

Teachers' Perceptions of School Leadership: Implications for Performance and Morale

Marco Lorenzo O. Cular

Mandong Integrated School, Aklan State University
marcolorenzo.cular@deped.gov.ph

Article Details:

Received: 29 May 2026
Revised: 25 June 2026
Accepted: 19 July 2026
Published: 31 July 2026
Corresponding Email:
marcolorenzo.cular@deped.gov.ph

Recommended Citation:

Cular, M. L. O. (2026). Teachers' Perceptions of School Leadership: Implications for Performance and Morale. *The International Review of Multidisciplinary Research*. 1 (9), 367-378.
<https://doi.org/10.67167/vertex.672>

Index Terms:

school leadership, teacher perceptions, distributed leadership, work performance, morale, leadership styles

Abstract. School leadership plays a vital role in influencing teachers' performance, motivation, and workplace morale. This study examined teachers' perceptions of school leadership styles and their implications for work performance and morale among public integrated schools in the District of Batan. Guided by the need to assess leadership's impact on teacher outcomes, the research addressed four questions: (1) the predominant leadership styles perceived, (2) levels of teacher performance and morale, (3) the significance of relationships between leadership and outcomes, and (4) the style most positively associated with high performance and morale. A quantitative descriptive-correlational research design was employed involving 69 purposively selected teachers from public integrated schools. Data were collected using a validated researcher-made questionnaire administered through Google Forms. The instrument demonstrated excellent internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .907$). Descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, and multiple regression analyses were performed using SPSS version 21. Results revealed that distributed leadership ($M = 4.53$) and transformational leadership ($M = 4.53$) were the most highly perceived leadership styles. Teachers also reported very high levels of work performance (Grand Mean = 4.63), particularly in professional responsibilities ($M = 4.70$), and very high morale (Grand Mean = 4.58), with motivation receiving the highest rating ($M = 4.59$). Significant positive relationships were found between distributed, democratic, servant, constructivist, emotional, and instructional leadership and teachers' work performance and morale ($r = .411-.668, p < .05$). Regression analysis identified distributed leadership as the strongest predictor of professional responsibilities ($\beta = .801, p = .012$) and teacher motivation ($\beta = .923, p = .003$). The findings underscore the importance of collaborative and participatory leadership practices in promoting teacher effectiveness and sustaining high workplace morale. Strengthening distributed leadership in schools is therefore recommended to enhance teacher engagement, professional commitment, and overall school effectiveness.

Introduction

School leadership is widely recognized as one of the most influential school-level factors affecting teaching quality, teacher commitment, and school effectiveness. Effective school leaders establish a shared vision, foster collaborative cultures, support professional learning, and create conditions that enable teachers to perform at high levels. Research has consistently demonstrated that leadership influences teacher effectiveness both directly through instructional support and indirectly through school climate, teacher motivation, and organizational conditions (Hallinger, 2003; Leithwood et al., 2020; Hallinger & Kovačević, 2021).

Contemporary educational leadership has increasingly shifted from traditional hierarchical management toward collaborative and teacher-centered leadership approaches. Among the most widely studied leadership styles are transformational, transactional, distributed, instructional, and laissez-faire leadership. Transformational leadership, first introduced by Burns (1978) and further developed by Bass (1985), emphasizes inspiring a shared vision, fostering

innovation, providing individualized support, and empowering teachers to exceed expected performance. Numerous studies have shown that transformational leadership positively influences teacher commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and overall school improvement (Leithwood et al., 2020). These principles are consistent with Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2020), which explains that individuals perform more effectively when their psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness are fulfilled.

In contrast, transactional leadership focuses on maintaining organizational stability through clearly defined expectations, supervision, rewards, and corrective actions (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985). Although this leadership style has been associated with improved task completion and accountability, researchers suggest that its effectiveness is generally limited to achieving short-term organizational goals because it relies primarily on extrinsic motivation (Hyseni Duraku & Hoxha, 2021). This perspective aligns with Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (Herzberg, 1959), which distinguishes between hygiene factors that prevent dissatisfaction and motivational factors that promote long-term job satisfaction and commitment.

Another leadership style frequently discussed in educational research is laissez-faire leadership, originally described within the leadership framework developed by Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939). Characterized by limited supervision, delayed decision-making, and minimal administrative involvement, laissez-faire leadership has consistently been associated with lower teacher motivation, weak organizational commitment, and reduced instructional effectiveness. Studies indicate that the absence of active leadership often creates uncertainty, diminishes accountability, and weakens collaborative school cultures (Skogstad et al., 2007; Harms et al., 2018).

More recently, distributed leadership has gained prominence as an effective leadership approach in schools. Rather than concentrating authority solely in the school head, distributed leadership encourages teachers and other stakeholders to participate actively in leadership functions and school decision-making (Spillane, 2006). Evidence suggests that distributed leadership strengthens teacher collaboration, professional learning communities, organizational trust, and teacher commitment, thereby contributing to sustained school improvement (Mifsud, 2021; Liu et al., 2021). Likewise, instructional leadership remains essential in improving classroom practices by emphasizing curriculum implementation, teacher supervision, instructional monitoring, and continuous professional development (Hallinger, 2003).

Despite the extensive international literature on educational leadership, relatively few empirical studies have examined how teachers in Philippine public integrated schools perceive different leadership styles and how these perceptions influence their work performance and workplace morale. This gap is particularly evident in the District of Batan, where integrated schools operate under unique organizational structures and leadership demands. Understanding teachers' perceptions of leadership is important because these perceptions shape motivation, professional engagement, instructional practices, and organizational commitment, all of which contribute to overall school effectiveness.

Guided by leadership theories and motivational frameworks, this study examined the relationship between teachers' perceptions of school leadership styles and their work performance and morale in selected public integrated schools in the District of Batan. Specifically, it seeks to identify the leadership styles most commonly perceived by teachers and determine which leadership approaches are significantly associated with higher levels of teacher performance and workplace morale. The findings are expected to provide empirical evidence that can inform leadership development programs, strengthen school management practices, and support policies that promote collaborative, teacher-centered, and effective educational leadership.

Methodology

This study utilized a quantitative descriptive correlational design to examine teachers' perceptions of various school leadership styles and how these perceptions relate to their work performance and morale. This design was appropriate because it allows for measuring the strength and direction of relationships between leadership styles and teacher outcomes without manipulating variables.

Data were analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. Descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation, and frequency distribution were computed to describe the leadership styles and the levels of teachers' work performance and morale. The Pearson correlation was used to assess the relationship between leadership styles and teachers' work performance and morale. Multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the predictive power of different leadership styles on work performance and morale.

The results of the correlational and regression analyses helped identify which leadership styles have the most significant impact on teachers' work performance and morale.

Results and Discussion

Predominant leadership styles perceived by teachers

The findings revealed that transformational leadership ($M = 13.59$, $SD = 1.68$; Converted $M = 4.53$) and distributed leadership ($M = 13.59$, $SD = 1.67$; Converted $M = 4.53$) were the most highly perceived leadership styles, both interpreted as Very Highly Perceived. Approximately 94.20% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their school administrators demonstrated these leadership practices. This finding supports studies showing that transformational and distributed leadership enhance teacher motivation, collaboration, and organizational effectiveness (Leithwood et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2021).

Democratic and constructivist leadership also received Very Highly Perceived ratings (Converted $M = 4.52$), indicating that teachers value participative decision-making, collaboration, and reflective practice. This finding is consistent with research highlighting the positive role of shared leadership in improving teacher efficacy and school improvement (Harris & Jones, 2020).

Servant, emotional, instructional, transactional, and autocratic leadership were all rated Highly Perceived, suggesting that teachers recognize the value of supportive leadership, instructional guidance, and organizational structure. However, laissez-faire leadership obtained the lowest rating ($M = 10.42$, $SD = 3.24$; Converted $M = 3.47$), interpreted as Slightly Perceived, indicating that teachers rarely viewed their administrators as passive or uninvolved. This finding is consistent with recent evidence indicating that laissez-faire leadership is generally associated with lower employee motivation, weaker organizational commitment, reduced collaboration, and poorer organizational performance because of limited leader involvement and decision-making (Backhaus & Vogel, 2022; Kamal et al., 2024).

The grand mean of 4.21 indicates that school administrators were generally perceived as demonstrating Highly Perceived leadership practices. The predominance of transformational and distributed leadership suggests that collaborative, participatory, and empowering leadership approaches are highly valued by teachers and contribute to a positive school environment. These findings highlight the importance of strengthening shared leadership, teacher empowerment, and instructional support to sustain teacher performance and workplace morale (Leithwood et al., 2020).

Leadership Style	<i>f</i>	%	Std. Deviation	Mean	Verbal Description
Transformational					
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	1.68	4.53	Very Highly Perceived
Disagree	0	0.00			
Neutral	4	5.80			
Agree	23	33.33			
Strongly Agree	42	60.87			
TOTAL	69	100			
Transactional					
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	1.74	4.25	Highly Perceived
Disagree	2	2.90			
Neutral	8	11.59			
Agree	30	43.48			
Strongly Agree	29	42.03			
TOTAL	69	100			
Distributed					
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	1.67	4.53	Very Highly Perceived
Disagree	1	1.45			
Neutral	3	4.35			
Agree	24	34.78			
Strongly Agree	41	59.42			
TOTAL	69	100			
Autocratic					
Strongly Disagree	3	4.35	2.19	3.88	Highly Perceived
Disagree	4	5.80			
Neutral	13	18.84			
Agree	28	40.58			

Strongly Agree	21	30.43			
TOTAL	69	100			
Laissez-faire					
Strongly Disagree	6	8.69			
Disagree	12	17.39			
Neutral	13	18.84	3.24	3.47	Lightly Perceived
Agree	20	28.99			
Strongly Agree	18	26.09			
TOTAL	69	100			
Democratic					
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00			
Disagree	1	1.45			
Neutral	4	5.80	1.85	4.52	Very Highly Perceived
Agree	22	31.88			
Strongly Agree	42	60.87			
TOTAL	69	100			
Servant					
Strongly Disagree	1	1.45			
Disagree	1	1.45			
Neutral	4	5.80	1.87	4.48	Highly Perceived
Agree	24	34.78			
Strongly Agree	39	56.52			
TOTAL	69	100			
Constructivist					
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	1.69	4.52	Very Highly Perceived
Disagree	1	1.45			
Neutral	3	4.35			
Agree	25	36.23			
Strongly Agree	40	57.97			
TOTAL	69	100			
Emotional					
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	1.89	4.47	Highly Perceived
Disagree	1	1.45			
Neutral	5	7.25			
Agree	24	34.78			
Strongly Agree	39	56.52			
TOTAL	69	100			
Instructional					
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	1.58	4.47	Highly Perceived
Disagree	1	1.45			
Neutral	4	5.80			
Agree	27	39.13			
Strongly Agree	37	53.62			
TOTAL	69	100			
Grand Mean	4.21	Highly Perceived			

Note: 1 – 1.49 (Not Perceived); 1.50 – 2.49 (Slightly Perceived); 2.50 – 3.49 (Moderately Perceived); 3.50 – 4.49 (Highly Perceived); 4.50 – 5.00 (Very Highly Perceived)

Table 1. Predominant Leadership Style

II. Level of Teachers' Work Performance

Teachers rated their work performance as very high across all areas: Instructional Quality (M = 4.68, SD = .42), Task Completion (M = 4.52, SD = .49), and Professional Responsibilities (M = 4.70, SD = .46). Over 95% of respondents in each category selected "agree" or "strongly agree," indicating strong self-perceived competence, accountability, and professionalism. These findings are consistent with recent studies demonstrating that instructional leadership positively

influences teacher effectiveness, instructional quality, and professional commitment (Leithwood et al., 2020). Likewise, research has shown that collaborative leadership, professional learning communities, and clearly defined professional roles contribute to improved teacher performance and organizational effectiveness (Liu et al., 2021; Mifsud, 2024).

Furthermore, Hallinger and Kovačević (2021) emphasized that effective instructional leadership and continuous professional learning are fundamental to sustaining high teacher performance, while Liu et al. (2021) reported that teacher effectiveness is enhanced in school environments characterized by professional collaboration, teacher autonomy, and supportive leadership.

These findings suggest that schools should continue investing in evidence-based instructional practices, clear performance expectations, and supportive leadership to sustain high teacher performance. Providing structured professional development opportunities and fostering a collaborative school culture can further enhance teacher competence, commitment, and instructional effectiveness (Hallinger & Kovačević, 2021; Mifsud, 2024). Such initiatives ultimately contribute to improved student achievement and overall school effectiveness.

Performance	<i>f</i>	%	Std. Deviation	Mean	Verbal Description
Instructional Quality					
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00			
Disagree	0	0.00			
Neutral	1	1.45	1.23	4.68	Very High
Agree	21	30.43			
Strongly Agree	47	68.12			
TOTAL	69	100			
Task Completion					
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00			
Disagree	0	0.00			
Neutral	3	4.35	1.35	4.52	Very High
Agree	28	40.58			
Strongly Agree	38	55.07			
TOTAL	69	100			
Professional Responsibility					
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00			
Disagree	0	0.00			
Neutral	1	1.45	1.23	4.70	Very High
Agree	20	28.98			
Strongly Agree	48	69.57			
TOTAL	69	100			
Grand Mean				4.63	Very High

Note: 1 – 1.49 (Very Low); 1.50 – 2.49 (Low); 2.50 – 3.49 (Moderate); 3.50 – 4.49 (High); 4.50 – 5.00 (Very High)

Table 2. Level of Teachers' Work Performance

III. Level of Teachers' Morale

Teachers demonstrated very high levels of morale across all indicators, with a grand mean of 4.58. Job satisfaction registered a mean of 4.57 (SD = 1.42), with 97.10% (f = 67) of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing, indicating a strong sense of fulfillment in their roles. This finding is consistent with recent evidence indicating that supportive school leadership, positive organizational relationships, and professional autonomy are among the strongest predictors of teachers' job satisfaction and well-being (Wartenberg et al., 2023; Tria, 2023).

Motivation received the highest mean at 4.59 (SD = 1.48), with 97.10% (f = 67) of respondents expressing positive responses. This finding supports recent studies showing that leadership practices promoting teacher empowerment, collaboration, and supportive working conditions enhance teachers' intrinsic motivation, professional engagement, and overall morale (Hoque et al., 2023; Dreer, 2023).

Organizational commitment matched job satisfaction with a mean of 4.57 (SD = 1.37), and 98.55% ($f = 68$) of teachers expressed strong agreement, suggesting a deep emotional and professional attachment to their schools. Recent reviews have likewise concluded that school environments characterized by supportive leadership, positive interpersonal relationships, and healthy organizational climates strengthen teachers' commitment, well-being, and long-term retention (Cansoy, 2019; Gray et al., 2023).

These findings suggest that school leaders should continue cultivating school environments that recognize teacher contributions, encourage collaboration, and promote professional well-being. Investing in supportive leadership, healthy workplace relationships, and teacher development can strengthen morale, increase organizational commitment, and improve teacher retention and school effectiveness (Wartenberg et al., 2023; Hoque et al., 2023).

Morale	<i>f</i>	%	Std. Deviation	Mean	Verbal Description
Job Satisfaction					
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	1.42338	4.57	Very High
Disagree	0	0.00			
Neutral	2	2.90			
Agree	25	36.23			
Strongly Agree	42	60.87			
TOTAL	69	100			
Motivation					
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	1.47673	4.59	Very High
Disagree	0	0.00			
Neutral	2	4.35			
Agree	24	40.58			
Strongly Agree	43	62.32			
TOTAL	69	100			
Organizational Commitment					
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	1.37075	4.57	Very High
Disagree	0	0.00			
Neutral	1	1.45			
Agree	27	39.13			
Strongly Agree	41	59.42			
TOTAL	69	100			
Grand Mean				4.58	Very High

Note: 1 – 1.49 (Very Low); 1.50 – 2.49 (Low); 2.50 – 3.49 (Moderate); 3.50 – 4.49 (High); 4.50 – 5.00 (Very High)

Table 3. Level of Teachers' Morale

IV. Relationship between Teachers' Perceived Leadership Styles and Work Performance

The results showed that leadership styles impact teacher performance to varying degrees. Transformational leadership had no significant correlation with instructional quality ($r = -.062$, $p = .612$), task completion ($r = .008$, $p = .951$), or professional responsibilities ($r = -.018$, $p = .886$), indicating minimal influence, consistent with recent studies suggesting that the effectiveness of transformational leadership varies across school contexts (Bellibaş et al., 2021).

Transactional leadership showed moderate, significant positive correlations with instructional quality ($r = .260$, $p = .031$), task completion ($r = .330$, $p = .006$), and professional responsibilities ($r = .413$, $p = .000$).

Strong and consistent positive correlations were found for distributed ($r = .468$ – $.582$, $p = .000$), democratic ($r = .445$ – $.558$, $p = .000$), servant ($r = .445$ – $.543$, $p = .000$), constructivist ($r = .440$ – $.539$, $p = .000$), emotional ($r = .411$ – $.495$, $p = .000$), and instructional leadership ($r = .451$ – $.486$, $p = .000$), supporting recent evidence that collaborative leadership enhances teacher performance, teacher efficacy, and instructional effectiveness (Hallinger & Kovačević, 2021; Mifsud, 2024).

Autocratic leadership showed weak but significant correlations with task completion ($r = .254$, $p = .035$) and professional responsibilities ($r = .272$, $p = .024$), but none with instructional quality ($r = .132$, $p = .280$). Laissez-faire leadership had no significant correlations ($r = .110$ – $.226$, $p > .05$).

These findings suggest that school leaders should adopt collaborative and supportive styles—particularly distributed, democratic, and servant leadership—to enhance teacher performance and morale (Hallinger & Kovačević, 2021; Mifsud, 2024).

Leadership style	Instructional Quality (r)	Sig. (p)	Task Completion (r)	Sig. (p)	Professional Responsibilities (r)	Sig. (p)
Transformational	-.062	.612	.008	.951	-.018	.886
Transactional	.260	.031	.330	.006	.413	.000
Distributed	.468	.000	.459	.000	.582	.000
Autocratic	.132	.280	.254	.035	.272	.024
Laissez-faire	.110	.369	.226	.062	.156	.201
Democratic	.448	.000	.445	.000	.558	.000
Servant	.445	.000	.493	.000	.543	.000
Constructivist	.440	.000	.478	.000	.539	.000
Emotional	.448	.000	.411	.000	.495	.000
Instructional	.451	.000	.459	.000	.486	.000

Table 4. Relationship between Teachers' Perceived Leadership Styles and Work Performance

V. Relationship between Teachers' Perceived Leadership Styles and Morale

The data revealed that leadership style significantly affects teacher job satisfaction, motivation, and organizational commitment. Transformational leadership showed weak, non-significant correlations (e.g., job satisfaction $r = .070$, $p = .567$), differing from recent findings suggesting that the effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes depend on contextual and organizational factors (Leithwood et al., 2020; Hallinger & Kovačević, 2021).

Transactional leadership had moderate, significant correlations (job satisfaction $r = .603$, $p = .000$), reinforcing its motivational value through clearly defined expectations, supervision, and rewards (Hyseni Duraku & Hoxha, 2021).

Strongest effects were observed in distributed ($r = .651$ – $.659$), democratic ($r = .553$ – $.667$), servant ($r = .597$ – $.668$), constructivist ($r = .529$ – $.668$), emotional ($r = .534$ – $.574$), and instructional leadership ($r = .540$ – $.624$), supporting recent evidence that collaborative and instructional leadership practices strengthen teacher job satisfaction, motivation, organizational commitment, and overall morale (Hallinger & Kovačević, 2021; Mifsud, 2024).

Autocratic leadership showed small but significant effects on job satisfaction ($r = .327$, $p = .006$) and commitment ($r = .320$, $p = .007$), while laissez-faire leadership had no significant impact, consistent with research indicating that passive leadership is generally ineffective in promoting teacher engagement and organizational commitment (Backhaus & Vogel, 2022; Kamal et al., 2024).

These findings underscore the importance of participatory and empowering leadership styles—particularly distributed, democratic, servant, and instructional—for promoting teacher morale and retention (Hallinger & Kovačević, 2021; Mifsud, 2024).

Leadership style	Instructional Quality (r)	Sig. (p)	Task Completion (r)	Sig. (p)	Professional Responsibilities (r)	Sig. (p)
Transformational	.070	.567	.068	.576	.044	.718
Transactional	.603	.000	.419	.000	.410	.000
Distributed	.651	.000	.659	.000	.586	.000
Autocratic	.327	.006	.234	.053	.320	.007
Laissez-faire	.188	.121	.125	.305	.169	.165
Democratic	.667	.000	.607	.000	.553	.000
Servant	.668	.000	.605	.000	.597	.000
Constructivist	.668	.000	.587	.000	.529	.000
Emotional	.574	.000	.568	.000	.534	.000
Instructional	.624	.000	.569	.000	.540	.000

Table 5. Relationship between Teachers' Perceived Leadership Styles and Morale

VI. Most associated leadership style with high work performance

Instructional Quality

None of the leadership styles significantly predicted instructional quality, but distributed leadership showed the strongest positive effect ($\beta = .456$, $p = .195$), suggesting it might help improve instruction even if the effect was not statistically significant. This fits with Hallinger and Kovačević (2021) and Mifsud (2024), who found that distributed leadership strengthens teacher collaboration, shared responsibility, and professional learning, which can enhance teaching and instructional improvement. Other styles, such as transformational and transactional leadership, had small negative, non-significant effects, possibly because their influence on instructional quality depends on contextual factors such as school culture, organizational support, and teacher learning (Leithwood et al., 2020; Hallinger & Kovačević, 2021).

Schools should focus on encouraging distributed leadership by involving teachers in decision-making and sharing responsibilities to improve instructional quality. Relying only on traditional top-down leadership may not be enough. More research is needed to explore how leadership influences teaching indirectly through teacher motivation, professional collaboration, and the overall school environment (Mifsud, 2024; Leithwood et al., 2020).

Predictor (Leadership style)	B	Standard error	Beta	t	Sig.
Transformational	-.029	.031	-.116	-.940	.351
Transactional	-.151	.167	-.213	-.900	.372
Distributed	.336	.256	.456	1.312	.195
Autocratic	-.018	.128	-.031	-.137	.891
Laissez-faire	.056	.079	.147	.706	.483
Democratic	.115	.197	.174	.585	.561
Servant	-.026	.272	-.040	-.096	.923
Constructivist	-.009	.280	-.012	-.030	.976
Emotional	-.006	.193	-.010	-.033	.974
Instructional	.077	.241	.099	.317	.752

Table 6. Linear Regression Analysis on Instructional Quality

Task Completion

None of the leadership styles significantly predicted task completion, though transactional leadership showed the strongest negative effect ($\beta = -.352$, $p = .134$), suggesting that rigid, compliance-based approaches may hinder performance, consistent with findings that transactional leadership alone may be insufficient to sustain teacher motivation and long-term performance (Hyseni Duraku & Hoxha, 2021). In contrast, distributed leadership had a positive but non-significant effect ($\beta = .337$, $p = .326$), hinting at potential benefits from shared responsibility, teacher collaboration, and professional engagement (Mifsud, 2024; Hallinger & Kovačević, 2021). These results suggested that overreliance on transactional leadership may reduce task effectiveness, while fostering distributed practices may better support teacher initiative. Further study should explore how teacher motivation, professional collaboration, and school climate mediate these effects (Leithwood et al., 2020; Hallinger & Kovačević, 2021).

Predictor (Leadership style)	B	Standard error	Beta	t	Sig.
Transformational	-.006	.033	-.022	-.180	.858
Transactional	-.273	.179	-.352	-1.522	.134
Distributed	.272	.275	.337	.991	.326
Autocratic	.065	.137	.106	.477	.635
Laissez-faire	.083	.084	.200	.982	.330
Democratic	.072	.211	.099	.340	.735
Servant	.227	.291	.317	.782	.438
Constructivist	.215	.300	.271	.717	.476
Emotional	-.220	.206	-.309	-1.068	.290
Instructional	-.020	.258	-.024	-.079	.938

Table 7. Linear Regression Analysis on Task Completion

Professional Responsibilities

Distributed leadership significantly predicted professional responsibilities ($\beta = .801, p = .012$), indicating that sharing leadership roles strongly encourages teachers to take ownership of their professional duties. This supports Hallinger and Kovačević (2021) and Mifsud (2024), who emphasized that distributed leadership fosters teacher responsibility, collaboration, professional learning, and engagement. Democratic leadership showed a positive trend nearing significance ($\beta = .498, p = .065$), suggesting that participative leadership styles may also boost professional commitment, consistent with Leithwood et al. (2020), who reported that collaborative and instructional leadership positively influence teacher commitment, professional learning, and school improvement.

Other leadership styles, including transformational, transactional, and instructional, did not significantly predict professional responsibilities, indicating that collaborative and inclusive approaches may be more effective in promoting teacher professionalism.

This implied that schools should prioritize distributed and democratic leadership models to enhance teacher accountability and active involvement in their professional roles. Encouraging shared decision-making and participation can strengthen teacher commitment and improve overall school performance (Hallinger & Kovačević, 2021; Mifsud, 2024).

Predictor (Leadership style)	B	Standard error	Beta	t	Sig.
Transformational	-.028	.028	-.112	-1.011	.316
Transactional	-.087	.149	-.123	-.584	.561
Distributed	.589	.228	.801	2.583	.012
Autocratic	.057	.114	.101	.496	.622
Laissez-faire	.045	.070	.119	.641	.524
Democratic	.330	.176	.498	1.879	.065
Servant	-.026	.242	-.039	-.106	.916
Constructivist	.019	.249	.026	.075	.941
Emotional	-.201	.171	-.310	-1.173	.245
Instructional	-.255	.215	-.329	-1.188	.240

Table 8. Linear Regression Analysis on Professional Responsibilities

VII. Most associated leadership style with high morale

Job Satisfaction

No leadership style significantly predicted job satisfaction, though democratic leadership showed a marginally significant positive effect ($\beta = .421, p = .084$), implying it may contribute to positive teacher attitudes. This aligns with Hallinger and Kovačević (2021) and Mifsud (2024), who found that participative and distributed leadership enhances teacher job satisfaction through shared decision-making, collaboration, and professional empowerment.

This implied that school leaders should consider adopting more democratic leadership approaches to foster higher levels of teacher job satisfaction. By involving teachers in decision-making processes and valuing their input, leaders can create a more inclusive and supportive environment that may enhance staff morale and retention. Even if the effect is not yet statistically significant, the observed trend suggests practical value that merits further investigation (Leithwood et al., 2020; Hallinger & Kovačević, 2021).

Predictor (Leadership style)	B	Standard error	Beta	t	Sig.
Transformational	-.019	.029	-.067	-.672	.504
Transactional	.186	.156	.226	1.190	.239
Distributed	.315	.239	.369	1.318	.193
Autocratic	.022	.120	.033	.180	.858
Laissez-faire	-.008	.074	-.017	-.104	.917
Democratic	.323	.184	.421	1.757	.084
Servant	-6.993E-005	.253	.000	.000	1.000

Constructivist	.108	.261	.129	.414	.680
Emotional	-.239	.180	-.317	-1.330	.189
Instructional	-.052	.225	-.058	-.233	.816

Table 9. Linear Regression Analysis on Job Satisfaction

Motivation

Distributed leadership significantly predicted teacher motivation ($\beta = .923$, $p = .003$), suggesting that shared leadership strongly boosts teacher drive and engagement. This supports Hallinger and Kovačević (2021) and Mifsud (2024), who emphasized that empowering teachers through distributed leadership strengthens intrinsic motivation, professional learning, teacher collaboration, and engagement. Other styles, including democratic and laissez-faire, showed positive but non-significant effects.

This implied that school leaders should actively implement distributed leadership practices to enhance teacher motivation. By sharing responsibilities and empowering staff in decision-making and instructional roles, administrators can foster a sense of ownership and autonomy. This approach not only builds trust but also drives greater engagement and initiative among teachers, as supported by empirical evidence on distributed leadership and teacher empowerment (Hallinger & Kovačević, 2021; Mifsud, 2024).

Predictor (Leadership style)	B	Standard error	Beta	t	Sig.
Transformational	-.006	.031	-.022	-.207	.837
Transactional	-.133	.170	-.156	-.784	.436
Distributed	.818	.260	.923	3.148	.003
Autocratic	-.025	.130	-.036	-.190	.850
Laissez-faire	.088	.080	.192	1.094	.279
Democratic	.292	.200	.366	1.460	.150
Servant	.042	.275	.053	.153	.879
Constructivist	-.144	.284	-.131	-.403	.688
Emotional	-.199	.195	-.255	-1.022	.311
Instructional	-.177	.244	-.190	-.725	.471

Table 10. Linear Regression Analysis on Motivation

Organizational Commitment

No leadership style reached significance, but servant leadership showed a strong positive trend ($\beta = .630$, $p = .091$), suggesting it may foster commitment by supporting teachers' well-being, consistent with recent evidence that people-centered and supportive leadership practices strengthen teacher commitment, professional well-being, and positive work attitudes (Leithwood et al., 2020; Hallinger & Kovačević, 2021). Distributed leadership also showed a meaningful, though non-significant, positive impact ($\beta = .476$, $p = .128$).

Although not statistically significant, the positive trends suggest that servant and distributed leadership may enhance teachers' organizational commitment. Leaders who prioritize teacher well-being (servant leadership) or foster collaboration and shared responsibility (distributed leadership) can potentially build stronger loyalty and dedication among staff. Schools may benefit from integrating these approaches to cultivate a more committed and resilient teaching workforce (Mifsud, 2024; Hallinger & Kovačević, 2021).

Predictor (Leadership style)	B	Standard error	Beta	t	Sig.
Transformational	-.021	.031	-.076	-.688	.494
Transactional	-.187	.165	-.237	-1.132	.262
Distributed	.392	.253	.476	1.546	.128
Autocratic	.163	.127	.259	1.283	.205
Laissez-faire	-.006	.078	-.014	-.074	.941
Democratic	.119	.195	.161	.612	.543
Servant	.461	.268	.630	1.717	.091

Constructivist	-.306	.277	-.378	-1.105	.274
Emotional	-.091	.190	-.125	-.476	.636
Instructional	-.048	.238	-.056	-.203	.840

Table 11. Linear Regression Analysis on Organizational Commitment

Conclusion and Recommendations

Teacher perceptions predominantly favor collaborative and shared leadership styles, including distributed, transformational, and democratic approaches, which are linked to increased teacher engagement and positive morale.

The study examined the influence of various leadership styles on teacher motivation, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and professional responsibilities.

Distributed leadership emerged as the most impactful style, highlighting the significance of shared decision-making and accountability. Transactional leadership showed moderate perception with mixed effects, indicating that while structured, reward-based approaches may enhance motivation, they could also restrict creativity and autonomy if overused. Transformational leadership had minimal influence on teacher performance and morale in this context, potentially due to the lack of institutional support or alignment with collaborative school cultures. Autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles were found to be less effective, with laissez-faire particularly associated with low engagement and morale. Overall, teacher work performance and morale were rated very high, reflecting a supportive environment that values professionalism, autonomy, and recognition.

The findings emphasize that inclusive and participatory leadership practices are crucial for maintaining high teacher performance and morale, primarily by empowering teachers and fostering a collaborative school culture.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank the colleagues and institutions who provided guidance, feedback, and support throughout the conduct of this research and the preparation of this manuscript. Any remaining errors or omissions are the sole responsibility of the author.

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 author declares that he has 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

- Backhaus, L., & Vogel, R. (2022). Leadership in the public sector: A meta-analysis of styles, outcomes, contexts, and methods. *Public Administration Review*, 82(6), 986–1003. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13516>
- Cansoy, R. (2019). The relationship between school principals' leadership behaviours and teachers' job satisfaction: A systematic review. *International Education Studies*, 12(1), 37–52. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v12n1p37>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum Press. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7>
- Dreer, B. (2023). On the outcomes of teacher wellbeing: A systematic review of research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1205179. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1205179>

- Gray, P., Senabe, S., Naicker, N., Kgalamono, S., Yassi, A., & Spiegel, J. M. (2023). A systematic review of the factors that influence teachers' occupational wellbeing. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(12), 6070. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20126070>
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 329–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764032000122005>
- Hallinger, P., & Kovačević, J. (2021). Science mapping the knowledge base in educational leadership and management: A longitudinal bibliometric analysis, 1960–2018. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(1), 5–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219859002>
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2020). COVID-19 – School leadership in disruptive times. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(4), 243–247. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2020.1811479>
- Harms, P. D., Credé, M., Tynan, M., Leon, M., & Jeung, W. (2017). Leadership and stress: A meta-analytic review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(1), 178–194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.10.006>
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons. <https://books.google.com/books?id=7IQJAAAAIAAJ>
- Hoque, K. E., Wang, X., Qi, Y., & colleagues. (2023). The factors associated with teachers' job satisfaction and their impacts on students' achievement: A review (2010–2021). *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10, Article 177. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01645-7>
- Kamal, F., Ridwan, & Kesuma, T. A. R. P. (2024). Laissez-faire leadership: A comprehensive systematic review for effective education practices. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 18(4), 1460–1467. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v18i4.21407>
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 10(2), 271–299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1939.9713366>
- Liu, Y., Bellibaş, M. Ş., & Gümüş, S. (2021). The effect of instructional leadership and distributed leadership on teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Mediating roles of supportive school culture and teacher collaboration. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(3), 430–453. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220910438>
- Mifsud, D. (2024). A systematic review of school distributed leadership: Exploring research purposes, concepts and approaches in the field between 2010 and 2022. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 56(2), 154–179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2022.2158181>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>
- Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S., & Hetland, H. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12(1), 80–92. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.1.80>
- Tria, J. Z. (2023). Job satisfaction among educators: A systematic review. *International Journal of Professional Development, Learners and Learning*, 5(2), ep2310. <https://doi.org/10.30935/ijpdl/13212>
- Wartenberg, G., Aldrup, K., Grund, S., & Klusmann, U. (2023). Satisfied and high performing? A meta-analysis and systematic review of the correlates of teachers' job satisfaction. *Educational Psychology Review*, 35, Article 114. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09831-4>

Appendices

No appendices are attached to this study.