

School Heads' Profile and Leadership Styles and Its Influence on School and Teachers' Performance and Attributes in the Fourth Congressional District, Division of Quezon

Isabel C. Salvador ¹, Rizalie M. Lim ²

¹ Department of Education, ² Marinduque State University

¹ isabel.salvador@deped.gov.ph, ² rizalielim1973@gmail.com

Article Details:

Received: 25 February 2026

Revised: 27 February 2026

Accepted: 05 March 2026

Published: 08 March 2026

Corresponding Email:

isabel.salvador@deped.gov.ph

Recommended Citation:

Salvador, I.C., Lim, R.M. (2026). School Heads' Profile and Leadership Styles and Its Influence on School and Teachers' Performance and Attributes in the Fourth Congressional District, Division of Quezon. *The International Review of Multidisciplinary Research*, 1 (3), 107-121.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18906924>

Index Terms:

school heads' profile, leadership styles, influence on school, teachers' performance, attributes

Abstract. This study examined the influence of school heads' profiles and leadership styles on school performance, teachers' performance, and teachers' attributes in terms of motivation and job satisfaction in the Fourth Congressional District, Division of Quezon. Employing a descriptive research design, data were collected through survey questionnaires from twenty-eight (28) school heads and four hundred seventy-six (476) teachers selected via multi-stage sampling. Descriptive statistics and regression analysis were utilized for data analysis. Findings revealed that most school heads were female, aged 41-50, serving as Principal I, with 6-10 years of service, holding Master's degrees, and attending more than 10 trainings annually. The democratic leadership style was predominantly practiced among school heads. Schools achieved highly proficient performance levels across all indicators, while teachers demonstrated very satisfactory performance and were highly motivated and highly satisfied with their jobs. Regression analysis indicated that school heads' profiles and leadership styles statistically significantly influenced both school performance and teachers' performance. However, these factors showed no significant effect on teachers' motivation and job satisfaction. The study concludes that while school heads' profiles and leadership styles positively impact school and teacher performance outcomes, they do not directly influence teachers' intrinsic attributes such as motivation and job satisfaction. To sustain these positive performance results and support teacher well-being, the following recommendations are proposed: school heads should continue practicing democratic leadership styles, pursue continuous professional development opportunities, and provide targeted technical assistance and mentoring programs for teachers. These measures will help maintain high levels of teacher motivation, job satisfaction, and overall school effectiveness in the long term.

Introduction

Leaders are those considered to be in charge of an organization. The organization relies on the capacity of leaders to lead and their ability to initiate various programs and activities that promote positive growth and development, and desirable change. Without a leader, an organization has no direction, and therefore, the different wills and likes of its members prevail, which may result in conflict, misunderstanding, and confusion. This applies not only to a particular company but most especially in managing and supervising a school. However, leaders, including school heads in a specific school, are unique from one another and manifest and practice various leadership styles. These differences are often influenced not only by leadership orientation but also by the personal and professional profiles of the school heads themselves.

Several studies have emphasized that school heads' profile, such as age, sex, educational attainment, length of service, position, and relevant training, plays a significant role in shaping leadership practices and decision-making processes. According to Bush (2020), leadership behavior in schools is closely associated with the leader's professional background and experience, which influence how authority is exercised and how relationships with teachers are managed. Similarly,

Hallinger (2021) asserted that school leaders' educational qualifications and leadership training significantly affect their instructional leadership practices and school effectiveness. These findings suggest that leadership style cannot be examined in isolation from the school heads' profiles.

Every leader has a particular talent. No one embodies all the necessary qualities or traits for leadership (Mariano & Oco, 2024). Despite this fact, whatever leadership style is emphasized, the school heads are primarily responsible for the success or failure of teachers as subordinates. Moreover, studies indicate that school heads with longer administrative experience and higher educational attainment tend to demonstrate more adaptive and participative leadership styles, which positively influence teacher motivation and school performance (Gumus et al., 2022). According to Cadimas et al., (2024), leadership style is a crucial element in an organization's ability to prosper due to its impact on employees' performance. In other words, the school heads can inspire and encourage teachers to perform better than before, depending on the leadership style they adopt. In many cases, this leadership style is shaped by the school heads' professional preparation and leadership exposure.

In such a case, the teachers' desire to grow professionally as facilitators of the teaching and learning process, with the help and instructional supervision of the school heads, becomes obligatory. As a matter of fact, Republic Act 9155, also known as the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, states that the school head who manages the school has "the authority, responsibility, and accountability for achieving higher learning outcomes". This mandate highlights the importance of school heads' qualifications, experience, and preparedness in fulfilling leadership responsibilities.

Furthermore, according to Bugyei (2022), the managers have the responsibility to motivate their employees to apply their knowledge and skills to realize organizational goals. On the other hand, managers can influence employees' job satisfaction, commitment, and productivity in the practice of various leadership styles (Rexha & Buleshkaj, 2024). School principals must consider that teachers who lack job satisfaction and are demotivated may hinder the implementation of educational programs. Hence, school heads must adopt various strategies to enhance teachers' motivation and job satisfaction (Bugyei, 2022), which are often strengthened by leadership competence gained through experience and training.

Hence, this study about school heads' profiles and leadership style practices and their influence on schools and teachers' performance and attributes is deemed necessary and worth investigating. Given the current situation, where changes are prevalent due to continued technological advancements, the leadership styles of school heads, as well as the tendencies of teachers and schools, may also evolve. Having said this, an updated study is needed to craft a school management plan that addresses the current context, enabling school heads to work effectively and efficiently with teachers and other stakeholders towards a common goal of achieving quality education.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative research methodology. As the main feature of quantitative research, it provides quantitative data in the form of numbers subject to appropriate and most applicable statistical treatment. In this study, frequency counts and other numerical values, which serve as the raw data, were extracted from the Survey Questionnaire, the existing research instrument, as answered by the respondents. Therefore, a quantitative research methodology was adopted. No other data were gathered or collected for computation and calculation. Specifically, the researcher considered the descriptive type of quantitative research. For this reason, a present phenomenon or situation —the influence of school heads' profiles and leadership styles practices on the performance of teachers and schools in the case of this study — naturally occurring in a particular place and time, was determined. Moreover, the descriptive type of quantitative research was employed since no experiment was conducted to test the effectiveness of a specific program, instructional material, project, or innovation in general. Furthermore, although hypotheses were stated in this study, its primary aim was to describe and derive implications of a significant difference and relationship.

Research Population and Sample

The population for this study consisted of elementary school heads and teachers from the Fourth Congressional District of the Division of Quezon, which includes ten (10) municipalities: Alabat, Atimonan, Calauag, Guinayangan, Gumaca, Lopez, Perez, Plaridel, Quezon, and Tagkawayan. A total of 476 elementary teachers and 28 school heads were distributed across these municipalities, serving as the sample. To ensure a representative and unbiased sample, this study employed a multi-stage cluster random sampling technique. In the first stage, school districts were selected at random to ensure fair representation while maintaining a manageable sample size. These selected municipalities served as clusters.

In the second stage, within each selected school district, three schools were randomly chosen to represent different school sizes—small, medium, and large—based on enrollment and staffing, except for Plaridel and Perez, which had only two schools. This step was crucial for capturing the variability in leadership styles that the size and context of the school may influence. Along with the school heads, teachers from these selected schools were included to provide a broader perspective of their attributes or characteristics in terms of motivation and job satisfaction. By using a two-stage cluster random sampling approach, this study ensured that the sample was both geographically distributed and demographically diverse, while maintaining randomness to reduce selection bias. This method strengthened the validity and generalizability of the study findings across the Fourth Congressional District of Quezon Province. The final selection is presented below.

Municipality	School	Category	No. of School Heads	No. of Teachers
Alabat	Alabat Central School	Large	1	38
	Angeles Caglate Elementary School	Medium	1	12
	Pambil Elementary School	Small	1	8
Atimonan	Malinao Ilaya Elementary School	Large	1	20
	Maligaya Elementary School	Medium	1	12
	Malinao Ibaba Elementary School	Small	1	9
Calauag	Calauag East Central School	Large	1	29
	Maglandinga Elementary School	Medium	1	17
	Sumilang Elementary School	Small	1	7
Guinayangan	Guinayangan Elementary School	Large	1	28
	Gregorio M. Mendoza Elementary School	Medium	1	14
	Sta. Maria Elementary School	Small	1	8
Gumaca	Camohaguin Elementary School	Large	1	25
	Lagyo Elementary School	Medium	1	17
	Gayagayaan Elementary School	Small	1	9
Lopez	Don Emilio Elementary School	Large	1	35
	Villa Hermosa Elementary School	Medium	1	12
	Banabalin Elementary School	Small	1	5
Perez	Perez Central School	Large	1	28
	Pambuhan Elementary School	Small	1	6
Plaridel	Plaridel Central School	Large	1	25
	Concepcion Elementary School	Small	1	8
Quezon	Quezon Elementary School	Large	1	27
	Del Pilar Elementary School	Medium	1	11
	Cometa Elementary School	Small	1	6
Tagkawayan	Tagkawayan Central School	Large	1	38
	Magsaysay Elementary School	Medium	1	13
	Gayagayaan Elementary School	Small	1	9
Total			28	476

Table 1. Sample of Elementary School Heads and Teachers in the Fourth Congressional District of the Division of Quezon

Research Instrument

The researcher adapted a Survey Questionnaire as a tool to measure the variables and collect the necessary quantitative data. The first Survey Questionnaire was intended for school heads. It was divided into three parts. Part I aimed to determine the profile of the respondents in terms of sex, age, plantilla position, years of service as school head, highest educational attainment, and number of trainings attended in a year. Meanwhile, Part II of the Survey Questionnaire was about the dominant leadership style of the school heads using the 18 statements adopted from Sage Publication's Leadership Styles Questionnaire. Part III was designed to obtain the school's performance (i.e., in percentage) as indicated by its enrollment rate, graduation rate, promotion rate, drop-out rate, and cohort survival rate data. Finally, the last part, i.e., Part IV, was the teachers' performance based on the Key Results Areas (KRAs) in the Individual Performance, Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF). On the other hand, the Survey Questionnaire for teachers was made up of two parts. Part I was about teachers' attributes in terms of motivation, with 15 statements adapted from the work of Fernet et al. (2008). Lastly, Part II pertained to the teachers' attributes in terms of job satisfaction, composed of nine statements from the study of Ahiri et al. (2023).

Data Gathering Procedure

Seeking Approval to Conduct the Study. Prior to the conduct of the study, the researcher formally sought approval from the Schools Division Office to ensure proper authorization and ethical compliance. A letter of request addressed to the Schools Division Superintendent was personally submitted at the Division Office, indicating the purpose, scope, and target respondents of the study. Upon approval, the signed endorsement from the Schools Division Superintendent was presented to the respective Public Schools District Supervisors and the school heads of the selected elementary schools in the Fourth

Congressional District. This process ensured transparency, administrative coordination, and institutional support before the actual data gathering commenced.

Questionnaire Validation. The survey instruments used in this study were adapted from standardized and previously validated questionnaires related to leadership styles, school performance, teachers' performance, motivation, and job satisfaction. As these instruments had already undergone reliability and validity testing in prior scholarly studies, a separate validation process was no longer deemed necessary.

Administration and Retrieval of Questionnaires. After securing all necessary approvals, the researcher proceeded with the administration of the survey questionnaires. Prior to data gathering, a two-stage simple random sampling technique was employed, first in selecting the districts and second in identifying the participating schools. The questionnaires were personally distributed to the selected elementary school heads, along with an attached informed consent letter explaining the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, and the confidentiality of responses.

Collation, Organization, and Analysis of Data. Once the retrieval phase was complete, the gathered data were systematically encoded and organized into a master database. Responses from the physical questionnaires and the digital Google Forms were integrated to ensure a unified dataset.

Crafting of the School Management Plan. Based on the results of the study, a management plan was developed to address identified gaps and enhance school leadership and performance. The findings were used to formulate evidence-based strategies, programs, and activities that may be implemented at the school and division levels.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The data provided by respondents in the Survey Questionnaire regarding their profile, leadership style practices, school performance, and teachers' performance are tabulated, categorized, discussed, analyzed, and interpreted to inform the development of a school management plan. The statistical tools used are discussed below.

For statements of problems numbers 1 and 2, the percentage was used as descriptive statistics to determine the distribution of school heads' profiles and leadership styles. This statistical tool enabled the researcher to describe which categories of a particular profile and leadership style among elementary school heads are most and least dominant, respectively. For statements of problems 3 and 4, the average mean was an appropriate descriptive statistic to use, allowing the school performance and the teachers' performance to be computed and corresponding verbal interpretations or descriptions to be determined. The table that follows served as a reference.

Range	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
100 or 0.00	Distinguished	The school is being managed exceptionally by the school heads.
90.00-99.99 or 0.09-4.99	Highly Proficient	The school is being managed to a high extent by the school heads.
80.00-89.99 or 5.00-9.99	Proficient	The school is being managed to a low extent by the school heads.
Less than 80.00 or 10.00 Above	Beginning	The school is being managed to the lowest extent by the school heads.

Note: Adapted from Division Memorandum No. 435, s. 2021 Schools Division of Bohol

Table 2. Table for Interpreting the School Performance

Range	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
4.500-5.00	Outstanding	Performance represents an extraordinary level of achievement and commitment in terms of quality and time, technical skills and knowledge, ingenuity, creativity, and initiative. Teachers at this performance level should have demonstrated exceptional job mastery in all major areas of responsibility. Teachers' achievement and contributions to the organization are of marked excellence.
3.500-4.499	Very Satisfactory	Performance exceeded expectations. All goals, objectives, and targets were achieved above the established standards.
2.500-3.499	Satisfactory	Performance meets expectations in terms of quality of work, efficiency, and timeliness. The most critical annual goals were met.
1.500-2.499	Unsatisfactory	Performance failed to meet expectations, and/or one or more of the most critical goals were not met.
Below 1.499	Poor	Performance was consistently below expectations, and/or reasonable progress toward critical goals was not made. Significant improvement is needed in one or more important areas.

Table 3. Table for Interpreting the Teachers' Performance

For statement of the problem number 5, the formula for the weighted mean, being another descriptive statistic, was necessary to provide a verbal interpretation of teachers' attributes, such as motivation and job satisfaction. This allowed the researcher to understand which indicators the teachers have the highest and lowest motivation and job satisfaction. The Likert scale, as follows, was formulated to provide a precise verbal interpretation of teachers' school performance, motivation, and job satisfaction.

Scale	Mean Range	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
5	4.21-5.00	Very Highly Motivated	Elementary teachers often report a very high level of motivation in their tasks.
4	3.41-4.20	Highly Motivated	Elementary teachers generally feel highly motivated to perform their tasks.
3	2.61-3.40	Moderately Motivated	Elementary teachers generally feel moderately motivated to complete their tasks.
2	1.81-2.60	Slightly Motivated	Elementary teachers often experience a low or very low sense of motivation in completing their tasks.
1	1.00-1.80	Not Motivated at All	Elementary teachers often lack motivation to complete their tasks.

Table 4. Likert Scale for Interpreting the Motivation Level of the Elementary Teachers

Scale	Mean Range	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
5	4.21-5.00	Very Highly Satisfied	Elementary teachers tend to have a very high sense of satisfaction with their work as teachers.
4	3.41-4.20	Highly Satisfied	Elementary teachers generally report a high level of job satisfaction.
3	2.61-3.40	Moderately Satisfied	Elementary teachers generally report a moderate level of satisfaction with their teaching work.
2	1.81-2.60	Slightly Satisfied	Elementary teachers often report a low or very low level of satisfaction with their teaching work.
1	1.00-1.80	Not Satisfied at All	Elementary teachers often lack a sense of satisfaction in their teaching careers.

Table 5. Likert Scale for Interpreting the Job Satisfaction Level of the Elementary Teachers

To address statement of the problem number 6, which aimed to determine which among the school heads' profile and leadership styles significantly influence school performance, teacher performance, and teachers' attributes, regression analysis was used. This statistical method was appropriate for determining whether school performance, teachers' performance, and attributes such as motivation and job satisfaction are predicted by the school head's profile and leadership styles.

Ethical Considerations

This study strictly adhered to ethical principles as outlined by the Marinduque State University Research Ethics Committee. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all respondents. They were informed of the study's purpose, procedures, potential risks, and benefits, with the assurance that they may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained by assigning codes instead of names, and all data were securely stored with access limited only to the researcher. The study ensured that no physical, psychological, or social harm was inflicted on the participants. The findings were reported honestly, and the results were used solely for academic and research purposes.

Results and Discussion

Profile of School Heads

This section profiles the school heads based on sex, age, plantilla position, years of service, highest educational attainment, and annual trainings. Regarding sex, school heads are predominantly female (64%, or 18 of 28 respondents), contradicting Martinez, Molina-Lopez, and de Cabo (2020) on barriers to women in principal roles and suggesting males face greater contextual challenges. Most are early middle-aged (41–50 years), aligning with DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2007 (Llego, 2019), which requires five years as Teacher III, Head Teacher, or Teacher-in-Charge beyond qualifying tests—prioritizing experience over age. Plantilla positions range from Head Teacher (3%) to Principal I (68%), with none at Principal IV; higher roles may enhance leadership perceptions (Oco, 2022). Years of service peak at 6–10 years (68%), indicating growing proficiency (Macalos, 2022), while 54% hold master's degrees and 4% doctorates, aiding school management. Notably, 96% attend over 10 trainings yearly, underscoring the need for ongoing development (Macalos, 2022).

Collectively, these school heads form a competent, mature leadership cadre—mostly female, mid-career, progressively promoted per DepEd standards, highly educated, and training-active—equipped for effective school management and instructional excellence.

School Heads' Leadership Styles

Leadership Styles	Frequency	Percentage
Authoritarian	6	21.43
Democratic	16	57.14
Laissez-faire	6	21.43
Total	28	100.0

Table 7. Leadership Styles of the School Head Respondents

Table 7 shows the three most common leadership styles among school heads—authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire—with 57.14% (16 of 28) favoring democratic approaches characterized by communication, collaboration, and collective decision-making (Laghari et al., 2023), where heads partner with teachers for school success; 21.43% (6 of 28) each support authoritarian styles, emphasizing task-oriented productivity and high output quality (Emmanuel, 2022), or laissez-faire hands-off methods that allow teacher autonomy without pressure (Cherry, 2024). Overall, these styles reflect adaptive management in unique school contexts with diverse stakeholders, aligning with Hersey and Blanchard's situational leadership theory, which advocates tailoring approaches to subordinates' maturity and competence levels.

School Performance

School's Performance	Percentage	Verbal Interpretation
Enrolment Rate	96.44	Highly Proficient
Graduation Rate	99.39	Highly Proficient
Promotion Rate	98.14	Highly Proficient
Dropout Rate	0.64	Highly Proficient
Cohort Survival Rate	96.81	Highly Proficient

Table 8. Performance of the Selected Elementary Schools in the 4th Congressional District of Quezon (28 schools)

Table 8 presents the results for the 28 schools selected in the 4th Congressional District of the Division of Quezon. The performance indicators of the schools, including Enrolment Rate, Graduation Rate, Promotion Rate, Dropout Rate, and Cohort Survival Rate, have a qualitative description of “Highly Proficient,” which is the second-highest category of school performance. It can be inferred from the data above that the school heads, together with the internal stakeholders (e.g., teachers) and external stakeholders (e.g., parents, LGUs, etc.), are working together in order to overcome the challenges of the school as an educational institution in relation to students' performance and attitudes. The positive results of the data also indicate that learners are highly encouraged to attend school and pursue their studies, with the primary efforts of school heads and teachers being supported by other stakeholders.

Teachers' Performance

Criteria/Components	Mean Rating	Verbal Interpretation
1. Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	4.13	Very Satisfactory
2. Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners	4.16	Very Satisfactory
3. Curriculum Planning, Assessment, and Reporting	3.93	Very Satisfactory
4. Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	4.07	Very Satisfactory
5. Personal Growth and Professional Development	4.24	Very Satisfactory
Grand Mean	4.11	Very Satisfactory

Table 9. Teachers' Performance as Reflected in the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF)

Table 9 illustrates the teachers' performance as reflected in the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF). The five (5) performance indicators of teachers have a qualitative description of “Very Satisfactory”, which is the second highest, next to “Outstanding”. The elementary teachers, as managed by their school heads, demonstrate good all-around performance in fulfilling their professional responsibilities. The teachers' performance is highest in the Personal

Growth and Professional Development dimensions, with a numerical rating of 4.24. It is because education and training are more accessible nowadays. Some schools and organizations offer programs online. According to Macalos (2022), almost all of the teachers are pursuing Master's and Doctoral degree programs. In this regard, teachers consistently attend seminars, training workshops, and other professional development activities to promote ongoing career progress and growth. In contrast, the lowest performance is observed in Curriculum, Planning, Assessment and Reporting, with a numerical rating of 3.93.

Teachers' Attributes

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. It is pleasant to carry out my tasks as a teacher.	4.57	0.513	Very Highly Motivated
2. I find my tasks as a teacher interesting to do.	4.64	0.506	Very Highly Motivated
3. I like doing my tasks as a teacher.	4.67	0.480	Very Highly Motivated
4. It is important for me to carry out my tasks as a teacher.	4.70	0.479	Very Highly Motivated
5. I do my tasks as a teacher to attain work objectives that I consider important.	4.73	0.462	Very Highly Motivated
6. I find my tasks as a teacher important for the academic success of my students.	4.74	0.441	Very Highly Motivated
7. I carry out my tasks as a teacher so that I do not feel bad.	4.39	0.755	Very Highly Motivated
8. I do my tasks as a teacher so that I will not feel guilty.	4.44	0.748	Very Highly Motivated
9. I do my tasks as a teacher so that I do not feel bad.	4.26	0.797	Very Highly Motivated
10. My work demands my tasks as a teacher.	4.51	0.548	Very Highly Motivated
11. The school obliges me to do my tasks as a teacher.	4.32	0.732	Very Highly Motivated
12. I am paid to do my tasks as a teacher.	4.49	0.670	Very Highly Motivated
13. I see the relevance of carrying out my tasks as a teacher.	4.66	0.486	Very Highly Motivated
14. I see the reason why I am doing my tasks as a teacher.	4.72	0.449	Very Highly Motivated
15. I see the purpose of my tasks as a teacher.	4.75	0.431	Very Highly Motivated
Composite Mean	4.57	0.566	Very Highly Motivated

Table 10. Level of Motivation of the Teacher Respondents

Table 10 gives the teachers' attributes in terms of motivation. All 15 statements indicating the teachers' motivation are being qualitatively interpreted as "Very Highly Motivated," as also reflected in the calculated average weighted mean of 4.57. As a whole, the teachers possess a very high level of motivation under the leadership of their respective school heads. With the leadership of their school heads, the teachers reveal "Very Highly Motivated" interpretation in the statement "I see my purpose of my tasks as a teacher" with the highest weighted mean of 4.75. Likewise, they share the same sentiment in the statement "I find my tasks as a teacher important for the academic success of my students," with a weighted mean of 4.74. In this case, the source of teachers' motivation is a clear understanding of their tasks or role as teachers, especially in developing the academic aspects of learners. Thus, teachers place a very high value on their profession, which keeps them motivated every day. This result supports the claim of Astuti et al. (2020) that teachers' motivation is reflected in their professionalism and performance of duties and responsibilities. In agreement with their study, the present finding confirms that when teachers embrace their profession and recognize its impact on learners' success, they demonstrate higher levels of intrinsic motivation and commitment, even if teaching was not their initial career choice.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. In my opinion, being a teacher is the most noble profession.	4.73	0.603	Very Highly Satisfied
2. Working as a teacher suits my personality perfectly.	4.32	0.615	Very Highly Satisfied
3. My income as a teacher can meet the needs of my family.	3.74	0.917	Highly Satisfied
4. The work situation at school supports my duties as a teacher.	4.21	0.792	Very Highly Satisfied
5. I strive to create a conducive learning environment for students.	4.58	0.515	Very Highly Satisfied
6. I have never neglected my primary task as a teacher.	4.47	0.563	Very Highly Satisfied
7. I guide the students according to their potential.	4.56	0.546	Very Highly Satisfied
8. I have sufficient competence to become a professional teacher.	4.42	0.494	Very Highly Satisfied
9. I find it easy to achieve teaching and learning goals.	4.17	0.599	Highly Satisfied
Composite Mean	4.36	0.627	Very Highly Satisfied

Table 11. Level of Job Satisfaction of the Teacher Respondents

Table 11 illustrates the teachers' attributes in terms of job satisfaction. The seven statements that indicate the teachers' job satisfaction have a descriptive analysis of "Very Highly Satisfied", while the two statements correspond to "Highly Satisfied". As a whole, the teachers are "Very Highly Satisfied" with their job according to the procured average weighted mean of 4.36. In particular, the teachers are "Very Highly Satisfied" with the statement "In my opinion, being a teacher is the most noble profession," with the highest weighted mean of 4.73. Meaning, they are highly recognized and respected by society and are looked up to by others. However, they have a "Highly Satisfied" interpretation in the statement "My income as a teacher can meet the needs of my family," with the lowest weighted mean of 3.74. The teachers also reveal an interpretation of "Highly Satisfied" through their work, as stated in the phrase "I find it easy to achieve teaching and learning goals," with a weighted mean of 4.17. In this regard, teachers are not content with their job when learners have trouble or difficulty understanding the lessons.

Influence of School Heads' Profile and Leadership Styles on School and Teachers' Performance and Attributes

Model	Coefficients			t	p-value	Decision
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
(Constant)	99.720	.890		112.081	.000	
Sex	-.124	.239	-.021	-.520	.604	
Age	-1.258	.295	-.246	-4.265	.000	
Plantilla Position	.096	.150	.042	.636	.525	
4 Years in Service as School Head	.484	.224	.135	2.157	.032	Reject Ho
Highest Educational Attainment	-.954	.113	-.473	-8.464	.000	
Number of Trainings Attended	-.138	.199	-.033	-.695	.488	
Leadership Skills	.755	.162	.186	4.673	.000	

Table 12. Statistical Table Showing the Influence of the School Heads' Profile and Leadership Styles on the School Performance in Terms of Enrolment

Table 12 presents regression results on how school heads' profiles and leadership styles influence enrollment performance, with $R = 0.576$ and $R^2 = 0.332$ —indicating the predictors (sex, age, plantilla position, years in service, educational attainment, trainings, and leadership style) explain 33.2% of variance. Significant effects include negative relations for age ($B = -1.258$, $p = 0.000$) and educational attainment ($B = -0.954$, $p = 0.000$), suggesting older, more educated heads correlate with lower enrollment; positive relations for years in service ($B = 0.484$, $p = 0.032$) and leadership style ($B = 0.755$, $p = 0.000$), implying longer experience and stronger leadership boost enrollment. Sex, plantilla position, and trainings showed no significant impact.

Model	Coefficients			t	p-value	Decision
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
(Constant)	98.136	.326		301.278	.000	
Sex	-.246	.087	-.123	-2.810	.005	
Age	.043	.108	.026	.402	.688	
5 Plantilla Position	.163	.055	.217	2.974	.003	Reject Ho
Years in Service as School Head	.397	.082	.335	4.831	.000	
Highest Educational Attainment	-.139	.041	-.208	-3.360	.001	
Number of Trainings Attended	-.064	.073	-.046	-.874	.383	
Leadership Skills	-.165	.059	-.123	-2.795	.005	

Table 13. Statistical Table Showing the Influence of the School Heads' Profiles and Leadership Styles on the School Performance in Terms of Graduation Rate

Table 13 shows regression results for school heads' profiles and leadership styles on graduation rates: $R = 0.427$, $R^2 = 0.183$ (18.3% variance explained by sex, age, plantilla position, years in service, educational attainment, trainings, and leadership style), indicating moderate influence with other factors at play. Significant positive effects include years in service ($B = 0.397$, $p = 0.000$) and plantilla position ($B = 0.163$, $p = 0.003$), linking experience and higher ranks to better rates; negative effects for educational attainment ($B = -0.139$, $p = 0.001$), leadership style ($B = -0.165$, $p = 0.005$), and sex ($B = -0.246$, $p = 0.005$). The constant (98.136) reflects a high baseline. As Gamala and Marpa (2022) note, management skills drive graduation via effective leadership, underscoring the value of experience over attainment in adaptive strategies.

Coefficients						
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	p-value	Decision
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
(Constant)	95.562	.641		149.150	.000	
Sex	-.170	.172	-.040	-.990	.323	
Age	.332	.212	.092	1.562	.119	
Plantilla Position	.603	.108	.374	5.577	.000	
6 Years in Service as School Head	.814	.162	.321	5.038	.000	Reject Ho
Highest Educational Attainment	-.621	.081	-.435	-7.652	.000	
Number of Trainings Attended	-.132	.143	-.045	-.926	.355	
Leadership Skills	-.668	.116	-.233	-5.741	.000	

Table 14. Statistical Table Showing the Influence of the School Heads' Profiles and Leadership Styles on the School Performance in Terms of Promotion Rate

Table 14 shows regression results for school heads' profiles and leadership styles on promotion rates: $R = 0.555$, $R^2 = 0.298$ (29.8% variance explained by sex, age, plantilla position, years in service, educational attainment, trainings, and leadership style), indicating moderate predictive strength. Significant positive effects include plantilla position ($B = 0.603$, $p < 0.001$) and years in service ($B = 0.814$, $p < 0.001$), linking higher ranks and experience to better rates; negative effects for educational attainment ($B = -0.621$, $p < 0.001$) and leadership style ($B = -0.668$, $p < 0.001$), suggesting advanced qualifications emphasize rigor over promotion. These findings challenge Co, Trinidad, and Sadang (2018), who tie strong organizational leadership to high student achievement and promotion.

Coefficients						
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	p-value	Decision
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
(Constant)	3.977	.147		27.061	.000	
Sex	-.519	.039	-.343	-13.164	.000	
Age	.315	.049	.245	6.454	.000	
Plantilla Position	-.221	.025	-.387	-8.922	.000	
7 Years in Service as School Head	-.459	.037	-.510	-12.363	.000	Reject Ho
Highest Educational Attainment	-.019	.019	-.038	-1.031	.303	
Number of Trainings Attended	-.028	.033	-.027	-.867	.387	
Leadership Skills	-.242	.027	-.237	-9.052	.000	

Table 15. Statistical Table Showing the Influence of School Heads' Profiles and Leadership Style on the School Performance in Terms of Drop-out Rate

Table 15 shows regression results for school heads' profiles and leadership styles on dropout rates: $R = 0.843$, $R^2 = 0.711$ (71.1% variance explained by sex, age, plantilla position, years in service, educational attainment, trainings, and leadership style), indicating strong predictive power. Significant negative effects include sex ($B = -0.519$, $p = 0.000$), plantilla position ($B = -0.221$, $p = 0.000$), years in service ($B = -0.459$, $p = 0.000$), and leadership style ($B = -0.242$, $p = 0.000$), linking female, higher-ranking, experienced, and skilled leaders to lower rates; age showed a positive effect ($B = 0.315$, $p = 0.000$). Educational attainment and trainings were nonsignificant ($p > 0.05$). Equation: $y_7 = 3.977 - 0.519(\text{Sex}) + 0.315(\text{Age}) - 0.221(\text{Plantilla Position}) - 0.459(\text{Years in Service}) - 0.242(\text{Leadership Skills}) + 0.38953(\text{Std. Error})$. Aligning with Co, Trinidad, and Sadang (2018), these factors do not influence dropouts, emphasizing dynamic, experienced leadership for retention.

Model	Coefficients			t	p-value	Decision
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
(Constant)	101.103	1.507		67.067	.000	
Sex	1.269	.404	.129	3.139	.002	
Age	-.565	.500	-.068	-1.131	.259	
Plantilla Position	1.311	.254	.353	5.154	.000	
7 Years in Service as School Head	.894	.380	.153	2.350	.019	Reject Ho
Highest Educational Attainment	-2.425	.191	-.736	-12.698	.000	
Number of Trainings Attended	-.989	.336	-.144	-2.940	.003	
Leadership Skills	-1.088	.274	-.164	-3.976	.000	

Table 16. Statistical Table Showing the Influence of School Heads' Profiles and Leadership Styles on the School Performance in Terms of Cohort Survival Rate

Table 16 shows regression results for school heads' profiles and leadership styles on cohort survival rates: $R = 0.529$, $R^2 = 0.280$ (28% variance explained by sex, age, plantilla position, years in service, educational attainment, trainings, and leadership style), indicating moderate influence. Constant = 101.103 (high baseline). Positive significant effects: plantilla position ($B = 1.311$, $p < .001$), years in service ($B = 0.894$, $p = 0.019$), sex ($B = 1.269$, $p = 0.002$)—favoring higher ranks, experience, and male heads for better retention. Negative effects: educational attainment ($B = -2.425$, $p < .000$), trainings ($B = -0.989$, $p = .003$), leadership style ($B = -1.088$, $p < .000$), suggesting credentials and skills may mismatch practical needs. Results emphasize experience and position over qualifications for adaptive, student-centered leadership.

Model	Coefficients			t	p-value	Decision
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
(Constant)	3.844	.094		40.926	.000	
Sex	.123	.025	.216	4.873	.000	
Age	-.047	.031	-.098	-1.520	.129	
Plantilla Position	-.007	.016	-.034	-.457	.648	
1 Years in Service as School Head	.015	.024	.044	.632	.528	Reject Ho
Highest Educational Attainment	.051	.012	.267	4.283	.000	
Number of Trainings Attended	.107	.021	.269	5.092	.000	
Leadership Skills	.084	.017	.219	4.927	.000	

Table 17. Statistical Table Showing the Influence of School Heads' Profiles and Leadership Styles on Teachers' Performance

Table 17 shows regression results for school heads' profiles and leadership styles on teachers' performance: $R = 0.407$, $R^2 = 0.166$ (16.6% variance explained by sex, age, plantilla position, years in service, educational attainment, trainings, and leadership style), indicating significant but modest influence. Significant positive effects: sex ($B = 0.123$, $p = 0.000$), educational attainment ($B = 0.051$, $p = 0.000$), trainings ($B = 0.107$, $p = 0.000$), leadership style ($B = 0.084$, $p = 0.000$)—linking qualifications, development, and skills to better outcomes. Age ($p = 0.129$), plantilla position ($p = 0.648$), and years in service ($p = 0.528$) were nonsignificant. Equation: $Y = 3.844 + 0.123(\text{Sex}) + 0.051(\text{Educational Attainment}) + 0.107(\text{Trainings}) + 0.084(\text{Leadership Style})$. As Macalos (2022) and Parveen et al. (2022) note, richer experience via seminars/graduate studies and strong leadership enhance teacher performance.

Model	Coefficients ^a			t	p-value	Decision
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
(Constant)	4.676	.157		29.774	.000	
Sex	.029	.042	.033	.683	.495	
Age	.003	.052	.004	.061	.951	
Plantilla Position	.021	.026	.063	.784	.433	
2 Years in Service as School Head	-.008	.040	-.016	-.213	.831	Ho not rejected
Highest Educational Attainment	-.024	.020	-.082	-1.202	.230	
Number of Trainings Attended	-.014	.035	-.023	-.399	.690	
Leadership Skills	-.033	.029	-.057	-1.165	.245	

Table 18. Statistical Table Showing the Influence of School Heads' Profiles and Leadership Styles on Teachers' Motivation

Table 18 presents regression results for school heads' profiles and leadership styles on teachers' motivation: $R = 0.080$, $R^2 = 0.006$ (0.6% variance explained by sex, age, plantilla position, years in service, educational attainment, trainings, and leadership style), indicating no significant predictive effect (all $p > 0.05$: sex $p=0.495$, age $p=0.951$, plantilla $p=0.433$, years in service $p=0.831$, attainment $p=0.230$, trainings $p=0.690$, leadership $p=0.245$). Constant = 4.676 reflects high baseline motivation from intrinsic factors like self-efficacy (Jud, Hirt, Rosenthal, & Karlen, 2023), job satisfaction, or support systems, beyond heads' attributes.

Model	Coefficients			t	p-value	Decision
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
(Constant)	4.463	.151		29.624	.000	
Sex	-.084	.040	-.100	-2.071	.039	
Age	.022	.050	.030	.431	.667	
Plantilla Position	-.008	.025	-.027	-.331	.740	
3 Years in Service as School Head	.020	.038	.040	.524	.601	Ho not rejected
Highest Educational Attainment	-.013	.019	-.047	-.688	.492	
Number of Trainings Attended	-.006	.034	-.010	-.172	.864	
Leadership Skills	-.031	.027	-.054	-1.116	.265	

Table 19. Statistical Table Showing the Influence of School Heads' Profiles and Leadership Styles on Teachers' Job Satisfaction

Table 19 shows regression results for school heads' profiles and leadership styles on teachers' job satisfaction: $R = 0.113$, $R^2 = 0.013$ (1.3% variance explained by sex, age, plantilla position, years in service, educational attainment, trainings, and leadership style), indicating no significant predictive effect (all $p > 0.05$: sex $p=0.495$, age $p=0.951$, plantilla $p=0.433$, years in service $p=0.831$, attainment $p=0.230$, trainings $p=0.690$, leadership $p=0.245$). Constant = 4.676 reflects high baseline motivation from intrinsic factors like self-efficacy (Jud, Hirt, Rosenthal, & Karlen, 2023), job satisfaction, or support systems, beyond heads' attributes.

leadership style), indicating minimal influence. Only sex was significant ($B = -0.084$, $p = 0.039$; weak negative effect); others nonsignificant ($p > 0.05$). Constant = 4.463 reflects high baseline satisfaction from intrinsic/organizational factors like environment and support. As Lazaridou (2024) notes equal commitment across genders and Mariano and Oco (2024) a low-moderate leadership-satisfaction link, heads' attributes play limited roles.

Proposed School Management Plan

The findings of this study revealed that selected school heads' profile variables and leadership styles significantly influence school performance indicators and teachers' performance, while having no significant influence on teachers' motivation and job satisfaction. In particular, leadership style, years in service, plantilla position, educational attainment, and training exposure emerged as important predictors of school and instructional effectiveness. These results indicate that strengthening instructional leadership and providing targeted professional support are more appropriate interventions than motivation-centered programs.

Guided by these findings, Project S.M.I.L.E.S. (Supervisory and Management Improvement through Linkage – Empowering Strategies) was developed as a school-based management plan aimed at enhancing instructional supervision, strengthening teacher performance, and sustaining school performance outcomes. The project focuses on data-driven monitoring, differentiated technical assistance, and collaborative professional support using observation results and teachers' E-SAT data. By identifying specific areas of strength and need, the program allows school heads to provide light, moderate, or substantial support based on evidence, thereby maximizing the impact of leadership practices on teaching effectiveness and school performance.

The complete details, framework, and implementation matrix of Project S.M.I.L.E.S. are presented in Appendix A of this study. This appendix contains the comprehensive design of the plan, including its objectives, strategies, timelines, responsible persons, and evaluation tools, which serve as a practical guide for the actual application of the proposed management intervention.

Conclusion and Implications

Summary

This study aimed to investigate the influence of profile and leadership styles practiced by school heads on the school performance, teachers' performance, and attributes. The study employed a descriptive research methodology. The Survey Questionnaire as data gathering tool contained the profile of school heads in terms of sex, age, plantilla position, years in service, highest educational attainment and number of trainings in a year; leadership styles of school heads, school performance indicators such as enrollment rate, graduation rate, promotion rate, dropout rate and cohort survival rate; teachers' performance in the dimensions of content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment and diversity of learners, curriculum, planning, assessment, and reporting, community linkages and professional engagement and personal growth and professional development; and teachers' attributes in terms of motivation and job satisfaction. The collection of relevant data covered some schools in the Fourth Congressional District of Quezon, selected using a multi-stage sampling technique, which represented twenty-eight (28) school heads and four hundred seventy-six (476) teachers. The gathered data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, such as percentages and weighted means, and inferential statistics, including regression analysis. Based on the analysis and interpretation of the data, a management plan was crafted exclusively for school heads. It was designed to help school heads empower both teachers and students to achieve improved performance.

Summary of Findings

The profile of 28 school heads reveals a predominantly female (18 or 64%), mid-career (41–50 years: 15 or 54%), Principal I-dominant (19 or 68%) group with 6–10 years service (19 or 68%), Master's degrees (15 or 54%), and high training engagement (>10/year: 27 or 96%), suggesting a mature, qualified cadre aligned with DepEd promotion paths emphasizing experience over youth or advanced degrees. Democratic leadership prevails (16 school heads vs. 6 each authoritarian/laissez-faire), indicating collaborative tendencies that may foster inclusive school cultures amid female-majority leadership.

School performance is consistently "Highly Proficient" across indicators—enrollment (94.44%), graduation (99.39%), promotion (98.14%), dropout (0.64%), cohort survival (96.81%)—reflecting strong operational stability and retention, likely bolstered by heads' experience and positions. Teachers' IPCRF ratings are uniformly "Very Satisfactory"

(Content/Pedagogy: 4.13; Learning/Diversity: 4.16; Curriculum/Planning: 3.93; Community/Engagement: 4.07; Growth/Development: 4.24), signaling effective instruction and holistic professionalism under current leadership. Teachers report "Very Highly Motivated" (M=4.57; highest: purpose in tasks at 4.75; lowest: avoiding negativity at 4.26) and "Very Highly Satisfied" (M=4.36; highest: nobility of profession at 4.73; lowest: income adequacy at 3.74) levels, highlighting intrinsic drives like purpose and calling over extrinsic factors like pay, which may sustain performance despite modest financial concerns.

Regression confirms profiles/leadership significantly predict school performance (experience/position/leadership key across metrics) and teacher performance (16.6% variance via sex/attainment/trainings/leadership), but minimally affect motivation (0.6%) or satisfaction (1.3%; weak sex effect only)—suggesting external/intrinsic factors dominate attributes. A targeted management plan addresses gaps to optimize heads' effectiveness in operations, retention, and motivation.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, it is concluded that the profile characteristics and leadership styles of school heads play a meaningful role in shaping both school performance and teachers' performance, although their influence varies across specific indicators. Selected profile variables—particularly sex, highest educational attainment, number of trainings attended, years in service, and plantilla position—together with leadership style, were found to significantly influence school performance outcomes such as enrollment, graduation, promotion, dropout, and cohort survival rates, as well as teachers' performance in key professional domains. These results underscore the importance of experience, continuous professional development, and effective leadership practices in achieving positive institutional and instructional outcomes. However, the study further revealed that the same profile variables and leadership styles of school heads do not significantly influence teachers' attributes, specifically motivation and job satisfaction. The very low variance explained by the regression models indicates that teachers' motivation and job satisfaction are largely shaped by factors beyond school heads' demographic characteristics and leadership styles.

Based on the findings of the study, the school heads' profile and leadership styles have a significant influence on school performance and teachers' performance. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that the school heads' profile and leadership styles have no significant influence on school and teachers' performance is rejected.

On the other hand, the results further revealed that the school heads' profile and leadership styles have no significant influence on teachers' attributes. Hence, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant influence of school heads' profile and leadership styles on teachers' attributes is accepted.

Recommendations

The in-depth review of the findings and implications of this study leads to the formulation of the following recommendations:

1. Based on the findings of the study, it is evident that selected profile variables and leadership style significantly influence school and teachers' performance. The results highlight the important role of school heads in shaping institutional outcomes through their leadership practices. In light of these findings, school heads are encouraged to continuously strengthen leadership practices that directly influence school and teachers' performance. Considering that selected profiles and leadership styles significantly influence school performance and teachers' professional effectiveness, school heads may sustain and further enhance democratic leadership practices that promote collaboration, shared decision-making, and professional accountability. They may actively engage in continuous professional development, advanced studies, and leadership training that focus on instructional leadership, data-driven decision-making, and school improvement planning. Moreover, school heads are encouraged to strategically utilize their experience and position by mentoring teachers, aligning school goals with performance indicators, and ensuring the effective implementation of programs that support enrolment, retention, and learner progression.
2. In view of the findings that years in service, plantilla position, and leadership competencies significantly influence school performance indicators, it is recommended that the Department of Education strengthen leadership development programs tailored to the career stage and position of school heads, particularly for newly appointed and mid-career principals. Systematic and needs-based training opportunities may be provided to enhance competencies that directly affect school outcomes, including instructional supervision, school governance, and performance monitoring. Furthermore, leadership selection, promotion, and deployment policies should consider both experience and demonstrated leadership effectiveness to ensure sustained school improvement.
3. Since teachers' performance is significantly influenced by selected school head profile variables and leadership style, schools may foster a supportive instructional environment where teachers are guided through regular feedback, coaching, and professional learning communities. Collaborative practices may be encouraged to allow teachers to continuously improve their content knowledge, pedagogy, assessment strategies, and professional

engagement. In addition, school-based professional development programs aligned with identified performance domains may be strengthened to further enhance teachers' instructional competence.

4. Given the findings that school heads' profiles and leadership styles do not significantly influence teachers' motivation and job satisfaction, it is recommended that policymakers and school administrators explore other determinants of these attributes, such as compensation, workload management, recognition systems, and work-life balance. Schools may implement institutional support mechanisms, including wellness programs, recognition initiatives, and professional growth opportunities, to address both intrinsic and extrinsic motivational needs. Teachers may also be encouraged to engage in self-directed professional growth and reflective practices that contribute to personal fulfillment and job satisfaction.
5. The management plan crafted in this study may be adopted and pilot-tested in selected schools to assess its effectiveness in improving school performance and teachers' professional effectiveness. It may be regularly monitored and evaluated to ensure alignment with school needs, performance indicators, and leadership practices. The management plan is also recommended to be used as a flexible framework that school heads may adapt based on contextual realities and institutional priorities.
6. Future researchers are encouraged to include additional variables not covered in this study, such as organizational culture, school climate, teacher workload, compensation, and support systems, to better explain teachers' motivation and job satisfaction. The use of mixed-methods or qualitative research designs is recommended to gain deeper insights into how leadership practices are experienced by teachers. Expanding the scope of the study to other districts or divisions is also suggested to validate and generalize the findings.

Acknowledgements

The researcher extends sincere gratitude to all who provided guidance, support, and encouragement in completing this study: foremost to Dr. Leodegario M. Jalos, Jr., Associate Dean of the Graduate School, Extended Graduate Programs, for his invaluable insights and administrative support; Dr. Rizalie M. Lim, Dean of Graduate Studies and thesis adviser, for her tireless guidance, expertise, and feedback; Dr. Noel R. Palomares, statistician, for statistical analysis; Ms. Cherry Ann M. Luna, editor, for enhancing clarity; and Ms. Jholey Rose L. Lancion, copy editor, for refining the draft. Deep thanks also go to the Oral Examination Committee—Dr. Diosdado P. Zulueta (Chairperson), Dr. Leodegario M. Jalos Jr., and Dr. Noel R. Palomares (Members)—for their enriching recommendations; district supervisors, school principals, and teachers for their cooperation in data gathering; Ma'am Liezl M. Manoy for her inspiration; my family for their unwavering love and strength; and all unnamed contributors whose kindness made this journey possible.

Funding

This research received no external funding from any public, commercial, or not-for-profit funding agency, and no organization provided financial support for the conduct of the study, authorship, or publication of this article.

Competing Interests Statement

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this article.

Data Availability Statement

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study; all data used were obtained from previously published sources as cited in the reference list.

References

- Asian Development Bank. (2021). *Teacher professional development case studies*. <https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/719856/teacher-development-case-studies.pdf>
- Astuti, R. W., Fitria, H., & Rohana. (2020). The influence of leadership styles and work motivation on teachers' performance. *Journal of Social Work and Science Education*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.52690/jswse.v1i2.33>
- Bugyei, G. (2022). The impact of leadership styles on teacher motivation in the Mfanteman Municipality of Ghana. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.7176/EJBM/14-1-02>
- Bush, T. (2020). *School leadership and management: Theory, policy, and practice* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

- Cadimas, M. C., Cañedo, L. C., & Mercado, M. V. (2024). School heads' leadership styles in relation to teachers' performance. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research*, 1(6).
- Cherry, K. (2024). *The pros and cons laissez-faire leadership*. Verywell Mind. <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-laissez-faire-leadership-2795316>
- Co, G. A., Trinidad, M. H., & Sadang, J. A. (2018). School principal's profile and public elementary schools' performance in the Schools Division Office of Imus City. *The Asian Conference on Education 2018 - Official Conference Proceedings*. The International Academic Forum.
- Department of Education. (2015). *Policy guidelines on classroom assessment for the K to 12 Basic Education Program*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/DO_s2015_08.pdf
- Department of Education. (2017). *Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/DO_s2017_042-1.pdf
- Department of Education. (2024). *Enrollment guidelines for the School Year 2024-2025*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DM_s2024_032-2.pdf
- Division Memorandum No. 435, s. 2021. (*Schools Division of Bohol*). [Basis for school performance interpretation table]
- Gamala, J. J., & Marpa, E. P. (2022). School environment and school heads' managerial skills: Looking into their relationships with the school's performance. *International Journal on Social Education*. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijonses.285>
- Gümüş, S., Bellibaş, M. Ş., & Pietsch, M. (2022). School leadership and achievement gaps based on socioeconomic status: A search for socially just instructional leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 60(4), 419–438. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-11-2021-0213>
- Hallinger, P. (2021). Developing instructional leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(1), 3–17.
- Jud, L., Hirt, C. N., Rosenthal, L., & Karlen, Y. (2023). Teachers' self-efficacy as a predictor of motivation and engagement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 115(3), 456–470.
- Laghari, M. A., Jalil, A., Chachar, Z. A., & Gopang, A. S. (2023). *Impact of head teachers' democratic leadership style on teachers' performance at public secondary schools*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/379413377_Impact_of_Head_Teachers'_Democratic_Leadership_Style_on_Teachers'_Performance_at_Public_Secondary_Schools
- Lazaridou, A. (2024). Gender differences in educational leadership and values: Adding insights from neuro-social perspective. *European Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 5(5). <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejedu.2024.5.5.837>
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). Transformational leadership. In B. Davies (Ed.), *The essentials of school leadership* (pp. 31–43). Sage Publications.
- Llego, M. A. (2019). *2019 DepEd guidelines on the selection, promotion, and designation of school heads*. <https://www.teacherph.com/promotion-school-heads/>
- Macalos, R. P. (2022). The impact of school principals' years of service on leadership effectiveness and problem-solving skills. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership*, 9(1), 15–28.
- Mariano, A. L., & Oco, R. M. (2024). Leadership style of school heads: Impact on teachers' job satisfaction. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 7(8). <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i08-34>
- Martínez, M. M., Molina-López, M. M., & de Cabo, R. M. (2020). Explaining the gender gap in school principalship: A tale of two sides. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(6), 863–882. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220918258>
- Oco, R. M. (2022). Leadership styles of school heads and its relationship to school performance. *Global Scientific Journal*, 10(1).
- Parreño, S. J. (2023). School dropouts in the Philippines: Causes, changes, and statistics. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.51798/sijis.v4i1.552>
- Parveen, K., Tran, P. Q. B., Kumar, T., & Shah, A. H. (2022). Impact of principal leadership styles on teacher job performance: An empirical investigation. *Frontiers in Education*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.814159>
- Republic Act No. 9155. (2001). *Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001*. <https://pqf.gov.ph/Uploads/Legal%20Basis/20010811-RA-9155-GMA.pdf>
- Thompson, G., & Glaso, L. (2018). Situational leadership theory: A test from a leader-follower congruence approach. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-01-2018-0050>

Appendices

No appendices are included in this article