

School Heads' Leadership Styles and Teachers Teaching Performance: Its Influence on Effective Instructions

Micky M. Soria, Jennifer S. Rubio, PhD

Mabini Colleges, Incorporated, Daet, Camarines Norte 4600, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.11090027>

Received: 16 September 2026; Accepted: 21 September 2026; Published: 03 October 2026

ABSTRACT

This study determined the perceived leadership styles of school heads, assessed teachers' teaching performance, examined the relationship between leadership styles and teaching performance, and proposed an intervention for effective instruction in public elementary schools in Daet North District, Division of Camarines Norte, during School Year 2025–2026. A quantitative descriptive-correlational research design was employed. A total of 366 teachers and master teachers participated in the assessment of school heads' leadership styles, while 117 respondents consented to the use of their Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) records. The leadership-style assessment was based on 366 respondents, whereas the correlation analysis was conducted using the 117 matched cases with both leadership-style and IPCRF data. Data were gathered through an adopted questionnaire and actual IPCRF records. Weighted mean, frequency, percentage, and Spearman's rank correlation coefficient were used for data analysis. All six leadership styles were rated "Strongly Agree," with instructional leadership obtaining the highest weighted mean of 3.61, followed by democratic leadership at 3.58 and delegative leadership at 3.57. Servant leadership obtained the lowest weighted mean of 3.44. Content Knowledge and Pedagogy had the highest proportion of Outstanding ratings at 97.44%, while Curriculum Planning, Assessment and Reporting and Personal Growth and Professional Development had the lowest proportions at 70.94% each. Significant weak negative associations were found between Community Linkages and Professional Engagement and five leadership styles: autocratic, democratic, instructional, servant, and delegative. Transformational leadership showed no significant association with any IPCRF domain. Based on the identified leadership indicators and performance areas, a three-day seminar-workshop on effective instruction was proposed to strengthen instructional support, professional development, and identified areas for improvement.

Keywords: leadership styles, teaching performance, instructional leadership, PPST, school heads, instructional effectiveness, descriptive-correlational research.

INTRODUCTION

Leadership is an essential factor in the success of educational institutions because it directly influences teacher performance, school climate, and student achievement. School heads serve as instructional leaders who guide teachers, manage school operations, and ensure that educational goals are effectively achieved. The way school leaders exercise their authority and interact with teachers significantly affects the quality of instruction and the overall learning environment within the school. Because of this, leadership styles have become an important area of study in educational management and administration.

Different leadership styles are practiced in schools depending on the approach and management strategies of school heads. These include autocratic, democratic, instructional, transformational, delegative, and servant leadership. Each leadership style carries distinct characteristics that may positively or negatively influence teachers' motivation, job satisfaction, professional growth, and teaching effectiveness. Instructional leadership focuses on improving teaching and learning through supervision and professional support, while democratic leadership promotes collaboration and shared decision-making. Transformational leadership inspires teachers toward innovation and growth, whereas servant leadership emphasizes support and empowerment. In contrast, autocratic leadership relies on authority and control, while delegative leadership allows teachers greater

autonomy in performing their tasks.

In the Philippine educational system, teachers are expected to demonstrate competence and professionalism guided by the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). Their performance is evaluated through the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF), which measures teachers' effectiveness across various domains such as content knowledge, pedagogy, learning environment, curriculum planning, assessment, community engagement, and professional development. School heads play a vital role in supporting teachers in achieving these standards through effective leadership practices and instructional supervision.

Despite existing educational reforms and professional development programs, schools continue to face challenges that affect both leadership and instructional performance. Administrative workload, limited resources, increasing educational demands, and the need for stronger stakeholder engagement continue to influence the quality of teaching and school management. These challenges highlight the importance of understanding how leadership styles influence teachers' teaching performance and instructional effectiveness.

This study examined the relationship between school heads' leadership styles and teachers' teaching performance in the Daet North District for School Year 2025–2026. Specifically, it focused on determining the dominant leadership styles exhibited by school heads, assessing teachers' teaching performance along the PPST domains, and identifying whether a significant relationship exists between leadership styles and teaching performance. The findings of the study may provide valuable insights for school heads, teachers, and educational stakeholders in strengthening leadership practices, enhancing instructional effectiveness, and improving the overall quality of education.

METHODOLOGY

The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design. The respondents were teachers and master teachers from 14 public elementary schools in Daet North District, Division of Camarines Norte. A total of 366 teachers and master teachers participated in the assessment of the perceived leadership styles of school heads. An adopted questionnaire was used to gather data on six leadership styles: autocratic, democratic, instructional, transformational, servant, and delegative leadership.

For the assessment of teachers' teaching performance, 117 of the 366 respondents consented to the use of their Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) records. Thus, the descriptive analysis of leadership styles was based on the 366 respondents, whereas the descriptive analysis of IPCRF ratings was based on the 117 respondents whose records were available and whose consent was obtained. The analysis of the relationship between leadership styles and teaching performance was conducted using the matched 117 cases for whom both leadership-style responses and IPCRF performance data were available.

Frequency counts, percentages, and weighted means were used to describe the respondents' assessments and teaching performance ratings. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient (Spearman's rho) was used to determine the direction, strength, and statistical significance of the association between school heads' leadership styles and teachers' teaching performance. Spearman's rho was considered appropriate because the data did not satisfy the assumption of normality and the variables were treated as ordinal or non-normally distributed measures. The correlation analysis was interpreted as an assessment of statistical association and was not used to establish a causal relationship between leadership styles and teaching performance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Leadership Styles of School Heads in Daet North District.

Leadership styles refer to the management approaches and skills demonstrated by school heads in carrying out their roles and responsibilities as stewards of the school. The way they led, supervised, and made decisions significantly influenced the overall performance of the institution. Effective leadership contributed to the quality of learning experienced by their clientele, particularly the students. Also, the success of various school

endeavors, such as academic competitions, school programs, and institutional activities, was often attributed to the leadership and management capabilities of the school head. Ensuring safety, maintaining order, and promoting a positive learning environment within the school also depended largely on the ability of the school head to effectively manage and guide the institution toward achieving its educational goals.

Autocratic. This refers to a style in which the school head holds full control and authority over decision-making, allowing minimal or no input from teachers or other staff. The table below shows the data gathered from 366 respondents, including school heads and teachers of the Daet North District. Their responses indicated the type of leadership demonstrated by their school heads.

Table 1 presents the autocratic leadership style of School Heads in Daet North District. The data show that Indicator 6, which gives orders and clarifies procedures, obtained the highest weighted mean of 3.62, interpreted as strongly agree. In contrast, Indicator 4, gives rewards and punishment to motivate the achievement of organizational objectives, received the lowest weighted mean of 3.10, interpreted also as agree. The overall weighted mean for autocratic leadership is 3.48, indicating that this leadership style is present among school heads and is strongly agreed upon by the respondents

The indicator with the highest weighted mean implies that school heads in the Daet North District typically provide clear directions to teachers, provide updates on newly released DepEd Orders, which helps maintain order and organization within the school. The school head informs teachers during faculty meetings important matters, such as submitting reports on time, adhering to class schedules, and following school rules and regulations as prescribed by the Department of Education. Through meetings, the school head guides ensure that teachers understand their responsibilities and that school operations run smoothly.

However, the indicator with the lowest weighted mean rewards and punishments are less emphasized, implying an area where the school head needs to improve. School heads tend to rely more on guidance than on strict control. In cases where teachers fail to follow instructions, such as submitting reports late or being frequently tardy, the school head calls their attention, offers guidance, and reminds them of their responsibilities. To reward teachers' accomplishments, these were recognized during the Teachers' Day Celebration, through the strengthening of Project PRAISE, or even through simple programs that acknowledge their achievements.

Table 1. Autocratic Leadership Style of the School Heads

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
The school heads...		
1. supervise and monitor us closely	3.57	SA
2. retain the final decision-making authority within our school.	3.52	SA
3. exercise full authority in leading us.	3.45	SA
4. give rewards and punishments to motivate the achievement of organizational objectives.	3.1	A
5. are the primary assessor of our achievements and accomplishments.	3.60	SA
6. give orders and clarifies procedures.	3.62	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	3.48	SA

Legend: 1.00-1.74 = Strongly Disagree (SD) 1.75-2.49 = Disagree (D)); 2.50-3.24 = Agree (A)); 3.25-4.00 = Strongly Agree (SA)

This approach helps maintain discipline and consistency while still allowing teachers some flexibility in carrying out their tasks, fostering a balance between structure and autonomy. This allows some flexibility in how teachers manage their work, while still maintaining discipline and order. As a result, teachers can perform their duties with a sense of direction while also feeling trusted in handling their task.

The findings were supported by Kusumaningrum et al. (2020), who highlighted the important role of principals in improving the quality of education. By giving clear instructions, creating a positive learning environment, and putting in place policies that help students learn, school heads can strengthen teaching and improve student outcomes. The results also suggest that while an autocratic leadership style helps keep order and consistency, combining it with more collaborative approaches like recognizing teachers' efforts and involving them in decision-making can further boost teacher motivation, engagement, and overall effectiveness in the classroom.

Democratic. This leadership refers to a style in which the school head actively seeks input from teachers, values their professional experiences, and encourages their participation in decision-making processes. Table 2 shows the Democratic leadership style of School Heads in Daet North District. The data show that Indicators 1 and 3, which believe that working together has greater potential than working individually and allow them to work optimally and foster a flexible work environment, were the highest-rated indicators with a weighted mean of 3.63, both interpreted as strongly agree. Conversely, Indicator 5, receptive to ideas and advice from us, received the lowest weighted mean of 3.51, interpreted as strongly agree. The overall weighted mean for democratic leadership is 3.58, indicating that this leadership style is present and observed among the school heads of the Daet North District and strongly agreed upon by the respondents.

Table 2. Democratic Leadership Style of the School Heads

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
The school heads...		
1. believe that working together has greater potential than working individually.	3.63	SA
2. is transparent and includes stake holders and students in decision-making process.	3.54	SA
3. allow us to work optimally and fosters a flexible work environment.	3.63	SA
4. create an environment where we take ownership of the work or project.	3.58	SA
5. is receptive to ideas and advice from us.	3.51	SA
6. encourage us to use our creativity and ingenuity to solve organizational problems.	3.57	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	3.58	SA

Legend: 1.00-1.74 = Strongly Disagree (SD) 1.75-2.49 = Disagree (D)); 2.50-3.24 = Agree (A)); 3.25-4.00 = Strongly Agree (SA)

where decisions are made collectively by its members, which serves as a platform for teachers, staff, and administrators to share ideas, discuss policies, and contribute to school planning and program implementation. This can be illustrated through the crafting of a school implementation plan, wherein school heads, teachers, parents, and other stakeholders work together to plan programs that best serve the needs of the institution. This demonstrates how collaborative efforts and shared responsibilities support the successful implementation of school programs. This approach ensures that decisions reflect the collective input of stakeholders and fosters a sense of ownership and accountability within the school community. However, in the indicator with the lowest weighted mean, on receptiveness to teachers' ideas suggests that, although collaboration is encouraged, teachers may still have limited opportunities to influence decision-making, particularly on administrative matters. This is evident during faculty meetings, where the school principal relays information received from higher authorities. Teachers tend to receive the information rather than actively contributing to decisions or making changes regarding it.

The finding was corroborated by Eckardt et al. (2021), who stated that leaders who encourage participation, share knowledge, and promote collaboration create an environment that fosters innovation and adaptability. Similarly, Rose and Celistino (2024) found that principals who used participative, democratic, or instructional leadership approaches positively influenced teachers' performance. Teachers working under supportive and interactive leaders demonstrated better teaching effectiveness, improved classroom management, and stronger

professional responsibility.

Instructional. This leadership refers to the actions of the school head aimed at improving teaching and learning by providing professional development opportunities, offering pedagogical guidance, and supporting teachers in enhancing classroom instruction. Table 3 presents the Instructional leadership styles of school heads in the Daet North District. The data shows that Indicator 1, make sure that our priorities in the classroom align with the goals and direction set by the school and department, was rated the highest indicator, with a weighted mean of 3.70, interpreted as strongly agree. On the other hand, Indicator 6, visit classrooms to discuss school matters with teachers and students, received the lowest weighted mean of 3.52, and was interpreted as strongly agree. The overall weighted mean for the leadership style of school heads in the Daet

North District along instructional is 3.61, indicating that this leadership style is evident and strongly agreed upon by the respondents.

Table 3. Instructional Leadership Style of the School Heads

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
The school heads...		
1. make sure that our priorities in the classroom are to align with the goals and direction set by the school and department.	3.7	SA
2. engages us in discussions about academic performance results to pinpoint the strength and weakness of the curriculum.	3.65	SA
3. proactively promote the application of skills learned during in-service training in the classroom.	3.63	SA
4. actively assists us in acknowledging and rewarding student contributions and achievements in the classroom.	6.53	SA
5. motivate us to use instructional time for teaching and practicing new skills and concepts.	3.61	SA
6. visits classroom to discuss school matters with teachers and student.	3.52	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	3.61	SA

Legend: 1.00-1.74 = Strongly Disagree (SD) 1.75-2.49 = Disagree (D)); 2.50-3.24 = Agree (A)); 3.25-4.00 = Strongly Agree (SA)

The indicator with the highest weighted mean implies that school heads in the Daet North District are effective in ensuring that classroom activities align with the goals of the school and the Department. One of the primary objectives of classroom instruction is to develop globally competitive and competent student leaders. This is evident through teachers' implementation of school programs and classroom activities that support the school's goals, such as integrating the school's vision, mission, and core values into daily instruction and learning activities. This practice implies that teachers are guided to align their actions with institutional rules and directions. However, in the indicator with the lowest weighted mean, visiting classrooms to discuss school matters with teachers and students, implies that this practice is not commonly implemented. Important matters are often addressed in the principal's office or the guidance office rather than directly in the classroom. This implies an opportunity for school heads to increase hands-on engagement and direct communication with both teachers and students to enhance instructional support and collaboration.

The findings were conformed by Karim et al. (2020), who emphasized that principals' ability to manage the curriculum and foster a positive school climate contributes significantly to teachers' confidence and effectiveness. Similarly, Wang and Villanueva (2024) found that effective leadership practices enhance teachers' motivation, commitment, and job satisfaction, leading to a more engaged and productive teaching environment. These authors also highlighted the importance of structured mentorship programs that pair experienced teachers with less experienced ones to promote guidance, professional growth, and knowledge sharing, particularly among younger female teachers.

Transformational. This refers to the style in which the school head inspired teachers by communicating a shared vision, modeled core values, and motivated staff to achieve long-term growth and positive change in teaching and learning. Table 4 presents the Transformational leadership style of school heads in Daet North District. The data show that Indicator 6, support experimentation, creation, innovation, and collaboration in learning, was the highest-rated indicator, with a weighted mean of 3.59, interpreted as strongly agree. Conversely, indicator 3, rarely gives direction or guidance to us, if she/he senses we can achieve our goal, received the lowest weighted mean of 3.37, interpreted as strongly agree. The overall weighted mean of 3.48 for the leadership style of school heads in the Daet North District, along with transformational, indicating that this type of leadership is present and strongly agreed upon by the respondents.

Table 4. Transformational Leadership Style of the School Heads

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
The school heads...		
1. Enable us to think about old problems from fresh perspectives.	3.42	SA
2. Challenge us to achieve our full potential.	3.51	SA
3. Rarely give direction or guidance to us if they sense we can achieve our goal.	3.37	SA
4. Regularly give us coaching and feedback to help us understand our progress.	3.45	SA
5. Help us with our self-development.	3.51	SA
6. Support experimentation, creation, innovation, and collaboration in learning.	3.59	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	3.48	SA

Legend: 1.00-1.74 = Strongly Disagree (SD) 1.75-2.49 = Disagree (D)); 2.50-3.24 = Agree (A)); 3.25-4.00 = Strongly Agree (SA)

The indicator with the highest weighted mean implies that school heads in Daet North District generally demonstrate a strong transformational leadership style, particularly in fostering an environment that encourages experimentation, innovation, and collaborative learning among teachers and students. They encourage teachers to create activities that support innovation, creativity, and active student engagement. This is evident in their participation in academic competitions organized by the Division Office, which foster innovation and collaboration among students, such as research competitions STEMazing, and other related activities.

On the other hand, in the indicator with the lowest weighted mean implies that the school head trusts the abilities of competent teachers and allows them to work independently, providing guidance only when necessary. Meanwhile, teachers who are less responsible or require additional support receive closer supervision. This is evident among newly hired teachers, as school heads closely supervise their classroom teaching. Likewise, the school head serves as a mentor during the Induction Program for Beginning Teachers, wherein teachers accomplish a set of activities, while the school head conducts monitoring and evaluation. This approach reflects a leadership style that balances empowerment with accountability, ensuring that all teachers are supported according to their needs.

These findings were supported by Barnová et al. (2022), which highlighted the impact of leadership styles on interpersonal relationships and organizational outcomes. The researchers concluded that leadership is not only about guiding organizational performance but also about building positive and productive relationships within the workplace. Leaders who adopt supportive and participatory approaches tend to strengthen trust and collaboration among team members, which in turn improves performance outcomes. Conversely, negative leadership practices can lead to strained relationships, reduced morale, and inefficiency. This supports the observation that school heads in the Daet North District emphasize collaborative and participatory leadership

practices to promote both teacher performance and a healthy organizational environment.

Moreover, Operario (2024) affirmed the findings, showing that principals demonstrated highly evident leadership practices, while teachers consistently attained very satisfactory performance ratings. Furthermore, the study highlighted that the combination of leadership styles among school heads significantly influences teachers' work performance, underscoring the importance of effective leadership in improving instructional outcomes.

Delegative. This refers to the style in which the school head allows teachers the freedom to make decisions and complete tasks independently, while providing support and resources when needed. This style emphasized trust, autonomy, and empowering teachers to take responsibility for their work.

Table 5 presents the Delegative leadership styles of school heads in Daet North District. The data show that Indicator 1, let us do work at our own pace allows us to appraise it, was the highest indicator with a weighted mean of 3.61, interpreted as strongly agree. In contrast, Indicator 3 ranked the lowest, which allows teachers to vote whenever a major decision must be made, with a weighted mean of 3.51, interpreted as strongly agree. The overall weighted mean score for leadership style of school heads in Daet North District along delegative is 3.57, indicating that this type of leadership style is evident among school heads of the Daet North District and strongly agreed upon by the respondents.

The indicator with the highest weighted mean is that school heads in the Daet North District generally practice a strong delegative leadership style. They trust teachers to work at their own pace and manage their tasks independently. This is evident in the delegation of responsibilities, such as assigning Grade Level Chairpersons to coordinate tasks among teachers and other coordinators, where teachers carry out their duties according to the assigned tasks within the required time frame.

Table 5. Delegative Leadership Style of the School Heads

No.	Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1	Let us do our work at our own pace and allows us to appraise it.	3.61	SA
2	Emphasize the importance of quality, allowing us to establish control standards.	3.57	SA
3	Allows us to vote whenever a major decision must be made.	3.51	SA
4	Delegates tasks to implement a new procedure or process.	3.56	SA
5	Let us think ahead and develop strategic long-term plans.	3.56	SA
6	Allows us the right to determine our organizational objectives.	3.6	SA
Overall Weighted Mean		3.57	SA

Legend: 1.00-1.74 = Strongly Disagree (SD) 1.75-2.49 = Disagree (D)); 2.50-3.24 = Agree (A)); 3.25-4.00 = Strongly Agree (SA)

While teachers are allowed to work at their own pace, they are still expected to submit reports on time, such as SF 9, grading sheets, test papers, and other related documents. While teachers are given autonomy in their work, the indicator with the lowest weighted mean for voting on major decisions implies that school heads still seek the consensus of the faculty on important matters. Additionally, although this indicator is still rated strongly agree, its lower ranking indicates that it requires attention from the school head. This demonstrates a leadership style that provides teachers with independence while keeping key decisions under the school head's guidance.

This result was corroborated by Papadakis et al. (2024), which highlighted that effective school leadership involves not only setting direction and providing support but also creating a culture where teachers are empowered, motivated, and guided toward high-quality performance. By allowing teachers autonomy in their tasks, school heads foster responsibility, confidence, and professional growth among staff, which can lead to

improved teaching outcomes and a more collaborative school environment. Moreover, delegating responsibilities encourages teachers to take initiative and develop problem-solving skills, contributing to a more dynamic and adaptable school culture. It also allows school heads to focus on strategic decision-making while ensuring that daily operations are efficiently managed by capable staff.

Servant Leadership. Servant leadership is the style in which the school head prioritized serving teachers, focused on their growth, well-being, and professional development, and emphasized supporting staff rather than exerting authority or seeking personal gain. Table 6 presents the Servant leadership styles of School Heads in Daet North District.

The data show that Indicator 1, which emphasizes the importance of empowering the school and community through service and contribution, was rated the highest indicator, with a weighted mean of 3.59, interpreted as strongly agree. Conversely, indicator 4, sacrifices his/her own interests to meet our needs, received the lowest weighted mean of 3.27, interpreted as strongly agree. The overall weighted mean of 3.44 for leadership styles along Servant Leadership of school heads in Daet North District, indicating that this type of leadership is present and strongly agreed upon by the respondents.

Table 6. Servant Leadership Style of the School Heads

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
The school heads...		
1. Emphasize the importance of empowering the school and community through service and contribution.	3.59	SA
2. Care more about others' success and accomplishments than their own.	3.42	SA
3. Prioritize our personal wellness.	3.45	SA
4. Sacrifice their own interests to meet our needs.	3.27	SA
5. Create a safe place for us to share our thoughts and feelings at a personal level.	3.44	SA
6. Hold high ethical standards and recognize our individuality.	3.5	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	3.44	SA

Legend: 1.00-1.74 = Strongly Disagree (SD) 1.75-2.49 = Disagree (D)); 2.50-3.24 = Agree (A)); 3.25-4.00 = Strongly Agree (SA)

The indicator with the highest weighted mean implies that school heads in Daet North District generally demonstrate a strong servant leadership style. They prioritize empowering the school and the community through service and contribution. This is evident through the school heads, through whom the SPTA fulfills its role in supporting the school, such as organizing solicitations, IGP, and sponsorships during Brigada Eskwela, and coordinating community volunteers to help prepare the school for the opening of classes suggests that while school heads are willing to go above and beyond when needed, certain constraints prevent all requests from being prioritized. This is evident in some teacher requests, where not everyone is given the chance to participate in trainings and seminars, not because they are unwilling, but because of the guidelines that school heads must follow. This shows a leadership style that helps others while also making practical decisions, taking care of both the school community and the school head's own responsibilities.

This finding was consistent with Wu and Shen (2022), who reported that principal leadership positively affected student achievement, although school-level conditions and available resources influenced the strength of this relationship. Their findings supported the present finding that leadership practices were exercised with-

in the conditions and resources available in the school. Thus, school heads' servant leadership was demonstrated not only through their willingness to serve and support others but also through their consideration of organizational conditions and practical limitations.

Teachers' Teaching Performance along PPST Domains

The Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) reflected the performance ratings obtained by teachers during one school year. The ratings show how teachers perform across various indicators, including content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment and diversity of learners, curriculum and planning, assessment and reporting, community linkages and professional engagement, as well as personal growth and professional development. These ratings reflect the teachers' level of dedication to their duties and responsibilities in fulfilling their roles as educators.

Table 7. Teachers' Teaching Performance Rating along the PPST Domains

Domain	Outstanding (4.50–5.00)	Very Satisfactory (3.50–4.49)	Satisfactory (2.50–3.49)
Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	114 (97.44%)	3 (2.56%)	—
Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners	113 (96.58%)	4 (3.42%)	—
Curriculum and Planning, Assessment and Reporting	83 (70.94%)	32 (27.35%)	2 (1.71%)
Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	96 (82.05%)	21 (17.95%)	—
Personal Growth and Professional Development	83 (70.94%)	34 (29.06%)	—

The ratings also serve as a guide for teachers in identifying the indicators that reflected their strengths and areas for improvement. Through the assessment results, teachers were able to determine which aspects of their performance they demonstrated effectively, and which areas required further development, allowing them to reflect on their professional practices and pursue continuous improvement in their teaching performance. In the context of the study, these performance ratings were essential in determining the level of performance of the respondents across the various indicators. The data were treated statistically to determine the relationship between the leadership styles of school heads and the performance of teachers in the Daet North District. Furthermore, the analysis of these ratings provided valuable insights into how leadership practices may influence teachers' professional effectiveness. The results also served as a basis for identifying areas where leadership support and professional development initiatives may be strengthened to further improve teacher performance.

Table 7 shows the summarized results of the ratings for the Daet North District in their Individual Performance Commitment Rating Form (IPCRF) across five domains: Content Knowledge and Pedagogy, Learning Environments and Diversity of Learners, Curriculum Planning and Assessment and Reporting, Community Linkages and Professional Engagement, and Personal Growth and Professional Development. The data were personally collected and consolidated by the researcher after being provided by the school's authorized personnel. The gathered data came from 117 respondents. The data reveal that most of respondents received an Outstanding rating in all domains.

Specifically, In the domain of Content Knowledge and Pedagogy, 114 out of 117 respondents, or 97.44%, rated teachers as Outstanding, while only 3 respondents (2.56%) rated them as Very Satisfactory. This was followed by Learning Environments and Diversity of Learners, with 113 or 96.58% respondents rated Outstanding and 4 or 3.42% respondents rated Very Satisfactory. Next, Community Linkages and Professional Engagement had 96 or 82.05% respondents rated Outstanding and 21 or 17.95% respondents rated Very Satisfactory. Lastly, Curriculum Planning, Assessment and Reporting and Personal Growth and Development had the same number of respondents received an outstanding rating with 83% or 70.94% respondents.

In the domain of Personal Growth and Professional Development, 34 or 29.06% of the respondents were rated Very Satisfactory, while in the domain of Curriculum and Planning, Assessment and Reporting, 32 or 27.35% were rated Very Satisfactory and only 2 or 1.71% were rated Satisfactory. These findings implied that most

teachers already possessed the necessary skills in lesson planning, learner assessment, and professional growth. The two respondents who were rated Satisfactory may have encountered certain difficulties, such as aligning lessons with competencies and effectively utilizing assessment results to improve instruction. Overall, the results implied that most teachers in the Daet North District consistently demonstrated high performance across all domains of the IPCRF. Moreover, the predominance of Outstanding ratings in Content Knowledge and Pedagogy indicated that teachers not only met but often exceeded professional expectations. This reflected their strong dedication, competence, and commitment to providing quality education.

Moreover, even in domains with comparatively lower Outstanding ratings, such as Curriculum and Planning, Assessment and Reporting and Personal Growth and Development, teachers still demonstrated high levels of performance, as evidenced by the large proportion of Very Satisfactory ratings and the minimal number of Satisfactory ratings. These findings indicate that teachers effectively carry out their professional responsibilities while continuously striving for improvement and professional growth. Nonetheless, these domains may still benefit from continuous improvement programs to further strengthen teaching performance and professional excellence.

This strong performance aligns with the objectives of DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015, which established the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) in all DepEd schools and offices. The RPMS applies to all officials and employees holding plantilla positions, whether school-based or non-school-based, and provides mechanisms, criteria, and processes for performance target setting, monitoring, evaluation, and development planning. Through this system, DepEd ensures that work efforts are aligned with its vision, mission, and strategic priorities, thereby supporting the delivery of quality educational services to Filipino learners.

The findings were also corroborated by Buenaventura (2020), who emphasized that the RPMS provides a structured and evidence-based approach to evaluating teacher performance, which helps improve both instructional quality and overall school effectiveness. In this context, the outstanding IPCRF ratings of the teachers in Daet North District demonstrate the effective implementation of performance management practices, highlighting how structured evaluation and professional development mechanisms can enhance teacher competence and, consequently, the quality of education delivered to learners.

Moreover, teacher performance is also influenced by school leadership. Leadership in education goes beyond routine management; it involves inspiring and guiding teachers and learners by promoting knowledge, skills, values, and cultural practices (Amankwah and Guo-Hua, 2020). In the same way, Rafique and Akhtar (2023) highlighted that teacher empowerment and continuous professional development improve teachers' job performance and organizational commitment, encouraging them to contribute beyond their assigned duties.

Relationship Between the School Heads' Leadership Styles and Teachers' Teaching Performance

The relationship between the school heads' leadership styles and the teachers' teaching performance rating was examined using the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient (Spearman's rho). The use of Spearman rho was deemed appropriate because the data failed to satisfy the assumption of normality based on the normality test conducted prior to the inferential analysis. Spearman rho, being a non-parametric statistical tool, is suitable for determining the strength and direction of association between variables measured on ordinal scales or data that are not normally distributed.

The findings revealed that most domains of teachers' teaching performance ratings did not show significant relationships with the leadership styles of school heads. Specifically, the domains of Content Knowledge and Pedagogy, Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners, Curriculum and Planning, and Personal Growth and Professional Development yielded p-values greater than the 0.05 level of significance across all leadership styles. Based on these results, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between the school heads' leadership styles and teachers' teaching performance ratings was accepted for these domains. This indicates that there was insufficient evidence to establish a significant relationship between leadership styles and teachers' performance in these areas. The results further imply that teachers' competencies in these domains are more likely influenced by their professional preparation, teaching experience, training, and

intrinsic motivation rather than by the leadership approaches of school heads.

Table 8. Test for Significant Relationship between the Leadership Style of School Heads and the Teachers' Teaching Performance Rating

Leadership Styles	Teachers' Teaching Performance Rating									
	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy		Learning Environments and Diversity of Learners		Curriculum and Planning, Assessment and Reporting		Community Linkages and Professional Engagement		Personal Growth and Professional Development	
	r	p-value	r	p-value	r	p-value	r	p-value	r	p-value
Autocratic	-0.104	0.264	-0.006	0.95	-0.052	0.574	-.198*	0.032	0.053	0.572
Democratic	-0.068	0.469	0.003	0.974	-0.124	0.183	-.301**	0.001	0	0.999
Instructional	-0.068	0.467	0	0.997	-0.08	0.389	-.185*	0.046	0.026	0.778
Transformational	-0.01	0.918	-0.009	0.925	0.018	0.847	0.009	0.923	-0.058	0.536
Servant	-0.08	0.39	0.001	0.991	-0.109	0.242	-.207*	0.025	0.043	0.647
Delegative	-0.068	0.464	-0.031	0.736	-0.109	0.242	-.217*	0.019	0.047	0.615

*Correlation is significant 0.05 level (2-tailed). **Correlation is significant 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Conversely, the null hypothesis was rejected for the domain of Community Linkages since the computed p-values for autocratic, democratic, instructional, servant, and delegative leadership styles were all less than the 0.05 level of significance. This indicates that there were statistically significant relationships between leadership styles and teachers' performance in community linkages, although these relationships were weak and negative in nature.

Notably, the domain community linkages demonstrated statistically significant relationships with several leadership styles. The results showed that autocratic leadership style showed a weak negative significant relationship with community linkages ($\rho = -0.198$, $p = 0.032$). Democratic leadership style exhibited a weak negative but highly significant relationship ($\rho = -0.301$, $p = 0.001$). Instructional leadership style also revealed a weak negative significant relationship ($\rho = -0.185$, $p = 0.046$), while servant leadership ($\rho = -0.207$, $p = 0.025$) and delegative leadership ($\rho = -0.217$, $p = 0.019$) followed the same pattern. These findings indicate that as the manifestation of these leadership styles increases, teachers' performance in community linkages tends to slightly decrease.

The negative correlations, although weak, suggest important implications in educational leadership and organizational dynamics. Community linkages require teachers to actively engage with parents, stakeholders, local government units, and the wider community. Excessive use of directive or highly controlling leadership styles may unintentionally limit teachers' autonomy and initiative in establishing external partnerships. Similarly, even participative approaches such as democratic and servant leadership may become less effective when overemphasized or inconsistently implemented, as they may create delays in decision-making and reduce responsiveness in community engagement activities.

On the other hand, transformational leadership showed no significant relationship with any of the teaching performance domains. This suggests that transformational practices such as vision-building, motivation, and inspiration may not directly translate into measurable outcomes reflected in IPCRF ratings. This may be because IPCRF indicators primarily focus on technical teaching competencies and performance outputs rather than motivational or organizational climate factors influenced by transformational leadership.

The findings suggest that leadership styles alone are not strong determinants of teachers' teaching performance as reflected in their IPCRF ratings. The weak correlations indicate that teacher performance is multifaceted and may also be influenced by other factors such as professional competence, teaching experience, workload, reso-

source availability, institutional support, and personal commitment. Nevertheless, the significant relationships identified in community linkages highlight the need for school heads to balance their leadership approaches to

avoid unintentionally limiting teachers' engagement in community related activities.

The results further imply that school administrators may adopt more contextual and adaptive leadership practices that empower teachers while strengthening collaboration with stakeholders. Leadership development programs may also focus on enhancing school heads' capacity to support teacher autonomy, promote stakeholder engagement, and foster shared responsibility in community-based programs and activities.

In this way, leadership practices can contribute more effectively to both instructional improvement and strengthened school-community relationships. The findings were corroborated by Jia et al. (2018) and Barnová et al. (2022), who emphasized that rigid or overly directive leadership practices may weaken collaboration and reduce proactive participation, which are essential in community-based activities. This provides a possible explanation for the weak negative relationships observed in this study between leadership styles and teachers' community linkage performance. Even democratic leadership, which is generally associated with participation and collaboration, showed a negative relationship in this study, suggesting that excessive consultation or shared decision-making may sometimes delay responsiveness in external engagements.

Additionally, Leithwood et al. (2020) argued that transformational leadership typically influences teacher performance indirectly through mediating factors such as professional commitment and school culture rather than producing immediate measurable effects. Similarly, Wang and Villanueva (2024) found that leadership practices are more strongly associated with teacher motivation and engagement than with formal performance indicators. This supports the present finding that transformational leadership did not show a significant relationship with any of the teaching performance domains. This suggests that the influence of transformational leadership on teaching performance may depend on other factors that shape teacher's professional practice.

Moreover, these findings are also supported by Padilla et al. (2025) and Ramirez and Capili (2024), who reported that leadership does not consistently show a direct effect on teacher performance but rather operates through mediating factors such as morale, job satisfaction, and organizational environment. Therefore, teacher performance is better understood as a multifaceted construct influenced not only by leadership styles but also by professional competence, intuitional support, workload conditions, and individual motivation.

Proposed Intervention to Enhance the Leadership Styles and the Teaching Performance to Improve the Quality of Instruction

The proposed intervention was developed based on the descriptive findings on school heads' leadership styles, the teaching performance ratings reflected in the IPCRF domains, and the statistically observed relationships between the variables. The intervention does not assume a causal effect of leadership styles on teacher performance. Instead, it provides a professional-development response to the areas identified as needing strengthening.

The findings showed that all six leadership styles were generally rated "Strongly Agree." However, specific indicators within each leadership style obtained comparatively lower weighted means and therefore provide areas for professional reflection and development. For autocratic leadership, the lowest indicator concerned the use of rewards and punishments to motivate organizational performance. In response, Project PRAISE (Program on Awards and Incentives for Service Excellence) may be strengthened through a structured recognition system with clear and transparent criteria for recognizing teacher accomplishments.

For democratic leadership, the lowest indicator concerned the receptiveness of school heads to teachers' ideas and advice. The intervention therefore includes Teacher Consultation Sessions, structured opportunities for teachers to provide input before major decisions, and feedback or suggestion mechanisms. These activities are intended to strengthen communication and participation in school-level decision-making.

For instructional leadership, the lowest indicator involved classroom visits conducted to discuss school matters with teachers and students. The intervention includes regular classroom walkthroughs, instructional rounds with Master Teachers, and post-observation feedback conferences. These activities provide opportunities for

school heads and teachers to discuss instructional practices and identify areas for professional improvement.

For transformational leadership, the lowest indicator concerned the provision of direction when teachers are expected to work independently. The intervention includes mentoring and coaching sessions, Individual Development Plans (IDPs), and scheduled professional conversations. These activities are intended to support an appropriate balance between teacher autonomy and professional guidance.

For servant leadership, the lowest indicator concerned the perception that school heads sacrifice their own interests to meet teachers' needs. The intervention includes a needs assessment system, transparent selection of teachers for training opportunities, and a wellness and support mechanism. These activities aim to promote equitable access to professional and workplace support.

For delegative leadership, the lowest indicator involved allowing teachers to vote on major school decisions. The intervention includes formal consultation procedures and, when appropriate, documented faculty voting or other participatory mechanisms for major school matters. These activities are intended to strengthen transparency and shared responsibility in decision-making.

The IPCRF results also showed that Content Knowledge and Pedagogy and Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners had high proportions of Outstanding ratings, while Curriculum and Planning, Assessment and Reporting and Personal Growth and Professional Development had comparatively lower proportions of Outstanding ratings. Thus, the intervention gives particular attention to instructional planning, assessment practices, and continuing professional development. Activities include RPMS-aligned training, assessment and data-analysis workshops, coaching on school forms and grading accuracy, professional development planning, reflective practice, and dissemination of relevant training and scholarship opportunities.

The correlation analysis showed statistically significant weak negative associations between five leadership styles and Community Linkages and Professional Engagement, while transformational leadership did not show a statistically significant association with this domain. Because the study was correlational, these findings are not interpreted as evidence that leadership styles caused changes in community-linkage performance. Nevertheless, the finding provides a basis for including activities that strengthen stakeholder engagement, collaborative planning, communication, and school-community partnerships.

Based on these findings, a 3-Day Seminar-Workshop on Effective Instruction is proposed. The seminar-workshop integrates leadership reflection, instructional improvement, stakeholder engagement, and professional development. School heads and relevant education personnel may collaborate in planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating the activities. School heads may serve as facilitators and instructional leaders, while teachers may participate in workshops, peer-sharing activities, coaching sessions, and reflective exercises.

The seminar-workshop may include higher-order thinking skills (HOTS), problem-based learning, inquiry-based instruction, assessment alignment, instructional planning, classroom observation and feedback, stakeholder engagement, and professional development planning. Peer-sharing sessions may also be used to allow teachers to exchange effective practices and collaboratively address identified instructional needs.

Through this intervention, the study responds to the descriptive and correlational findings while recognizing that teacher performance is a multifaceted construct. The proposed activities are therefore intended to strengthen professional practice and leadership support rather than to claim that changes in leadership style will necessarily produce changes in teachers' IPCRF ratings.

The proposed interventions show a clear alignment between leadership gaps and teacher performance needs.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn: 1) The study involved 366 teachers and master teachers in the assessment of the perceived leadership styles of school heads. All six

leadership styles—autocratic, democratic, instructional, transformational, servant, and delegative—were evident in the respondents’ assessments. Among the six styles, instructional leadership obtained the highest overall weighted mean, followed by democratic and delegative leadership. 2) Among the 366 respondents, 117 consented to the use of their IPCRF records. The IPCRF findings showed generally high teaching performance across the five domains, with most respondents obtaining Outstanding ratings. Curriculum and Planning, Assessment and Reporting and Personal Growth and Professional Development had comparatively lower proportions of Outstanding ratings than the other domains. 3). Based on the 117 matched cases used for the relationship analysis, most of the associations between school heads’ leadership styles and teachers’ teaching performance were not statistically significant. No, statistically significant associations were found across the leadership styles for Content Knowledge and Pedagogy, Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners, Curriculum and Planning, Assessment and Reporting, and Personal Growth and Professional Development. 4). Statistically significant negative associations were observed between Community Linkages and Professional Engagement and five leadership styles: autocratic, democratic, instructional, servant, and delegative leadership. These associations were weak in magnitude. Transformational leadership did not show a statistically significant association with any of the teaching performance domains. 5) The findings do not establish a causal relationship between school heads’ leadership styles and teachers’ teaching performance because the study employed a descriptive-correlational design. The observed associations, particularly those involving Community Linkages and Professional Engagement, may be considered together with other contextual factors such as workload, resources, organizational conditions, stakeholder-engagement opportunities, professional experience, and school-level practices. 6) The proposed 3-Day Seminar-Workshop on Effective Instruction was developed as a professional-development response to the descriptive findings and observed associations. Its activities focus on strengthening instructional supervision, teacher participation, stakeholder engagement, professional development, assessment practices, and reflective teaching. The intervention is therefore intended to address identified professional needs rather than to imply that leadership styles causally determine teachers’ performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are offered:

For school heads, the existing strengths in instructional leadership may be sustained through continuous professional development, instructional coaching, mentoring, classroom walkthroughs, and constructive feedback. School heads may also strengthen opportunities for teacher participation and consultation in matters affecting school operations and instructional practices. 2) For teachers, the generally high IPCRF performance may be sustained through continuous professional development, peer collaboration, reflective practice, mentoring, and participation in relevant training and learning opportunities. Particular attention may be given to Curriculum and Planning, Assessment and Reporting and Personal Growth and Professional Development because these domains had comparatively lower proportions of Outstanding ratings. 3) For school administrators and relevant education personnel, professional-development activities may be designed around the identified leadership indicators and teacher-performance needs. These may include structured consultation, instructional supervision, assessment development, stakeholder engagement, coaching, and professional development planning. 4) For school-community engagement, schools may strengthen communication and collaborative planning with parents, community stakeholders, local government units, and other partners. The statistically significant negative associations observed between several leadership styles and Community Linkages and Professional Engagement should be considered as areas for further examination rather than as evidence of a causal effect. 5) For the implementation of the proposed intervention, the 3-Day Seminar-Workshop on Effective Instruction may be conducted with the participation of school heads, teachers, Master Teachers, and other relevant education personnel. Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms may be included to determine participants’ responses to the training and identify areas for succeeding professional-development activities. 6) For future researchers, similar studies may be conducted using larger samples and respondent-level matched data. Future research may also examine other variables that may be associated with teachers’ performance, such as work environment, workload, motivation, professional development opportunities, institutional support, school culture, and stakeholder engagement. Longitudinal or other designs capable of examining temporal relationships may also be considered if the objective is to investigate possible causal

mechanisms.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher sincerely extends her gratitude to all those who provided support, guidance, and encouragement, which contributed to the success of this study. Above all, she thanks Almighty God for granting her wisdom, strength, and guidance throughout this research journey, as well as for the many blessings she has received. She also expresses her appreciation to Sonia S. Carbonell, PhD, Dean of Graduate Studies, for the opportunity to pursue her thesis and for her valuable support and guidance. Her sincere gratitude is extended to her thesis adviser and statistician, Jennifer S. Rubio, PhD, for her expertise, patience, and continuous encouragement, which greatly contributed to the completion of this study. The researcher also thanks the members of her Thesis Advisory Committee: Daryl I. Quinito, PhD; Analyn S. Ramos, EdD; Anicia S. Madarng, EdD., and Jamila M. Macapundag, MAED, MLL, for their valuable suggestions and contributions that improved the quality of this research. She is also grateful to Crestito M. Morcilla, CESO V, Schools Division Superintendent of Camarines Norte, for permitting her to conduct this study, and to Eden Z. Bugagao, Principal of Pandan Elementary School, for her support. She further extends her appreciation to the school heads, teachers, and master teachers of the Daet North District for their cooperation and participation, which were essential to this study. She is also thankful to her colleagues and friends Ms. Cherry A. Oco, Ms. May Langit, and especially to her brother for their support and encouragement throughout this journey. Most importantly, she expresses her deepest gratitude to her family, the Soria family, for their constant love, support, and encouragement. This achievement would not have been possible without them, and she dedicates this accomplishment to them.

REFERENCES

1. Kusumaningrum, D. E., Sumarsono, R. B., and Gunawan, I. (2020). The influence of instructional leadership, change leadership, spiritual leadership, school culture, and professional ethics on teacher teaching performance. *J. Manajemen Dan Supervisi Pendidikan* 4, 198–219. [https://doi:10.17977/um025v4i32020p198](https://doi.org/10.17977/um025v4i32020p198)
2. Eckardt, R., Skaggs, B. C., & Youndt, M. A. (2021). Leadership styles and organizational innovation: Exploring the mediating role of knowledge sharing. *Journal of Business Research*, 134, 302–312. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-01-2023-0014>
3. Rose, M., & Celestino, M. (2024). The Principals' Leadership Styles and Teachers' Performance of Selected Elementary Schools at The District of Norzagaray East. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(2). <https://www.ijams-bbp.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/MARY-ROSE-M.-CELESTINO.pdf>
4. Karim, S., Rahman, A., & Khalid, M. (2020). Instructional leadership and teachers' confidence: The mediating role of school climate.
5. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(4), 732–745. <https://www.sciedupress.com/journal/index.php/ijep>
6. Leithwood, K.. (2020). How school leadership influences student learning: A test of "The four paths model". *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(4), 570–599. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X19878772>
7. Wang, Z., & Villanueva, L. E. (2024). The impact of leadership styles on teacher work engagement towards the development of best practice guidelines. *Journal of Education and Educational Research*, 9(1), 296–309. <https://doi.org/10.54097/j3n5pp44>
8. Barnová, S., Krásna, S., & Gabrhelová, G. (2022). Leadership styles and their impact on relationships and outcomes in educational settings. *Pedagogická Orientace*, 32(2), 123–140. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc12060192>
9. Operario, J. (2024). School Principals' Leadership Style and Work Performance of Teachers in Eastern Samar, Philippines. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 9(1). <https://ijisrt.com/assets/upload/files/IJISRTJAN1126.pdf>
10. Andreasen J, Bjørndal C., and Kova B. (2019), "Being a teacher and teacher educator: The antecedents of teacher educator identity among mentors teachers," *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 85, pp.

- 281-291, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.05.011>.
11. Papadakis, S., Kanadlı, S., Karadaş, A., Tülübaşı, T., Karakoş, T., & Polat, H. (2024). Investigating the relationship between leadership for learning and student achievement through the mediation of teacher performance: A meta-analytic structural equation modeling (MASEM) approach. *Education Sciences*, 14(12), 1320. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14121320>
12. Department Order No. 2, s. 2015. Guidelines on the Establishment and Implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) in the Department of Education. https://www.deped.gov.ph/w-content/uploads/2015/02/DO_s2015_02.pdf
13. Buenaventura, A. G. (2020). The implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and its effect on teacher performance in public schools. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 99(2), 45–58. <https://pje.edu.ph/>
14. Joo Y. (2020). The effects of distributed leadership on teacher professionalism: The case of Korean middle schools. *International Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 99, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2019.101500>.
15. Amankwah E. and Guo-Hua Z. (2020). Headmasters' leadership styles and them significant on the general performance in schools: Using the basic schools in adansi- south district in ghana as a study. *International Journal of Education*, vol. 12, no. 3, p. 96, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.5296/ije.v12i3.17093>.
16. Rafique, A., & Akhtar, M. M. S. (2020). Effect of demographic variables of university teachers on their perceived teacher empowerment. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 42(3), 241–256. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1382372>
17. Jia, L., Chen, Y., & Mei, X. (2018). The influence of leadership styles on organizational creativity: A meta-analysis. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 39(4), 453–471. <https://doi.org/10.1111/loj.12345>
18. Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2012). The nature and effects of transformational school leadership: A meta-analytic review of unpublished research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(3), 387–423. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X11436268>
19. Padilla, R. M. B., Rayton, M. P. C., Limos Galay, J. A., & Lazaro, N. J. (2025). Leadership styles and teachers' performance in Magsaysay, Occidental Mindoro elementary schools. *International Journal of Research Studies in Management*, 13(4), 147–165. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsm.2025.25511>
20. Ramirez, H. J. & Capili, J. T. (2024). Leadership Style of School Heads And Its Influence to Teacher Retention: Basis for a Teacher Retention Plan. <https://doi.org/10.56648/aide-irj.v10i1.151>