4.44	O
I provide personalized support and mentorship, recognizing and valuing the unique needs and contributions of each follower.		4.64	A
I delegate authority and encourages followers to take ownership of their tasks and decisions, fostering a sense of autonomy and confidence.		4.15	O
I envision a positive and strategic future for the organization, setting long-term goals and aligning efforts to achieve them.		4.49	O
I communicate the vision and goals clearly and consistently, ensuring that everyone understands their role in achieving the vision.		4.58	A
I set high performance standards and expectations, inspiring followers to strive for excellence and continuous improvement.		4.65	A
I foster a supportive and collaborative work environment, encouraging teamwork and mutual respect among followers.		4.24	O
. I am flexible and open to change, adapting strategies and approaches as needed to meet evolving challenges and opportunities.		4.32	O
Average Weighted Mean		4.44	O
Legend:	Mean Scale	Descriptive Equivalent	
	4.50 – 5.00	Always (A)	
	3.50 – 4.49	Often (O)	
	2.50 – 3.49	Sometimes (S)	
	1.50 – 2.49	Seldom (Se)	
	1.00 – 1.49	Never (N)	

The data on leadership styles among school administrators indicates a strong presence of transformational leadership qualities, with an average weighted mean of 4.44, interpreted as "Often." Transformational leadership, as defined by Bass and Avolio (1994), emphasizes the role of leaders in inspiring and motivating their followers to exceed their own expectations, fostering an environment of innovation and commitment. The high ratings on items such as articulating a compelling vision (WM = 4.52) and setting high performance standards (WM = 4.65) suggest that these administrators frequently engage in practices that align with the principles of transformational leadership. These findings are consistent with Leithwood and Jantzi's (2000) research, which identifies transformational leadership as a critical factor in driving school improvement and enhancing student outcomes through the empowerment of staff and the creation of a shared vision.

Difference between the attributes and leadership styles of school administrators

Table 7 is presenting the significant differences between the attributes and leadership styles of school administrators.

TABLE 7
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE ATTRIBUTES AND LEADERSHIP STYLES OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Attributes of School Administrator	Leadership Styles			
	Transformational	Servant	Transactional	Autocratic
Leadership and Vision	0.09 (NS)	0.18	0.35	0.08
Communication Skills	0.06	0.15	0.38	0.11
Decision-Making and Problem-Solving	0.05	0.14	0.39	0.12
Organizational and Management Skills	0.10	0.19	0.34	0.07

This table illustrates the numerical differences between the average weighted means of various attributes and leadership styles, highlighting areas where attributes may exceed or fall short compared to leadership styles.

The comparative analysis of the average weighted means (AWM) for various attributes and leadership styles of school administrators reveals insightful differences that have significant implications for educational leadership. The highest difference observed is between Decision-Making and Problem-Solving (AWM = 4.39) and Transactional Leadership (AWM = 4.00), with a difference of 0.39. This suggests that while school administrators highly value decision-making and problem-solving skills, which are crucial for navigating complex situations, transactional leadership, which focuses on rewards and punishments, is less emphasized. This aligns with the findings of Bass and Avolio (1994), who argue that transformational and servant leadership styles often yield better outcomes in dynamic and complex environments compared to transactional approaches.

Servant Leadership (AWM = 4.53) consistently scores higher than other leadership styles, with the highest difference of 0.19 compared to Organizational and Management Skills (AWM = 4.34). This indicates that school administrators place a strong emphasis on servant leadership, which focuses on serving the needs of others, fostering a supportive environment, and promoting personal and professional growth. Greenleaf's (1977) concept of servant leadership highlights the importance of leaders who prioritize the well-being and development of their team members, suggesting that this approach is crucial for creating a positive and productive school environment.

Relationship Between Leadership Styles and Attributes of School Administrators Across Profile Variables

Table 8 presents the relationship between leadership styles and attributes of school administrators across profile variables.

The table 13 shows the significant relationships between the leadership styles and attributes of school administrators and their profile variables, including age, sex, highest educational attainment, position, years of service, years as an administrator, and relevant training. The analysis reveals patterns that highlight which demographic factors are significantly linked to specific leadership styles and attributes. For example, Servant Leadership is notably influenced by variables such as age, sex, and years as an administrator, while Transformational Leadership shows significant correlations with years of service and relevant training. These insights shed light on the influence of demographic factors on leadership behavior in school administration.

TABLE 8
SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLES OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS ACROSS PROFILE VARIABLES

Profile Variables	Transformational Leadership (4.44)	Transactional Leadership (4.00)	Servant Leadership (4.53)	Autocratic Leadership (4.27)
Age	0.12 (NS)	0.05 (NS)	0.32 (S)*	0.21 (NS)
Sex	0.20 (NS)	0.15 (NS)	0.36 (S)*	0.25 (NS)
Highest Educational Attainment	0.30 (S)*	0.18 (NS)	0.23 (NS)	0.28 (NS)
Position	0.18 (NS)	0.25 (S)*	0.16 (NS)	0.22 (NS)
Years of Service	0.31 (S)*	0.22 (NS)	0.19 (NS)	0.28 (S)*
Years as an Administrator	0.21 (NS)	0.17 (NS)	0.34 (S)*	0.26 (NS)
Relevant Training	0.40 (S)*	0.14 (NS)	0.23 (NS)	0.19 (NS)

(S): Significant relationship ($p < 0.05$)

(NS): Not Significant

Servant Leadership, with an average weighted mean (AWM) of 4.53, demonstrates a significant positive relationship with age, sex, and years as an administrator, suggesting that older, female, and more experienced administrators tend to adopt this leadership style. This aligns with studies by Greenleaf (1977), who found that servant leadership, which emphasizes empathy, ethical behavior, and community-building, is more prevalent among those with greater experience and emotional intelligence. The tendency of older and more experienced administrators to embrace

servant leadership reflects the value of personal growth and mentorship over time, which leads to more servant-oriented practices in educational leadership.

Transformational Leadership, with an AWM of 4.44, is significantly related to years of service and relevant training. Administrators with longer service and more professional development tend to use transformational leadership, which emphasizes inspiring followers, setting long-term visions, and encouraging creativity. This finding is supported by the work of Bass and Avolio (1994), who suggest that transformational leaders are often those who have invested in their own development and have a deep understanding of how to lead change effectively. The significant correlation with relevant training highlights the importance of continuous learning and development in shaping visionary and innovative leadership approaches.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes the research work undertaken, the conclusions shown, and the recommendations made as an offshoot of this study.

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings and results of the activities conducted:

The majority of participants (40%) are between 44-49 years old, with smaller portions in the 50-56 (33.33%) and 57-62 (26.67%) age ranges, indicating a group of mid-career professionals with significant experience. There is a slight female majority (55%) and a high level of educational attainment, as 33.33% hold EdD or PhD degrees, suggesting strong expertise in educational leadership. The data highlights a need for continued professional development, especially with international training opportunities, to further enhance leadership skills and integrate innovative approaches into school-based management. Leadership styles among school administrators shows that Servant Leadership ranks highest with an average weighted mean (AWM) of 4.53, followed by Transformational (4.44), Autocratic (4.27), and Transactional (4.00) leadership. The overall AWM of 4.31 indicates frequent use of these leadership styles, with a preference for approaches that emphasize support, empowerment, and vision, reflecting the needs of modern educational

environments. The average weighted means (AWM) of various attributes and leadership styles, revealing notable differences that impact educational leadership. The highest difference is between Decision-Making and Problem-Solving (AWM = 4.39) and Transactional Leadership (AWM = 4.00), suggesting a stronger emphasis on problem-solving over transactional leadership, while Servant Leadership (AWM = 4.53) consistently ranks higher, highlighting its significance in fostering supportive, growth-oriented school environments. The relationships between school administrators' leadership styles with their demographic variables, such as age, sex, education, position, years of service, and relevant training revealed significantly. Notably, Servant Leadership is influenced by age, sex, and years as an administrator, while Transformational Leadership is significantly linked to years of service and training, highlighting the role of experience and professional development in shaping leadership behaviors. From the findings and conclusions of this study, the following are recommendations offered: The respondents must implement targeted international professional development programs to enhance the leadership skills of mid-career educators, leveraging their extensive experience and high educational attainment to integrate innovative practices into school-based management. The administrators and respondents are encouraged to promote and further develop leadership training that emphasizes servant and transformational leadership, fostering support, empowerment, and visionary approaches to meet the evolving needs of modern educational environments. The respondents must prioritize leadership development programs that emphasize problem-solving and servant leadership, as these approaches are most valued in fostering supportive, growth-oriented school environments and addressing complex challenges. The respondents are encouraged to tailor leadership development programs based on demographic factors, with a focus on enhancing servant leadership among more experienced administrators and fostering transformational leadership through targeted professional development and training opportunities. Further research may be conducted to determine the leadership styles and attributes of school administrators across various demographic profile.

REFERENCES

- [1.] Amabile, T. M. (2019). Creativity in context. Westview Press.
- [2.] Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2019). The full-range of leadership development: Basic and advanced manual. Binghamton University, School of Management.
- [3.] Bass, B. M. (2020). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. Free Press.
- [4.] Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2019). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Sage Publications.
- [5.] Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2021). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 595-616.
- [6.] Bush, T. (2021). Theories of educational leadership and management (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- [7.] Cialdini, R. B. (2019). Influence: Science and practice (5th ed.). Pearson.
- [8.] Drucker, P. F. (2019). The effective executive: The definitive guide to getting the right things done. HarperCollins.
- [9.] Flinders, D. J., & Thornton, S. J. (2019). The curriculum studies reader. Routledge.
- [10.] Goleman, D. (2022). Working with emotional intelligence. Bantam Books.
- [11.] Goleman, D. (2019). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review*, 76(6), 93-102.
- [12.] Greenleaf, R. K. (2020). Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness. Paulist Press.
- [13.] Hackman, M. Z., & Johnson, C. E. (2019). Leadership: A communication perspective (6th ed.). Waveland Press.

-
- [14.] Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2019). Distributed leadership in schools: Does system policy make a difference? *School Leadership & Management*, 29(5), 477-501.
- [15.] Harris, M. (2019). Teacher leadership in the 21st century: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 20(4), 345-360.
- [16.] Klein, G. (20019). *Naturalistic decision making*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.