

Leadership Styles of School Administrators in Relation to Educational Challenges Encountered

Ailyn C. Eco, LPT*, Corazon S. Fajardo, PhD

Mabini Colleges, Inc., Governor Panotes Avenue, Daet, Camarines Norte, 4600, Philippines

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.10200571>

Received: 11 March 2026; Accepted: 16 March 2026; Published: 21 March 2026

ABSTRACT

This study determined the leadership styles of school administrators in relation to the educational challenges encountered in the Jose Panganiban District, Schools Division of Camarines Norte. The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design using a structured survey questionnaire consisting of two parts: Part I measured the leadership styles practiced by school administrators with indicators adopted from the leadership theories of Bass (1985), Hersey and Blanchard (1969), and Kouzes and Posner (1987), while Part II measured the educational challenges encountered in terms of human relations, communication, student-related concerns, and fiscal management using researcher-developed indicators. The respondents were 29 school administrators and 312 teachers. Findings revealed that school administrators demonstrated strong and flexible leadership practices, with transformational leadership obtaining the highest weighted mean of 3.86, followed by democratic leadership with 3.85. In terms of educational challenges, student-related concerns were frequently encountered by teachers obtaining a weighted mean of 2.55, while school administrators rated them lower obtaining 2.23, interpreted as rarely encountered. Correlation analysis showed that leadership styles were significantly related to most educational challenges as perceived by teachers, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis, while no significant relationship was found from the perspective of school administrators, resulting in the failure to reject the null hypothesis. The study concludes that although strong leadership practices were observed, student-related concerns remain a major challenge requiring a more systematic and coordinated intervention, leading to the development of the Teach-Lead Resolve Activities: Strengthening Teacher Leadership in Managing Student Concerns, which utilizes the Student Case Management and Response Journal for Teachers to support early identification, consistent documentation, and coordinated monitoring of student cases.

Keywords: Leadership styles, educational challenges, school administrators, intervention, autocratic, laissez-faire, transformational, transactional, and bureaucratic leadership

INTRODUCTION

Leadership plays a crucial role in influencing individuals and groups to accomplish tasks, responsibilities, and procedures while promoting a supportive work environment. According to Moore (2024), leadership in education involves guiding and influencing faculty and staff to improve teaching, learning, and assessment in educational institutions. Leaders in education significantly influenced the future of their institutions and communities by advocating for diversity and inclusion, fostering creativity, passion, and integrity, and promoting a healthy work environment, all aimed at maintaining fair access to high-quality education for all students.

Further, leadership is a dynamic concept influenced by various circumstances, challenges, and the needs of individuals and organizations. As roles progress, leadership styles are increasingly shaped by experience and interactions with employees. In addition, leadership styles are approaches designed to inspire and manage groups effectively. Personality, beliefs, abilities, and life experiences were among the many factors that shaped a

leadership style, ultimately impacting overall success (IMD Business School, 2025). Likewise, leaders have to continuously reflect on their practices to maintain trust, motivation, and productivity among their team. When leaders understand their followers' needs and respond appropriately, they create a supportive environment that encourages growth and improves performance.

Meanwhile, leadership challenges around the world are constantly evolving. At the Global Education Meeting in Brazil, United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) reported that progress in education worldwide remains limited and stressed the need for strong leadership at all levels, including schools. The 2024 Global Education Monitoring Report shows a decline in students' reading comprehension over the past decade, with only a 1% reduction in the number of out-of-school children since 2015, while about 251 million remain out of school and around 650 million did not complete high school. In addition, education spending per student has stayed almost unchanged since 2010, and the share of development aid for education fell from 9.3% in 2019 to 7.6% in 2022. These findings highlight the need to strengthen the training and reskilling of school leaders to promote meaningful change in education (UNESCO, 2024).

In addition, Harris and Jones (2020) suggested that school leaders should demonstrate determination, hope, and a strong belief that, no matter the situation, the cost, or the difficulty, they would do whatever it took to protect every child's education. Moreover, skills gained through years of experience and continuous training have made them more flexible and resilient in handling challenges while creating a supportive, high-quality learning environment. Effective leadership requires continuous learning and a willingness to embrace change.

Similarly, Republic Act No. 9155, also known as the Governance of Basic Education Act, supports UNESCO's goal of strengthening school leadership in the Philippines. It gives school leaders greater authority and responsibility in decision-making, curriculum implementation, resource management, and community involvement. These responsibilities aim to improve educational outcomes. In addition, several Department of Education (DepEd) orders directly support the development of school leaders in the Philippines. DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020 establishes the Philippine Professional Standards for school heads (PPSSH), which provide a framework of competencies that school leaders must master to lead effectively and improve school performance. In addition, DepEd Order No. 25, s. 2020 outlines the professional standards for supervisors, reinforcing leadership expectations and shared accountability at higher leadership levels.

Likewise, more recent policies also reinforce the focus on leadership growth. DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2025 updates the career progression system for teachers and school administrators emphasizing continuing professional development and preparation for leadership roles. Likewise, DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024 revises the School-Based Management (SBM) framework, strengthening the authority and decision-making role of school administrators in managing schools. These policies illustrate DepEd's commitment to strengthening leadership development and justify the need to explore how different leadership styles influence administrators' effectiveness in guiding teachers and improving student outcomes.

Schools in the Jose Panganiban District, Division of Camarines Norte, continue to strive for improved educational quality despite various challenges that affect teaching and learning. Like many public schools, those in the district face concerns related to human relations, communication, student behavior and discipline, as well as fiscal and resource management. These conditions place greater demands on school leaders, who are expected to guide teachers, manage school operations, and ensure that learning goals are achieved within existing constraints.

However, despite the recognized importance of leadership in school improvement, there is limited local evidence that clearly explains how the leadership styles practiced by school administrators in the Jose Panganiban District relate to the specific educational challenges encountered by schools. Understanding this relationship is essential because it can provide school leaders, teachers, and policymakers with practical insights into which leadership approaches are more effective in addressing common school problems. Thus, this study aims to determine the leadership styles of school administrators in relation to the educational challenges encountered in the district.

Objective of the Study

This study aimed to determine the leadership styles of school administrators in relation to the educational challenges encountered in Jose Panganiban, Schools Division of Camarines Norte. Specifically, it aimed to identify the leadership styles practiced by school administrators in terms of democratic, autocratic, laissez-faire, transformational, transactional, and bureaucratic, as well as the common educational challenges encountered by teachers and school administrators along with human relation, communication, students, and fiscal management. This further aimed at determining the significant relationship between the leadership styles practiced by school administrators and the educational challenges encountered.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationship between the leadership styles practiced by school administrators and the educational challenges encountered in the Jose Panganiban District, Schools Division of Camarines Norte. The descriptive approach was used to determine the leadership styles practiced by school administrators and the educational challenges encountered in schools, while the correlational method was utilized to determine the significant relationship between these variables. Data were gathered through a structured survey questionnaire using a Likert scale to measure the perceptions of respondents regarding leadership styles and educational challenges.

Population, Sample Size, and Sampling Technique

There were three hundred forty-one (341) three hundred forty-one respondents in this study coming from (31) public schools, comprising twenty-six (26) elementary schools and five (5) secondary schools covering the entire East and West in Jose Panganiban District. Specifically, three hundred twelve (312) teachers who were randomly selected from the total population of six hundred nine (609) teachers, and a total enumeration of the twenty-nine (29) school administrators were involved in this study.

Data Gathering Procedures

The study utilized a structured survey questionnaire consisting of two parts as the primary data-gathering instrument. Part I measured the leadership styles practiced by school administrators, including democratic, autocratic, laissez-faire, transformational, transactional, and bureaucratic leadership, with indicators adopted from established leadership theories, particularly the works of Bass (1985), Hersey and Blanchard (1969), and Kouzes and Posner (1987). Part II measured the educational challenges encountered in terms of human relations, communication, student-related concerns, and fiscal management, with indicators developed by the researcher and anchored on relevant literature as well as DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020 and Republic Act No. 9155. The questionnaire employed a Likert scale to evaluate the indicators. Prior to administration, the instrument underwent content validation by experts, while reliability testing was conducted for Part II of the instrument, since the indicators were researcher-developed. A dry-run was conducted and the results were analyzed using Cronbach's Alpha, which yielded the following reliability coefficients: human relations .835, communication .778, student-related concerns .876, and fiscal management .814, indicating acceptable to good reliability. After establishing the validity and reliability of the instrument, the questionnaire was administered to the respondents through face-to-face distribution, while Google Forms was used as an alternative mode of data collection for schools located in distant areas.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The data collected from the survey were organized, tabulated, and analyzed using appropriate statistical tools to answer the research questions. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 was used to process the data, ensuring accurate and objective results. The weighted mean was used to describe the leadership styles demonstrated by school administrators and the challenges they encountered in the areas of human relations, communication, student concerns, and fiscal management. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation

Coefficient (r) to evaluate the strength and significance of the relationship between leadership styles and educational challenges. The formula for (r) is shown below.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Leadership Styles Practiced by School Administrators

The democratic leadership style of school administrators as perceived by both school administrators and teachers got overall weighted means of 3.85 from school administrators and 3.54 from teachers. These suggest that school administrators in the Jose Panganiban District promote shared involvement, strengthen teamwork, and build stronger camaraderie between school administrators and teachers, thereby supporting a positive and collaborative school culture. Among the indicators, *promoting a culture of shared responsibility among staff members* obtained the highest weighted mean from both school administrators 3.90 and teachers 3.55. This indicates that this practice is strongly evident in schools. Meanwhile, *soliciting input and feedback from staff on important school matters* got the lowest weighted mean, with 3.79 from school administrators and 3.52 from teachers. This suggests that while consultation is generally practiced, it is sometimes challenging to do so consistently. The results are corroborated by Lindberg (2023), who highlighted that democratic leadership fosters inclusivity, collaborative decision-making, and teacher satisfaction. Likewise, Oco (2022) identified democratic leadership as the predominant leadership style among school heads emphasizing its efficacy in managing teachers and enhancing school performance.

Table 1. Leadership Style Practiced by School Administrators along Democratic Leadership

Indicators	School Administrators Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Teacher Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Encourages collaborative decision-making.	3.86	VO	3.54	VO
Solicits input and feedback from staff on important school matters.	3.79	VO	3.52	VO
Promotes culture of shared responsibility among staff members.	3.90	VO	3.55	VO
Overall Weighted Mean	3.85	VO	3.54	VO

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

3.25 – 4.00 Very Often (VO)

2.50 – 3.24 Often (O)

1.75 – 2.49 Seldom (S)

1.00 – 1.74 Never (N)

The autocratic leadership style of school administrators as perceived by the school administrators and teachers obtained overall weighted means of 2.95 from school administrators and 2.92 from teachers. This means that

school administrators in Jose Panganiban consistently exercise authority to ensure proper supervision and control of school activities. When urgent issues arise such as serious student misbehavior or safety concerns during school activities, school administrators often make quick decisions and give clear instructions to teachers and staff.

Table 2. Leadership Style Practiced by School Administrators along Autocratic Leadership

Indicators	School Administrators Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Teacher Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Enforces policies and rules strictly, without room for flexibility.	2.79	O	2.85	O
Expects staff to follow instructions without questioning.	2.55	O	2.71	O
Maintain hierarchical authority and control over school operations.	3.52	VO	3.20	O
Overall Weighted Mean	2.95	O	2.92	O

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

3.25 – 4.00 Very Often (VO)

2.50 – 3.24 Often(O)

1.75 – 2.49 Seldom(S)

1.00 – 1.74 Never(N)

Among the indicators, “maintaining hierarchical authority and control over school operations” obtained the highest weighted mean, with 3.52 from school administrators and 3.20 from teachers. This suggests that school administrators regularly exercise hierarchical authority in assigning tasks, especially for more complex and demanding responsibilities. On the other hand, “expecting staff to follow instructions without questioning” was rated the lowest with weighted means of 2.55 from school administrators and 2.71 from teachers. This implies that while authority is clearly present, administrators still allow some degree of dialogue and participation from teachers. Teachers are given opportunities to express their views, particularly when certain policies may not fully suit their specific situations, which helps school leaders make more informed decisions. These are corroborated by Cherry (2023), who’s study showed that autocratic leadership can be effective in situations that require clear direction, firm control, and decisive action. The results indicate that although autocratic leadership is not the dominant style, its use in specific situations helps maintain order, discipline, and operational stability within schools.

In terms of laissez-faire leadership approach, the overall weighted means are 3.28 from school administrators and 3.33 from teachers. This suggests that school administrators let the teachers perform their duties independently. Teachers are entrusted with important responsibilities such as managing their classrooms, preparing lessons, assessing learners’ performance, completing academic reports, coordinating with parents, and monitoring students’ attendance and progress.

Moreover, “encouraging an environment where staff are free to innovate” obtained the highest weighted mean, with 3.72 from school administrators and 3.60 from teachers. This means that school administrators strongly promote creativity and professional independence among teachers. By giving teachers the freedom to explore new strategies and approaches, administrators help foster a culture of innovation and continuous improvement in the school.

Table 3. Leadership Style Practiced by School Administrators along Laissez-Faire Leadership

Indicators	School Administrators Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Teacher Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Provides little supervision or guidance in day-to-day operations.	2.79	O	3.04	O
Encourages an environment where staff are free to innovate.	3.72	VO	3.60	VO
Allows teachers and staff to make decisions. on their own	3.31	VO	3.35	VO
Overall Weighted Mean	3.28	VO	3.33	VO

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

3.25 – 4.00 Very Often (VO)

2.50 – 3.24 Often (O)

1.75 – 2.49 Seldom (S)

1.00 – 1.74 Never (N)

Meanwhile, “providing little supervision” registered the lowest weighted mean, with 2.79 from school administrators and 3.04 from teachers, both interpreted as often. This indicates that while independence is encouraged, administrators do not completely withdraw from their supervisory roles. Teachers continue to receive guidance and support, particularly when challenges arise, as seen in practices such as classroom observations and performance monitoring that ensure teachers remain supported. As Cherry (2022) pointed out, laissez-faire leadership can be effective when subordinates are competent and capable of working independently. This is further supported by Kadiyono et al. (2020), who emphasized that autonomy, when accompanied by trust, can enhance teachers’ performance. Although laissez-faire leadership is not the dominant style, its appropriate use in schools helps promote independence, creativity, and professional growth while maintaining necessary administrative guidance and support.

The transformational leadership style of school administrators as perceived by both school administrators and teachers had overall weighted means of 3.86 from school administrators and 3.57 from teachers. This indicates that transformational leadership practices are very often demonstrated in schools. School administrators actively promote motivation, professional development, and continuous improvement to enhance school performance

and teacher effectiveness. This further reflects that school leaders possess strong personal and professional competencies that earn the respect and confidence of their teachers, enabling them to inspire continuous learning and encourage teachers to pursue further studies, attend seminars, and engage in professional training.

Moreover, “fostering a culture of continuous learning and improvement” obtained the highest weighted mean, with 3.97 from school administrators and 3.63 from teachers. This indicates that school administrators in the Jose Panganiban District strongly promote professional growth by engaging in professional development activities, adopting innovative teaching strategies, and continuously improving classroom instruction.

Table 4. Leadership Style Practiced by School Administrators along Transformational Leadership

Indicators	School Administrators Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Teacher Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Fosters a culture of continuous learning and improvement.	3.97	VO	3.63	VO
Inspires and motivates staff to achieve beyond expectations.	3.83	VO	3.55	VO
Develop a compelling vision for the future of the school.	3.79	VO	3.52	VO
Overall Weighted Mean	3.86	VO	3.57	VO

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

3.25 – 4.00 Very Often (VO)

2.50 – 3.24 Often (O)

1.75 – 2.49 Seldom (S)

1.00 – 1.74 Never (N)

Meanwhile, “developing a compelling vision for the future of the school” registered the lowest weighted mean, with 3.79 from school administrators and 3.52 from teachers, both interpreted as very often. This shows that although vision-building is consistently practiced, there remains room to further strengthen the clarity and communication of the school’s long-term direction. Aligning daily activities, projects, and decisions with shared long-term goals can help ensure that teachers, parents, and learners move in the same direction. Raolina et al. (2021) explained that transformational leadership positively influences teacher and student performance by promoting teamwork, shared purpose, and continuous improvement. The strong practice of transformational leadership contributes to higher motivation, continuous professional growth, and a forward-looking school environment that supports sustained improvement.

As to transactional leadership approach, the overall weighted means are 3.68 from school administrators and 3.25 from teachers. This indicates that transactional leadership practices are very often demonstrated in schools. This suggests that school administrators place strong emphasis on accountability, performance standards, and compliance with school policies. Transactional leadership is evident in the regular monitoring of teacher

performance through checking attendance, reviewing lesson plans, and conducting scheduled classroom observations.

“Monitoring staff performance and ensuring compliance with established standards” obtained the highest weighted mean, with 3.86 from school administrators and 3.46 from teachers, both interpreted as very often. This reflects the consistent practice of supervising teacher performance and ensuring that school rules, policies, and procedures are properly followed. On the other hand, “using rewards and incentives to motivate staff” registered the lowest weighted mean, with 3.38 from school administrators and 2.96 from teachers. This implies that although incentives are used, they are applied less consistently than performance monitoring and corrective actions. School administrators tend to rely more on supervision and feedback than on formal rewards. As noted by Dong (2023), transactional leadership positively influences organizational performance by emphasizing performance management and compliance, although excessive reliance on rewards may limit creativity. Transactional leadership contributes to structured school management by reinforcing accountability, discipline, and performance standards, which help ensure the efficient and orderly functioning of schools.

Table 5. Leadership Style Practiced by School Administrators along Transactional Leadership

Indicators	School Administrators Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Teacher Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Uses rewards and incentives to motivate staff.	3.38	VO	2.96	O
Monitors staff performance and ensure compliance with established standards.	3.86	VO	3.46	VO
Addresses problems by using corrective actions.	3.79	VO	3.32	VO
Overall Weighted Mean	3.68	VO	3.25	VO

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

3.25 – 4.00 Very Often (VO)

2.50 – 3.24 Often(O)

1.75 – 2.49 Seldom(S)

1.00 – 1.74 Never(N)

The bureaucratic leadership style of school administrators as perceived by both school administrators and teachers had overall weighted means of 3.68 from school administrators and 3.25 from teachers. This suggests that school administrators place strong importance on following policies, maintaining standard procedures, and ensuring consistency in school operations. This is evident in the strict compliance required in the submission of school reports such as SF2, DTR, Form 9, Form 10, and other official documents, which must follow prescribed templates issued by the Department of Education. These practices highlight the emphasis on standardized procedures, proper documentation, and consistent policy implementation in school operations.

Table 6. Leadership Style Practiced by School Administrators along Bureaucratic Leadership

Indicators	School Administrators Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Teacher Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Strictly adheres to formal rules in all school operations.	3.79	VO	3.38	VO
Emphasizes consistency and uniformity in the application of policies.	3.86	VO	3.42	VO
Discourage flexibility in decision-making and insist on following standard procedures.	2.76	O	2.74	O
Overall Weighted Mean	3.68	VO	3.25	VO

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

- 3.25 – 4.00 Very Often (VO)
- 2.50 – 3.24 Often(O)
- 1.75 – 2.49 Seldom(S)
- 1.00 – 1.74 Never(N)

Moreover, “emphasizing consistency and uniformity in the application of policies” obtained the highest weighted mean, with 3.86 from school administrators and 3.42 from teachers. This confirms that school administrators give high priority to the fair and consistent implementation of school rules and policies. Through this practice, school leaders help ensure that decisions are applied equally to all members of the school community. Meanwhile, “discouraging flexibility in decision-making and insisting on following standard procedures” registered the lowest weighted mean, with 2.76 from school administrators and 2.74 from teachers. This implies that while rules and procedures are strongly emphasized, some degree of flexibility is still allowed when situations require it. This was corroborated by Kumar (2024), who explained that bureaucratic leadership promotes order, fairness, and accountability, although excessive rigidity may limit flexibility. The results indicate that this leadership style supports structured and organized school management.

Educational Challenges Encountered By School Administrators

The challenges encountered in terms of human relations as perceived by teachers and school administrators showed overall weighted means of 1.97 for teachers, and 1.54 for school administrators. This indicates that human relations challenges are generally minimal in schools, although teachers perceive these concerns slightly more often than school administrators. Specifically, “conflicts between teachers and school administrators due to differences in opinions and decision-making” is rarely encountered which got the highest weighted mean, with 2.15 for teachers and 1.83 for school administrators. This implies that while disagreements do occur, they are not frequent. Moreover, “favoritism or unfair treatment among staff members affects the workplace” got the lowest

weighted mean, with 1.78 for teachers interpreted as rarely encountered and 1.28 for school administrators interpreted as not encountered at all. This suggests that issues related to unfair practices are isolated and not common in schools. These findings are supported by Rahman et al. (2021), who emphasized the importance of strong human relationships in ensuring smooth school operations. Human relations challenges are not prevalent, reflecting a supportive and collaborative school environment that promotes mutual respect, open communication, and timely resolution of minor interpersonal concerns.

Table 7. Common Educational Challenges Encountered by the Respondents along Human Relation

Indicators	Teachers		School Administrators	
	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Conflicts arise between teachers and school administrators due to differences in opinion and decision-making.	2.15	RE	1.83	RE
Teachers feel a lack of support from school administrators in handling classroom or work-related concerns.	1.96	RE	1.45	NE
There is difficulty in fostering teamwork among faculty members.	1.98	RE	1.59	NE
Teachers and staff experience misunderstandings due to unclear roles and responsibilities.	2.00	RE	1.55	NE
Favoritism or unfair treatment among staff members affects workplace.	1.78	RE	1.28	NE
Overall Weighted Mean	1.97	RE	1.54	NE

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

3.25 – 4.00 Always Encountered (AE)

2.50 – 3.24 Frequently Encountered (FE)

1.75 – 2.49 Rarely Encountered (RE)

1.00 – 1.74 Not Encountered at All (NE)

In terms of student-related concerns, the results show overall weighted means of 2.55 for teachers, interpreted as frequently encountered, and 2.23 for school administrators interpreted as rarely encountered. This is evident in classroom situations where students show shorter attention spans and occasional behavioral issues, making early lesson engagement essential. Although teachers are encouraged to apply positive discipline, its implementation becomes challenging when disciplinary actions are misunderstood or questioned by parents, which may place teachers in difficult situations.

For teachers, “lack of parental support” obtained the highest weighted mean 2.64, interpreted as frequently encountered, while “bullying and peer conflicts” had the lowest weighted mean 2.41, interpreted as rarely

encountered. This suggests that teachers more often experience the effects of limited parental involvement, reflected in discipline problems, difficulty in completing tasks, irregular attendance, and low motivation, which are linked to weaker academic performance and greater classroom management challenges. For school administrators “students’ difficulties in coping with academic requirements due to personal or socioeconomic factors” obtained the highest weighted mean 2.62.

Table 9. Common Educational Challenges Encountered by the Respondents along Students

Indicators	Teachers		School Administrators	
	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Students exhibit behavioral issues that disrupt classroom learning.	2.52	FE	1.83	RE
Lack of parental support affects students’ academic performance and discipline.	2.64	FE	2.38	RE
Bullying and peer conflicts negatively impact students' well-being.	2.41	RE	1.97	RE
Students face difficulties in coping with academic requirements due to personal or socioeconomic factors.	2.61	FE	2.62	FE
The use of social media and technology distracts students from their studies and classroom activities.	2.59	FE	2.34	RE
Overall Weighted Mean	2.55	FE	2.23	RE

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

3.25 – 4.00 Always Encountered (AE)

2.50 – 3.24 Frequently Encountered (FE)

1.75 – 2.49 Rarely Encountered (RE)

1.00 – 1.74 Not Encountered at All (NE)

Moreover, “students’ behavioral issues that disrupt classroom learning” recorded the lowest weighted mean 1.83. This suggests that school administrators and to view student-related concerns from a broader and more contextual perspective, often based on reports and overall school conditions rather than daily classroom interactions. Yüksel Kurt et al. (2024) affirms this who reported that behavioral concerns and insufficient parental engagement significantly influence students’ school experiences and overall school life, thereby making classroom management more demanding for teachers.

The common educational challenges encountered in terms of fiscal management as perceived by teachers and school administrators had overall weighted means of 1.83 for teachers and 2.03 for school administrators This

indicates that fiscal management challenges are generally infrequent in the schools covered by the study. These suggest that school administrators are usually able to manage financial resources in ways that support school operations. However, financial constraints remain a reality, and improper fund management can still create serious problems if not addressed properly.

Table 10. Common Educational Challenges Encountered by the school administrators along Fiscal Management

Indicators	Teachers		School Administrators	
	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Limited school budget affects the proper implementation of programs.	2.39	RE	2.31	RE
School administrators struggle with managing and allocating financial resources effectively.	2.08	RE	1.69	NE
Delayed release of funds affects the procurement of learning materials and equipment.	2.10	RE	2.10	RE
Overall Weighted Mean	1.83	RE	2.03	RE

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

3.25 – 4.00 Always Encountered (AE)

2.50 – 3.24 Frequently Encountered (FE)

1.75 – 2.49 Rarely Encountered (RE)

1.00 – 1.74 Not Encountered at All (NE)

Among the indicators, “limited school budget affecting the proper implementation of programs” obtained the highest weighted mean, with 2.39 for teachers and 2.31 for school administrators both interpreted as rarely encountered. This suggests that while budget limitations exist, they do not regularly hinder school activities. Schools are generally able to manage available funds and seek additional resources to sustain essential programs and operations. In contrast, “school administrators struggling with managing and allocating financial resources effectively” was perceived as the least challenge, with a weighted mean of 2.08 for teachers or rarely encountered and 1.69 for school administrators or not encountered at all. This implies that school administrators are generally competent in handling and allocating school funds. This further indicates that financial procedures, budgeting, and reporting systems are functioning effectively, helping ensure transparency, accountability, and the proper use of school resources. Ezeh and Ogara (2020), corroborated this emphasizing that effective financial management is essential for the smooth operation of schools and that proper budgeting, documentation, and accountability help prevent disruptions in school activities. The results indicate that while financial challenges exist, they are well managed and do not significantly affect school operations.

Relationship Between the Leadership Styles Practiced by School Administrators and the Educational Challenges Encountered

The significant relationship between the leadership styles practiced by school administrators and the educational challenges encountered by teachers, was computed using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r). The

values of r , along with their corresponding p -values, indicate both the strength and direction of the relationship between the variables. The democratic leadership shows significant negative correlations with human relations ($r = -0.501, p = .000$), communication ($r = -0.563, p = .000$), and fiscal management ($r = -0.362, p = .000$). This indicates that when democratic leadership is more frequently practiced, challenges in these areas are less often encountered by teachers. However, the correlation between democratic leadership and student-related concerns ($r = -0.102, p = .072$) is weak and not statistically significant. This indicates that while democratic leadership is effective in improving organizational and management-related concerns, it may not be sufficient on its own to address student behavior and learning difficulties.

Table 11. Test for Significant Relationship between the Leadership Styles Practiced by School Administrators and the Educational Challenges Encountered by Teachers

Leadership Styles	Educational Challenges							
	Human Relation		Communication		Students		Fiscal Management	
	r	p-value	r	p-value	r	p-value	r	p-value
Democratic	-.501**	.000	-.563**	.000	-.102	.072	-.362	.000
Autocratic	-.022	.696	-.009	.871	-.187**	.001	-.039	.493
Laissez-Faire	-.316**	.000	-.311**	.000	-.217**	.000	-.275**	.000
Transformational	-.471**	.000	-.524**	.000	-.104	.067	-.339**	.000
Transactional	-.423**	.000	-.443**	.000	-.138*	.015	-.333**	.000
Bureaucratic	-.370**	.000	-.389**	.000	-.167**	.003	-.273**	.000

*Correlation is significant @ 0.05 level.

**Correlation is Significant @ 0.01 level.

Moreover, autocratic leadership shows no significant relationships with human relations ($r = -0.022, p = .696$), communication ($r = -0.009, p = .871$), and fiscal management ($r = -0.039, p = .493$). However, it shows a weak but significant negative relationship with student-related concerns ($r = -0.187, p = .001$), indicating that a stricter and more directive leadership style may slightly help reduce student discipline and behavior problems. Further, laissez-faire leadership shows significant negative correlations with human relations ($r = -0.316, p = .000$), communication ($r = -0.311, p = .000$), student-related concerns ($r = -0.217, p = .000$), and fiscal management ($r = -0.275, p = .000$). This indicates that as laissez-faire leadership is more frequently practiced, challenges in these areas tend to decrease, although the relationships are weaker than those observed for democratic or transformational leadership.

Likewise, transformational leadership shows strong negative correlations with human relations ($r = -0.471, p = .000$), communication ($r = -0.524, p = .000$), and fiscal management ($r = -0.339, p = .000$), but not with student-related concerns ($r = -0.104, p = .067$). This highlights its effectiveness in addressing relational, communication, and fiscal concerns, but its limited impact on student-related challenges. This result is consistent with earlier findings showing that transformational leadership is very often practiced and that challenges in human relations, communication, and fiscal management are rarely encountered.

Meanwhile, transactional leadership shows significant negative correlations with human relations ($r = -0.423, p = .000$), communication ($r = -0.443, p = .000$), and fiscal management ($r = -0.273, p = .000$), but not with student-related concerns ($r = -0.138, p = .015$).

= .000), communication ($r = -0.443$, $p = .000$), student-related concerns ($r = -0.138$, $p = .015$), and fiscal management ($r = -0.333$, $p = .000$). Although weaker than transformational leadership, transactional approaches are still effective in reducing challenges across all four areas. In terms of fiscal management, transparency and clear standards help build trust and encourage cooperation when resources are limited. Moreover, the consistent implementation of rules and policies supports discipline and order in addressing student-related concerns. This implies that school administrators may use transactional leadership practices, such as performance monitoring and recognition, to reinforce accountability, improve communication, and support both organizational and student-related goals. Finally, bureaucratic leadership shows significant negative correlations with human relations ($r = -0.370$, $p = .000$), communication ($r = -0.389$, $p = .000$), student-related concerns ($r = -0.167$, $p = .003$), and fiscal management ($r = -0.273$, $p = .000$). This indicates that adherence to policies and procedures helps reduce challenges across all areas, though not as strongly as democratic or transformational leadership.

The consistently negative correlations across leadership styles and educational challenges mean that as effective leadership practices increase, the challenges encountered by teachers decrease. Among the leadership styles, democratic and transformational approaches show the strongest relationship in reducing communication, human relation, and fiscal management issues. Meanwhile, autocratic and bureaucratic leadership exhibit weaker but still significant effects, particularly in student-related concerns. This implies that, from the teachers' perspective, the leadership practices of school administrators in the Jose Panganiban District play a significant role in reducing organizational and management-related challenges in schools. The stronger effects of democratic and transformational leadership in minimizing problems in human relations, communication, and fiscal management indicate that collaborative and motivating leadership approaches are particularly effective in improving school climate and daily operations. This was affirmed by Raolina et al. (2021) and Rahman et al. (2021), who emphasized the value of transformational leadership and open communication in promoting teamwork and smooth school operations. Likewise, the significant contributions of transactional and bureaucratic leadership was conformed by Dong (2023) and Kumar (2024), who noted that accountability, clear standards, and adherence to procedures enhance organizational stability and efficiency. However, the weaker relationships between some leadership styles and student-related concerns suggest that student issues are influenced by factors beyond leadership style alone, which is supported by Yüksel Kurt et al. (2024), who reported that behavioral concerns and limited parental engagement strongly affect students' school experiences. These results confirm that while leadership styles are important, they must be complemented by context-sensitive student support systems to effectively address school challenges.

The test for significant relationships between the leadership styles practiced by school administrators and the educational challenges encountered, as perceived by the school administrators was also determined using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r). From the school administrators perspective, democratic leadership shows weak positive and statistically insignificant correlations with human relations ($r = .168$), communication ($r = .139$), student-related concerns ($r = .236$), and fiscal management ($r = .123$). This indicates that democratic leadership does not significantly reduce the challenges encountered by school administrators. This result is consistent with earlier findings showing that although democratic leadership is very often practiced by school administrators in the Jose Panganiban District, many school-level challenges are shaped by system-level and structural factors such as policies, resource limitations, and administrative requirements. This suggests that while participative practices remain important, democratic leadership alone is not sufficient to address school-level challenges and should be complemented by more directive strategies in situations that require firm control, particularly in managing student behavior.

On the other hand, school administrators perspective, in autocratic leadership shows two significant relationships: a moderate positive correlation with human relations ($r = .387$, $p = .038$) and a moderate negative correlation with student-related concerns ($r = -.459$, $p = .012$), while its relationships with communication ($r = .346$, $p = .066$) and fiscal management ($r = -.289$, $p = .129$) are not statistically significant. This indicates that greater use of autocratic leadership is associated with more challenges in human relations but fewer challenges in student-related concerns. This alignment suggests that a strict and directive leadership approach may be useful in situations requiring firm control over student behavior, but it may also contribute to interpersonal difficulties among teachers and staff when used extensively. Thus, while autocratic leadership can be effective for managing

discipline, it should be applied selectively and balanced with more participative and supportive approaches to maintain positive working relationships and a healthy school climate.

Table 12. Test for Significant Relationship between the Leadership Styles Practiced by School Administrators and the Educational Challenges Encountered (School Administrators)

Leadership Styles	Educational Challenges							
	Human Relation		Communication		Students		Fiscal Management	
	r	p-value	r	p-value	r	p-value	r	p-value
Democratic	.168	.384	.139	.473	.236	.218	.123	.526
Autocratic	.387*	.038	.346	.066	-.459*	.012	-.289	.129
Laissez-Faire	.229	.233	.088	.651	-.074	.702	-.137	.479
Transformational	.226	.237	.173	.370	.312	.100	.177	.359
Transactional	-.092	.634	-.065	.739	-.012	.952	.117	.545
Bureaucratic	.168	.383	.120	.536	-.029	.882	.033	.865

*Correlation is significant @ 0.05 level.

**Correlation is Significant @ 0.01 level.

Moreover, laissez-faire leadership shows weak and statistically insignificant correlations with all challenge areas ($p > .05$), indicating that a hands-off leadership approach does not have a meaningful influence on the challenges encountered by school administrators. Likewise, transformational leadership shows weak positive and statistically insignificant relationships across all challenges (r ranging from .173 to .312, $p > .05$). This indicates that, from the school administrators perspective, transformational leadership does not significantly reduce the challenges they encounter. Moreover, transactional leadership shows negative but statistically insignificant correlations with human relations, communication, and student-related concerns, and a weak positive but insignificant correlation with fiscal management ($r = .117$), indicating little to no effect of transactional leadership on reducing the challenges perceived by school administrators. Finally, bureaucratic leadership also shows weak and statistically insignificant correlations with all challenges (r ranging from $-.029$ to .168, $p > .05$). This implies that adherence to rules and procedures alone does not significantly reduce or increase the challenges faced by school administrators.

The findings were corroborated by Ogunode and Musa (2020), who emphasized that many challenges faced by school administrators are influenced by broader institutional demands, resource limitations, and operational constraints rather than leadership style alone. Similarly, Mukherjee (2022) affirmed that school leaders often deal with complex problems that require resilience and organizational support, indicating that leadership effectiveness is closely tied to contextual realities and not only to personal leadership practices. On the other hand, the significant relationship of autocratic leadership with student related concerns was affirmed by Cherry (2023), who noted that directive leadership can be effective in situations requiring firm control and immediate action, particularly in managing discipline. At the same time, the positive relationship between autocratic leadership and human relations challenges was supported by Yariv (2011), who pointed out that strict leadership may strain relationships with teachers and create interpersonal difficulties.

Proposed Intervention to Address the Educational Challenges Encountered by School Administrators

The results showed that both teachers and school administrators share similar views on the leadership styles practiced, with democratic and transformational leadership emerging as the most dominant. However, the study also revealed a difference in perceptions regarding student-related concerns. Teachers viewed these concerns as frequently encountered, while school administrators perceived them as rarely encountered. In response to these findings, the proposed intervention, “Teach-Lead Resolve Activities: Strengthening Teacher Leadership in Managing Student Concerns,” was developed to strengthen the management of student-related concerns through the use of the Student Case Management and Response Journal for Teachers. This journal includes the Student Issue Response Protocol, Student Case Management Form, Attendance Monitoring Form for Students At-Risk, and Summary of Incident, which support early identification, proper documentation, and coordinated responses to student cases. Through this intervention, teachers serve as frontline implementers while school administrators provide direction, supervision, and data-based decision-making. By combining existing leadership strengths with a structured response process, the intervention directly addresses the most prominent challenge identified in the study and promotes a more coordinated approach between teachers and school administrators in managing student-related concerns in the Jose Panganiban District.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

. Based on the study’s key findings, school administrators practiced varied and flexible leadership styles, with transformational and democratic leadership emerging as the most dominant. Other leadership styles such as autocratic, laissez-faire, transactional, and bureaucratic were applied as needed depending on situational demands within the school environment. Student-related concerns emerged as the most prominent educational challenge, with teachers encountering them more frequently than school administrators due to their direct interaction with learners. Leadership styles were significantly related to most educational challenges as perceived by teachers, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis, while no significant relationship was found from the perspective of school administrators, resulting in the failure to reject the null hypothesis. Although effective leadership practices help reduce certain challenges, student-related concerns remain a major issue requiring a more systematic and coordinated intervention.

In response, the proposed intervention, Teach-Lead Resolve Activities: Strengthening Teacher Leadership in Managing Student Concerns, was developed, utilizing the Student Case Management and Response Journal for Teachers to support early identification, consistent documentation, and coordinated monitoring of student cases. Accordingly, school administrators and teachers may collaborate in implementing structured systems and leadership-supported tools to improve the management of student-related concerns, while future researchers may explore additional strategies that could further strengthen student case management in schools.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher expresses her profound gratitude to Almighty God for the wisdom and strength provided and to individuals and institutions who became part of this meaningful academic journey. Sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. Sonia S. Carbonell, Dr. Corazon S. Fajardo, Dr. Anicia S. Madarang, Dr. Nomelita S. Lo, Dr. Jennifer S. Rubio, and Jamila M. Macapundag – for their suggestions and assistance for the enhancement of this manuscript. Sincere thanks are given to the Public Schools District Supervisor, as well as the Principals and school administrators of Jose Panganiban East and West Districts, and the Schools Division Office of Daet, Camarines Norte. Heartfelt appreciation is extended to Dr. Marlo Fiel P. Sultan, Mrs. Leticia Bernadette S. Benavidez, for encouragement and steadfast support extended throughout this academic endeavor. Finally, the researcher expresses profound gratitude to her family - Father Eddie, Mother Delia, Mommy Beth, Daddy Obet, spouse Alberto R. Eco Jr., and children Miko, Mika, Mathea, and Amina, for the unconditional love, which served as the foundation of my strength and perseverance.

REFERENCES

1. Basic Education Act of 2001. (2001). DepEd Rules and Regulations of Republic Act No. 9155 (Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001).<https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/10/41868/>
2. Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). Free Press.
<https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=1871417>
3. Bhandari, P. (2023, June 22). Correlational research: When & how to use. Scribbr.
<https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/correlational-research/>
4. Bush, T. (2008). *Leadership and management in education: Cultures, change, and context*. Sage Publications.
<https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=1817236>
5. Cherry, K. (2022). What is laissez-faire leadership? Verywell Mind.
<https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-laissez-faire-leadership-2795316>
6. Department of Education. (2020). *Philippine Professional Standards for School Administrators* (DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020).
https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024-.pdf
7. Department of Education. (2020). *Philippine Professional Standards for Supervisors* (DepEd Order No. 25, s. 2020).
https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_025-.pdf
8. Department of Education. (2024). *Policy Guidelines on the Implementation of the Revised School-Based Management System* (DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024).
https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DO_s2024_007.pdf
9. Department of Education. (2025). *Guidelines on the Implementation of the Expanded Career Progression System for Teachers and School Administrators* (DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2025).
https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DO_s2025_024r.pdf
10. Department of Education. (2020). *National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Administrators* (DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020).
https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024-.pdf
11. Dong, B. (2023). A systematic review of the transactional leadership literature and future outlook. *Academic Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 2(3), 21–33.
<https://doi.org/10.54097/ajmss.v2i3.7972>
12. Ezeh, C. R., & Ogara, P. I. (2020). Impact of financial management on effective school administration in Enugu Education Zone. *Multilingual Academic Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 7, 1–15.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/353998538>
13. 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>
14. Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2013). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
<https://www.mheducation.com>
15. International Institute for Management Development Business School. (2025). The 6 most common leadership styles & how to find yours.
<https://www.imd.org/blog/leadership/leadership-styles/>
16. Kadiyono, A. L., Sulistiobudi, R. A., Haris, I., Wahab, M. K. A., Ramdani, I., Purwanto, A., & Sumartiningsih, S. (2020). Develop leadership style model for Indonesian teachers' performance in Education 4.0 era. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, 11(9), 363–373.
<https://doi.org/10.31838/srp.2020.9.52>
17. Kumar, P. (2024, March 27). Understanding bureaucratic leadership in educational institutions. Teachers Institute.
<https://teachers.institute/organisational-behaviour/bureaucratic-leadership-education/>
18. Lindberg, C. (2023, April 19). Democratic leadership: Pros, cons, and examples. Leadership Ahoy!
<https://www.leadershipahoy.com/democratic-leadership-what-is-it-pros-cons-examples/>

19. Moore, K. D. (2024). The crucial role of educational leadership in shaping the future. LinkedIn. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/crucial-role-educational-leadership-shaping-future-dr-kim-moore-cttpe>
20. Mukherjee, D. (2022). Enabling crisis-resilient school management and change. National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration. <https://www.abacademies.org/articles/>
21. Northouse, P. G. (2018). Leadership: Theory and practice (8th ed.). Sage Publications. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/leadership/book258398>
22. Oco, R. M. (2022). Leadership styles of school administrators and its relationship to school performance. *Global Scientific Journal*, 10(1). <https://www.globalscientificjournal.com/researchpaper/>
23. Ogunode, N. J., & Musa, A. (2020, September 20). Higher education in Nigeria: Challenges and the ways forward. *Social Science Research Network*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3695914
24. Rahman, A., Ali, A., & Zeb, A. (2021). Human relationship and its impact on schools' performance in secondary schools. *Journal of Social Sciences Review*, 1(2), 53–69. <https://doi.org/10.54183/jssr.v1i2.7>
25. Raolina, H., Hariri, H., & Rini, R. (2021). Educational leadership practices. University of Lampung (Institutional Report). <https://eudl.eu/doi/10.4108/eai.16-10-2020.2305216>
26. Republic Act No. 10173. (2012). Data Privacy Act of 2012. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2012/08/15/republic-act-no-10173/>
27. Republic Act No. 9155. (2001). Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. <https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/2/7353>
28. UNESCO. (2024). Decisive leadership in education urgently needed. Global Education Monitoring Report. <https://www.unesco.org/gem-report/en/articles/decisive-leadership-education-urgently-needed>
29. Yariv, E. (2011). Deterioration in teachers' performance: Causes and remedies. *World Journal of Education*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjev1n1p81>
30. Yüksel Kurt, H., Koca, H., Başkonuş, T., & Akyel, Y. (2024). Challenges faced by school administrators in educating foreign national students. *International Journal of Arts and Social Science*, 7(2), 116–117. <https://www.ijassjournal.com/2024/V7I2/41466639137.pdf>