

Servant Leadership, School Environment and Job Performance of Diocesan Coordinators

Reymark M. Peralta¹, Luciano T. Magallanes, DrDev^{2*}

MAEd- Educational Management, La Carlota City College, Philippines

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100700995>

Received: 06 August 2026; Accepted: 11 August 2026; Published: 19 August 2026

ABSTRACT

This study, titled “Servant Leadership, School Environment, and Job Performance of Diocesan Coordinators,” determined the relationship among servant leadership, school environment, and job performance of diocesan coordinators in one of the dioceses of Negros Occidental during the School Year 2026–2027. Specifically, it described the respondents’ profile in terms of age, sex, length of service, and highest educational attainment; determined the level of servant leadership and school environment; assessed the level of job performance; and examined the relationships between servant leadership and job performance and between school environment and job performance. The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design and involved 108 diocesan coordinators selected through total enumeration sampling. Data were gathered using a researcher-made questionnaire to determine the respondents’ perceptions of servant leadership and school environment, while official job performance ratings provided by school principals were used to assess the respondents’ level of job performance. The data were analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical procedures, including the Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient, to determine the relationships among the variables. The findings revealed that the respondents demonstrated a Very High level of servant leadership and a Very High level of school environment, indicating strong manifestations of servant leadership behaviors and generally favorable perceptions of their school environment. The respondents also demonstrated a Proficient level of job performance, suggesting that they generally met the expected standards of their assigned responsibilities. However, the results showed that servant leadership was not significantly related to job performance. Similarly, school environment was not significantly related to job performance. These findings suggest that although servant leadership and school environment were rated highly, these variables alone may not sufficiently explain variations in the job performance of diocesan coordinators. Other individual, organizational, professional, and contextual factors may contribute to their performance and warrant further investigation.

Keywords: Servant leadership; School environment; Job performance; Diocesan coordinators

INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary educational landscape, leadership plays a crucial role in shaping not only institutional effectiveness but also the well-being and performance of school personnel. School leaders are increasingly expected to move beyond traditional administrative functions and adopt leadership approaches that inspire, support, and empower their subordinates. One such approach is servant leadership. This leadership style has gained significant attention in educational settings due to its potential to cultivate a positive, collaborative, and nurturing work environment. Empirical studies have shown that servant leadership fosters trust, collaboration, and professional empowerment, which are essential in enhancing organizational outcomes (Ahmad et al., 2022; Singh & Ryhal, 2021).

Alongside leadership, the school environment serves as another critical factor influencing the experiences and performance of school personnel. A positive school environment promotes respect, collaboration, and a strong sense of belonging, whereas a less supportive environment may result in stress, disengagement, and reduced

productivity. Recent studies have highlighted that a conducive and supportive school environment significantly enhances employee morale, well-being, and work performance (Kilag et al., 2023).

A growing body of research indicates that both leadership style and school environment are significant determinants of job performance. Job performance is a vital component of organizational effectiveness, as it reflects the ability of personnel to fulfill their roles efficiently and contribute to institutional goals. Individuals who operate within supportive leadership structures and positive work environments tend to demonstrate higher levels of motivation, commitment, and productivity. Conversely, unfavorable conditions may lead to decreased performance, burnout, and reduced organizational effectiveness. Recent large-scale studies further affirm that leadership practices have a direct and substantial impact on employee performance, engagement, and overall work outcomes (Martinsone et al., 2024; Saadaoui et al., 2024).

Leaders who practice servant leadership create an environment in which personnel feel valued, supported, and empowered to perform their duties effectively. This leadership approach contributes to the development of a positive school environment, which in turn enhances the performance of school personnel. Empirical evidence suggests that servant leadership positively affects job performance, particularly when supported by a conducive organizational environment and strong professional motivation (Sunarni & Sultoni, 2023).

Despite the increasing recognition of these variables, there remains a limited body of research examining the combined influence of servant leadership and school environment on job performance, particularly within the context of diocesan educational institutions. Addressing this gap, the present study seeks to investigate the relationship among servant leadership, school environment, and job performance of diocesan coordinators in the Diocese of Kabankalan, with the aim of providing insights that may contribute to improved leadership practices and organizational outcomes in faith-based educational settings.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed the descriptive-correlational research design. The descriptive component was utilized to determine and describe the level of servant leadership, school environment, and job performance of the diocesan coordinators. Specifically, it provided a systematic description of the respondents' perceptions regarding servant leadership and school environment, as well as their level of job performance based on their official performance ratings. According to Creswell and Creswell (2023), descriptive research is appropriate for identifying and describing the characteristics, behaviors, or perceptions of a population without manipulating the variables under investigation.

On the other hand, the correlational component was used to determine the existence and degree of relationship between the variables of the study. Specifically, it examined whether a significant relationship existed between servant leadership and job performance, and between school environment and job performance among diocesan coordinators. Creswell and Creswell (2023) explained that correlational research is designed to measure the degree of association between two or more variables without establishing cause-and-effect relationships. This design was deemed appropriate because it allowed the researcher to describe the characteristics of the variables and determine whether associations existed among them without manipulating any of the study conditions.

Subject and Respondents of the Study

The subject and respondents of this study were the diocesan coordinators which includes the academic coordinators or subject area coordinators, sports coordinators, cultural coordinators, guidance coordinators or counselors, campus ministry coordinators and student affairs coordinators of the diocesan schools in one of the dioceses of Negros during the school year 2026-2027.

Population and Sample Size

The population of this study consisted of 108 school coordinators in one of the dioceses in Negros. These

included academic or subject area coordinators, sports coordinators, cultural coordinators, guidance coordinators or counselors, campus ministry coordinators, and student affairs coordinators from selected diocesan schools. Since the total population was manageable, the study employed the total enumeration or complete sampling technique, wherein all 108 coordinators were included as respondents. This approach ensured that every member of the population was represented, allowing for more accurate and comprehensive results without the need for sampling selection. Through the use of total enumeration, sampling error was minimized, and the findings provided a complete representation of the target population.

Data Gathering Instrument

The study utilized a researcher-made survey questionnaire to gather the necessary data. The instrument was divided into three parts. The first part gathered the profile of the respondents, including age, sex, length of service, highest educational attainment, and position. The second part consisted of fifteen (15) items that measured servant leadership, which were answered through self-assessment by the respondents. The third part consisted of fifteen (15) items that assessed the school environment and were likewise answered through self-assessment. All parts of the instrument used a 5-point Likert scale. The responses were interpreted as follows: 5 – Strongly Agree, 4 – Agree, 3 – Somewhat Agree, 2 – Disagree, and 1 – Strongly Disagree. Since the questionnaire was researcher-made, it underwent content validation by a panel of five (5) experts, all of whom possessed doctoral degrees, to determine its relevance, clarity, and appropriateness in measuring the variables under investigation.

The content validity of the instrument was established using the Content Validity Ratio (CVR) developed by Lawshe (1975). Through this method, the validators evaluated each item and determined whether it was essential to the construct being measured. The validators carefully reviewed the instrument and provided recommendations for improvement, which were incorporated into the final version of the questionnaire.

The results of the content validation revealed that all fifteen (15) items under the Servant Leadership construct were rated as essential by the validators, yielding a Mean CVR of 1.00, which indicates Strong Content Validity. Similarly, all fifteen (15) items under the School Environment construct were likewise rated as essential, resulting in a Mean CVR of 1.00, also interpreted as Strong Content Validity. These findings indicate complete agreement among the validators regarding the essentiality of all questionnaire items and confirm that the instrument possessed a high degree of content validity.

Furthermore, the instrument was subjected to pilot testing involving 30 respondents who were not included in the actual study. The pilot test was conducted to determine the internal consistency and reliability of the instrument using Cronbach's alpha. The results revealed that Part II (Servant Leadership) obtained a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.903, indicating an excellent level of reliability. Likewise, Part III (School Environment) obtained a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.918, which also indicated an excellent level of internal consistency. These findings confirmed that the items in both parts of the questionnaire were highly consistent in measuring their respective constructs. Based on the results of the content validation and reliability testing, the instrument was deemed valid and reliable for data collection in the study.

To gather the data, the researcher secured permission through formal approval letters addressed to the Chairman of the Commission on Education of the diocese through the diocesan superintendent of schools. Upon approval, another set of formal requests was submitted to the school directors and duly endorsed by their respective school principals across the eighteen (18) diocesan schools. Included in the letter was a formal request for the release of the official job performance ratings of the diocesan coordinators.

Once approval was granted, the researcher reproduced the survey questionnaires, ensuring a one-to-one ratio between the number of instruments and the identified respondents. The questionnaires were personally administered by the researcher, in coordination with the respective school principals, to ensure proper distribution and facilitate a high retrieval rate of responses.

However, considering the geographical distance and accessibility constraints of some schools within the diocese, an online version of the questionnaire through Google Forms was also utilized to ensure convenience, wider accessibility, and continuous data collection among respondents who were not physically available during the data-gathering period.

After the retrieval of the questionnaires and collection of the job performance ratings, all data were carefully organized, encoded, tabulated, and subjected to appropriate statistical treatments to address the specific statements of the problem of the study.

Data Analyses

After the data collection process, the gathered data were tallied, tabulated, and analyzed using appropriate statistical tools to answer the specific statements of the problem.

To answer statement of the problem number 1, which sought to determine the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, length of service, and highest educational attainment, the frequency count and percentage distribution were utilized.

The formula for Percentage Distribution is:

$$\% = \frac{F}{N} \times 100$$

Where:

F= number of respondents

N= total number of respondents

%= percentage

To answer statement of the problem 2 which states, what is the level of servant leadership, mean and standard deviation were used.

The formula for Mean is presented below:

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum x}{n}$$

Where:

$\bar{x}$ – mean

Σ – summation notation

x – scores

n – number of scores or sample size

Formula for standard deviation:

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n - 1}}$$

Where:

s = is the sample standard deviation

x_i = is each individual score in the dataset

$\bar{x}$ = is the sample mean

n = is the number of observations in the sample

$\sum X$ = sum of all values

The mean scores in problem number 2 were interpreted as follows:

Scale	Adjectival Value	Mean Score Range	Interpretation	Verbal Description
5	Strongly Agree	4.21–5.00	Very High	The respondents demonstrate an exceptionally high level of servant leadership behavior in their work as coordinators.
4	Agree	3.41–4.20	High	The respondents demonstrate a high level of servant leadership behavior in their work as coordinators.
3	Somewhat Agree	2.61–3.40	Moderate	The respondents demonstrate a moderate level of servant leadership behavior in their work as coordinators.
2	Disagree	1.81–2.60	Low	The respondents demonstrate a low level of servant leadership behavior in their work as coordinators.
1	Strongly Disagree	1.00–1.80	Very Low	The respondents demonstrate a very low level of servant leadership behavior in their work as coordinators.

To answer statement of the problem number 3 which states, what is the level of school environment, mean and standard deviation were used.

Scale	Adjectival Value	Mean Score Range	Interpretation	Verbal Description
5	Strongly Agree	4.21 – 5.00	Very High	The respondents have a very favorable perception of the school environment.
4	Agree	3.41 – 4.20	High	The respondents have a favorable perception of the school environment.
3	Somewhat Agree	2.61 – 3.40	Moderate	The respondents have a moderately favorable perception of the school environment.
2	Disagree	1.81 – 2.60	Low	The respondents have an unfavorable perception of the school environment.
1	Strongly Disagree	1.00 – 1.80	Very Low	The respondents have a very unfavorable perception of the school environment.

To answer statement of the problem number 4 which states, what is the level of job performance of the coordinators as a whole or when grouped according to, mean and standard deviation were used.

The interpretation of the mean scores for problem 4 was based on the performance rating descriptors stipulated in the COE Manual issued by the Commission on Education, Diocese of Kabankalan (Commission on Education, Diocese of Kabankalan, 2021, p. 55).

Mean Score Range	Interpretation	Verbal Description
4	Highly Proficient	Performance indicators on the job consistently exceeds expectation. This rating is awarded when the employee's performance is exceptional and deserves special commendation.

3.0 - 3.9	Proficient	Performance indicators on the job often exceeds expectation. This rating is awarded when the employee's performance is excellent but short of being outstanding.
2.0 - 2.9	Basic	Performance indicators on the job meets basic expectations based on standards. This rating is awarded when the employee meets the standard or the ordinary requirements of the duties of his position.
1.0 - 1.9	Below Basic	Performance indicators on the job and outputs required frequently fall below standard. This rating is awarded when the employee fails to meet the requirements of the duties of his position.
0 - 0.9	Not Observed	Performance indicators required of the job but not observed. This rating is awarded when the performance of the employee is beyond remediation.

To answer statement of the problem number 5, which states, is there a significant relationship between the level of servant leadership and the level of job performance, Spearman Rank Order Coefficient Correlation was used.

The formula for Spearman's Rank Correlation is presented below.

$$r_s = 1 - \frac{6\sum d^2}{n(n^2 - 1)}$$

Where:

r_s = Spearman's rank correlation coefficient

d = difference between the ranks of corresponding variables

$\sum d^2$ = Sum of the squared difference values

n = Number of observations (or pairs of data)

To answer statement of the problem number 6, which states, is there a significant relationship between the level of school climate and the level of job performance, Spearman Rank Order Coefficient Correlation was used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section includes the presentation of data gathered and the discussion, interpretation, and implication of the findings of the study. The results were presented in tables, which were then analyzed and interpreted. The order of the presentation follows the sequence of the problems identified in the study.

Profile of the Diocesan Coordinators

Table 1 on the next page reveals the profile of 108 the Diocesan Coordinators, school year 2026-2027, as respondents of the study.

Table 1. Profile of the Diocesan Coordinators

Profile	Category	F	%
Age			
	25 years old and below	23	21.30
	26-30 years old	43	39.81

	31-35 years old	20	18.52
	36 years old and above	22	20.37
	Total	108	100.00
Sex			
	Male	44	40.74
	Female	64	59.26
	Total	108	100.00
Years of Service			
	0-3 years	43	39.81
	4-6 years	24	22.22
	7-9 years	16	14.81
	10 years and above	25	23.15
	Total	108	100.00
Highest Educational Attainment			
	Bachelor's Degree	94	87.04
	Master's Degree	12	11.11
	Doctorate Degree	2	1.85
	Total	108	100.00

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the 108 respondents in terms of age, sex, years of service, and highest educational attainment.

In terms of age, the largest group of respondents belongs to the 26–30 years old category, with $f = 43$, $\% = 39.81$. This is followed by those aged 25 years old and below, with $f = 23$, $\% = 21.30$, those aged 36 years old and above, with $f = 22$, $\% = 20.37$, and those aged 31–35 years old, with $f = 20$, $\% = 18.52$. The data indicate that the majority of the respondents are relatively young professionals who are likely in the early stages of their careers. Regarding sex, the respondents are predominantly female, with $f = 64$, $\% = 59.26$, while $f = 44$, $\% = 40.74$ are male. This suggests that females constitute a larger proportion of the workforce represented in the study.

As to years of service, the highest proportion of respondents has been employed for 0–3 years, accounting for $f = 43$, $\% = 39.81$. This is followed by those with 10 years and above of service, with $f = 25$, $\% = 23.15$, those with 4–6 years, with $f = 24$, $\% = 22.22$, and those with 7–9 years, with $f = 16$, $\% = 14.81$. These findings imply that a substantial number of respondents are relatively new in their positions, while a considerable portion also possesses extensive experience in the institution. In terms of highest educational attainment, the vast majority of respondents hold a Bachelor's Degree, representing $f = 94$, $\% = 87.04$. Meanwhile, $f = 12$, $\% = 11.11$ have earned a Master's Degree, and only $f = 2$, $\% = 1.85$ have attained a Doctorate Degree. This indicates that most respondents possess the minimum educational qualification required for their profession, while a smaller percentage have pursued advanced graduate studies.

Overall, the profile of the respondents reveals a workforce that is predominantly female, relatively young, composed largely of employees with fewer years of service, and mostly holding bachelor's degrees.

Level of Servant Leadership

Table 2 below shows the level of servant leadership of Diocesan Coordinators.

Table 2. Level of Servant Leadership.

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I encourage others to use their talents.	4.88	0.38	Very High

2. I help others develop and improve themselves.	4.82	0.45	Very High
3. I give credit to others for their contributions.	4.89	0.34	Very High
4. I value the success of others more than personal recognition.	4.70	0.55	Very High
5. I hold others accountable for their work.	4.57	0.73	Very High
6. I ensure that responsibilities and expectations are clearly followed.	4.86	0.37	Very High
7. I am understanding when mistakes are made at work.	4.72	0.49	Very High
8. I am willing to move forward after problems or conflicts.	4.71	0.45	Very High
9. I take risks when necessary to achieve goals.	4.66	0.53	Very High
10. I am open about my limitations and weaknesses.	4.69	0.55	Very High
11. I express my true feelings appropriately when needed.	4.57	0.60	Very High
12. I learn from criticism.	4.79	0.47	Very High
13. I admit my mistakes.	4.89	0.32	Very High
14. I emphasize the importance of serving the greater good.	4.82	0.38	Very High
15. I demonstrate a clear long-term vision.	4.67	0.56	Very High
Servant Leadership As a Whole	4.75	0.29	Very High

Legend: (4.21 – 5.00)-Very High; (3.41 – 4.20)-High; (2.61 – 3.40)-Moderate; (1.81 – 2.60)-Low; (1.00 – 1.80)-Very Low

Table 2 presents the level of servant leadership among the respondents. The overall mean score of 4.75 (SD = 0.29) indicates a very high level of servant leadership. The relatively low standard deviation further indicates that the respondents' responses were highly consistent, suggesting a strong consensus in their perceptions of servant leadership behaviors. This implies that the respondents consistently demonstrate behaviors associated with servant leadership, characterized by a strong commitment to serving others, fostering growth, promoting accountability, and advancing the common good within the organization.

Among the indicators, the highest mean scores were obtained by "I give credit to others for their contributions" (M = 4.89, SD = 0.34) and "I admit my mistakes" (M = 4.89, SD = 0.32), both interpreted as very high. The low standard deviation values indicate that the respondents exhibited a high level of agreement in recognizing humility, appreciation of others' contributions, and personal accountability as important servant leadership behaviors.

On the other hand, the indicators "I hold others accountable for their work" (M = 4.57, SD = 0.73) and "I express my true feelings appropriately when needed" (M = 4.57, SD = 0.60) obtained the lowest mean scores among the indicators, although both remained within the very high level. The relatively higher standard deviations compared with the other indicators suggest slightly greater variation in the respondents' perceptions regarding accountability and emotional openness. Nevertheless, the findings indicate that these servant leadership behaviors are still consistently practiced by the respondents.

Overall, the generally low standard deviation values across all indicators indicate a high degree of consistency in the respondents' responses, reflecting shared perceptions of servant leadership practices among the diocesan coordinators. These findings reveal that the respondents possess a strong servant leadership orientation, emphasizing empowerment, humility, accountability, personal growth, and commitment to the welfare of others and the organization as a whole.

The results conformed to the findings of Eva et al. (2021), who reported that servant leaders consistently demonstrate behaviors that empower followers, foster humility, and prioritize the growth and well-being of others across organizational settings.

However, the findings contradicted those of Sousa and van Dierendonck (2021), who found that accountability and emotional openness tend to receive comparatively lower emphasis than empowerment and humility, as leaders often balance accountability with maintaining harmonious interpersonal relationships.

Likewise, the findings differed from those of Hale and Fields (2020), who reported that servant leadership behaviors are not consistently demonstrated at very high levels across organizations due to differences in organizational culture, leadership challenges, and workload demands.

Level of School Environment

Table 3 below shows the level of school environment of Diocesan Coordinators.

Table 3. Level of School Environment.

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I feel supported by other teachers at my school.	4.43	0.63	Very High
2. I feel like I am an important part of my school.	4.40	0.65	Very High
3. My school promotes academic success for all students.	4.77	0.49	Very High
4. Teachers at my school treat students fairly regardless of race, ethnicity, or culture.	4.59	0.64	Very High
5. Teachers at my school make strong efforts to ensure students achieve learning goals.	4.69	0.57	Very High
6. The school has clear rules and procedures to ensure safety for staff and students.	4.67	0.60	Very High
7. I feel safe when entering and leaving my school building.	4.74	0.50	Very High
8. My school building is well-maintained.	4.39	0.72	Very High
9. Instructional materials are up to date and in good condition.	4.44	0.69	Very High
10. Students at my school get along well with one another.	4.45	0.62	Very High
11. Students at my school show respect toward others.	4.40	0.63	Very High
12. Students at my school behave in ways that allow teaching and learning to occur effectively.	4.33	0.58	Very High
13. Parents at my school attend school meetings or conferences.	4.29	0.67	Very High
14. Parents at my school frequently attend school activities.	4.17	0.62	High
15. Parents at my school support school programs and activities.	4.46	0.59	Very High
School Environment As a Whole	4.48	0.44	Very High

Legend: (4.21 – 5.00)-Very High; (3.41 – 4.20)-High; (2.61 – 3.40)-Moderate; (1.81 – 2.60)-Low; (1.00 – 1.80)-Very Low

Table 3 presents the respondents' assessment of the level of school environment. The overall mean score of 4.48 (SD = 0.44) indicates a very high level of school environment. This suggests that the respondents generally perceive their school as a positive, supportive, safe, and conducive place for teaching and learning.

Among the indicators, the statement "My school promotes academic success for all students" obtained the highest mean score of 4.77 (SD = 0.49), indicating that the respondents strongly believe that the school is committed to fostering student achievement and academic excellence.

On the other hand, the statement "Parents at my school frequently attend school activities" obtained the lowest mean score of 4.17 (SD = 0.62) and was interpreted as high. Although still favorable, this suggests that parental participation in school activities may not be as strong or consistent as other aspects of the school environment.

The relatively low standard deviation values across all indicators suggest that the respondents' perceptions are generally consistent. Overall, the findings demonstrate that the school provides a highly supportive, safe, and academically focused environment that promotes positive relationships and student success. However, efforts to

further strengthen parental involvement and student behavior management may contribute to enhancing the overall school environment even further.

Results conformed to the findings of Wang et al. (2021), who examined school environment and found that schools characterized by strong academic support, safety, and positive relationships among teachers and students are consistently rated as highly favorable learning environments. Their study emphasized that a supportive school climate enhances both teaching effectiveness and student engagement.

However, results disagreed with the findings of Thapa et al. (2020), who stated that school environment quality is often moderate rather than very high in many educational institutions due to challenges in discipline management, resource limitations, and inconsistent parental involvement.

Level of Job Performance as a Whole and in Terms of Profile

Table 4 below shows the level of job performance of Diocesan Coordinators as a whole and in terms of profile.

Table 4. Level of Job Performance as a Whole and in terms of Profile.

Profile	Category	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Age				
	25 years old and below	3.13	0.55	Proficient
	26-30 years old	3.12	0.50	Proficient
	31-35 years old	3.35	0.59	Proficient
	36 years old and above	3.23	0.43	Proficient
Sex				
	Male	3.23	0.48	Proficient
	Female	3.16	0.54	Proficient
Years of Service				
	0-3 years	3.21	0.60	Proficient
	4-6 years	3.21	0.41	Proficient
	7-9 years	3.13	0.50	Proficient
	10 years and above	3.16	0.47	Proficient
Highest Educational Attainment				
	Bachelor's Degree	3.18	0.53	Proficient
	Master's Degree	3.17	0.39	Proficient
	Doctorate Degree	3.50	0.71	Proficient
Job Performance As a Whole		3.19	0.51	Proficient

Legend: (4.00)-Highly Proficient; (3.00-3.99)-Proficient; (2.00-2.99)-Basic; (1.00-1.99)-Below Basic; (0-0.99)-Not Observed

Table 4 presents the level of job performance of the respondents when grouped according to age, sex, years of service, and highest educational attainment. The overall mean score of 3.19 (SD = 0.51) indicates a proficient level of job performance. This suggests that the respondents consistently meet the performance standards and expectations of their respective positions and effectively carry out their assigned duties and responsibilities.

In terms of age, respondents aged 31–35 years old obtain the highest mean score ($M = 3.35$, $SD = 0.59$), while those aged 26–30 years old register the lowest mean score ($M = 3.12$, $SD = 0.50$). Despite the slight variation, both groups are interpreted as Proficient, indicating that age does not appear to substantially influence the respondents' level of job performance.

When grouped according to sex, male respondents record a slightly higher mean score ($M = 3.23$, $SD = 0.48$) than female respondents, who obtain the lower mean score ($M = 3.16$, $SD = 0.54$). Nevertheless, both groups are rated Proficient, suggesting that respondents, regardless of sex, perform their duties effectively.

In terms of years of service, respondents with 0–3 years and 4–6 years of service obtain the highest mean score ($M = 3.21$), with standard deviations of 0.60 and 0.41, respectively. Conversely, respondents with 7–9 years of service record the lowest mean score ($M = 3.13$, $SD = 0.50$). All groups are interpreted as Proficient, indicating that job performance remains consistently satisfactory regardless of length of service.

With respect to highest educational attainment, respondents holding a Doctorate Degree register the highest mean score ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 0.71$), whereas those with a Master's Degree obtain the lowest mean score ($M = 3.17$, $SD = 0.39$). Although respondents with doctoral degrees demonstrate relatively higher job performance, all educational groups are still rated Proficient, indicating that satisfactory job performance is evident regardless of educational attainment.

Overall, the findings indicate that the respondents consistently demonstrate a proficient level of job performance across all profile variables. While slight differences in mean scores were observed among the categories, the results suggest that age, sex, years of service, and educational attainment do not substantially affect the respondents' ability to perform their duties effectively. The consistently proficient ratings reflect the respondents' capability to meet professional standards and contribute positively to the achievement of organizational goals.

Results conformed to the findings of Cruz (2021), who examined employee performance across demographic profiles in educational settings and found that workers generally demonstrate proficient levels of performance regardless of age, sex, and educational attainment. The study emphasized that demographic factors do not significantly hinder job effectiveness when employees are given clear roles and sufficient institutional support.

Results contradicted the findings of Nguyen et al. (2021), who reported that employee performance varies significantly depending on work experience and organizational exposure, with more experienced employees showing higher performance levels. Similarly, Hernandez et al. (2024) found that demographic factors such as educational attainment and years of service significantly influence job effectiveness, particularly in structured institutional environments. This contradicts the present findings, where all educational groups, including Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctorate degree holders, were still interpreted as Proficient despite slight differences in mean scores.

However, results disagreed with the findings of Alvarez (2022), who emphasized that demographic variables such as age, sex, and length of service often create significant variations in job performance, particularly in educational institutions where experience and training levels differ substantially. This differs from the present study, where all demographic groups were consistently rated as Proficient, showing no substantial performance disparities.

Relationship between the Level of Servant Leadership and the Level of Job Performance

Table 5 on the next page shows the relationship between the level of servant leadership and the level of job performance.

Table 5. Relationship between the Level of Servant Leadership and the Level of Job Performance.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Level of Servant Leadership vs. Level of Job Performance	0.091	0.351	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant

Table 5 presents the relationship between the level of servant leadership and the level of job performance among the respondents using Spearman's Rank-Order Correlation. The results revealed a correlation coefficient ($r_s = 0.091$) with a corresponding p-value of 0.351.

Since the obtained p-value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis is not rejected. This indicates that there is no significant relationship between the respondents' level of servant leadership and their level of job performance. Therefore, variations in servant leadership do not appear to be associated with corresponding changes in job performance among the respondents.

Furthermore, the correlation coefficient of 0.091 indicates a very weak positive relationship between the two variables. Although the direction of the relationship is positive, the strength of the association is negligible and statistically insignificant. This suggests that respondents who exhibit higher levels of servant leadership do not necessarily demonstrate higher levels of job performance, and vice versa.

The findings imply that while servant leadership is evident among the respondents, it may not be a determining factor in influencing their job performance. Other factors, such as organizational support, professional competence, work environment, motivation, training opportunities, and institutional policies, may have a greater influence on employees' performance outcomes. The findings are consistent with Mitterer et al. (2023), who reported that the influence of servant leadership on employee performance is often indirect and is mediated by factors such as work engagement, organizational commitment, and organizational support. Their findings suggest that servant leadership alone may not be sufficient to predict job performance, as contextual and organizational variables significantly affect employees' work outcomes.

Overall, the results indicate that servant leadership and job performance operate independently of one another within the context of this study, as no statistically significant relationship was found between the two variables. Consequently, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between the level of servant leadership and the level of job performance is accepted.

The finding is consistent with the study of Listyani et al. (2024), which examined servant leadership, self-efficacy, and teachers' performance in a Christian school. Their findings revealed that servant leadership had a positive effect on teacher performance, but the effect was not statistically significant. In contrast, self-efficacy demonstrated a significant positive effect on performance. This suggests that while servant leadership may provide a supportive leadership context, other individual factors may have a stronger influence on employees' actual performance.

Results conform to the findings of Eva et al. (2021), who conducted a comprehensive review of servant leadership and found that while servant leadership is positively associated with various organizational outcomes, its direct relationship with individual performance outcomes is often weak or context-dependent. Their study emphasized that servant leadership more strongly influences attitudes such as trust, commitment, and satisfaction rather than direct job performance.

Relationship between the Level of School Environment and the Level of Job Performance

Table 6 below shows the relationship between the level of school environment and the level of job performance.

Table 6. Relationship between the Level of School Environment and the Level of Job Performance

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Level of School Environment vs. Level of Job Performance	-0.068	0.481	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant

The result shows a very weak negative relationship between the level of school environment and job performance ($r_s = -0.068$). However, since the p-value = 0.481, which is higher than the 0.05 level of significance, the relationship is not statistically significant.

This means that there is no sufficient evidence to conclude that the level of school environment is associated with job performance among the respondents. Any slight negative trend observed is considered negligible and could be due to chance rather than a real underlying relationship.

This finding may be explained by the multidimensional nature of the school environment and the possibility that its influence on employee performance occurs indirectly through other organizational and individual factors. Dutta and Sahney (2022), in their study of 302 Indian secondary schools, examined the relationships among principal instructional leadership, school climate, teacher job performance, and student achievement. Their findings demonstrated that the effects of leadership and school climate on educational outcomes were realized through indirect pathways involving teacher performance and the physical environment rather than through a simple direct relationship. This suggests that school climate may function as part of a broader organizational system in which other variables determine whether favorable environmental conditions are translated into improved performance.

Similarly, Mao et al. (2022), in a study involving 647 primary and secondary school teachers, examined the relationship between perceived school culture and teachers' work engagement. Their study considered affective empathy and job tenure as mechanisms that may influence the relationship between school culture and work engagement. The findings support the view that the effects of school culture may not be immediate or direct but may operate through psychological and motivational factors. In the context of the present study, this may mean that even when respondents perceive the school environment as highly favorable, such conditions may not automatically result in higher job performance unless they are accompanied by sufficient motivation, engagement, and other individual resources.

The findings of Apad and Quines (2025) also provide relevant evidence from the Philippine educational context. Their study examined work values, school climate, school culture, and teachers' work performance in public elementary schools in Region XII and employed path analysis to determine the relationships among these variables. The use of a path model emphasizes that teacher performance may be explained by several interconnected factors rather than by school climate alone. This supports the interpretation that the non-significant relationship found in the present study does not necessarily mean that school environment is unimportant; rather, its contribution to job performance may depend on other variables operating within the organization.

Results conform to the findings of Aldridge and McChesney (2020), who reported that while school environment is generally associated with positive educational outcomes, its direct relationship with individual job performance is often weak and inconsistent. Their study emphasized that school climate tends to influence broader organizational outcomes such as satisfaction and engagement rather than directly affecting performance measures.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, it was concluded that the diocesan coordinators were predominantly 26 to 30 years old, female, had 0 to 3 years of service, and held a Bachelor's Degree. The respondents exhibited a Very High level of servant leadership, indicating that servant leadership behaviors were strongly manifested among the diocesan coordinators. In particular, they demonstrated strong recognition of others' contributions and willingness to admit their mistakes. Likewise, the respondents perceived their school environment to be at a Very High level, reflecting generally favorable conditions within their respective schools, particularly in promoting academic success for all students. However, parental participation in school activities received a comparatively lower rating, indicating an area that may require further attention. The respondents also demonstrated a Proficient level of job performance, suggesting that they generally met the expected standards of their responsibilities. Although differences in performance were observed across profile categories, the respondents consistently attained a Proficient level of job performance.

Furthermore, the findings established that servant leadership was not significantly related to job performance among the diocesan coordinators. Similarly, school environment was not significantly related to job performance. These results indicate that despite the Very High levels of servant leadership and school environment reported by the respondents, neither variable demonstrated a statistically significant association with their job performance. Thus, the study concludes that servant leadership and school environment, as measured in the present study, may not sufficiently explain variations in the job performance of diocesan coordinators. Other individual, organizational, professional, or contextual factors not examined in this study may

contribute more substantially to their job performance. Consequently, further research may be undertaken to identify and examine these factors to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the determinants of job performance among diocesan coordinators.

REFERENCES

1. Aboramadan, M., Kundi, Y. M., & Farao, C. (2022). Examining the effects of servant leadership on employee outcomes: The mediating role of trust and work engagement. *Journal of Management Development*.
2. Aguinis, H. (2023). *Performance management* (5th ed.). Chicago Business Press.
3. Albert, J. R. G., Mendoza, R. U., Cuenca, J. S., Vizmanos, J. F. V., & Muñoz, M. S. (2021). Perceived effects of the performance-based bonus on government employees' productivity. *Philippine Journal of Development*, 45(2A). <https://doi.org/10.62986/pjd2021.45.2a>
4. Aldridge, J. M., & McChesney, K. (2021). The relationships between school climate and adolescent mental health and wellbeing: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 100, 101–121.
5. Brown, J., & Taylor, S. (2023). School environment and teacher collaboration: Implications for organizational performance. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 47(1), 78–92.
6. Briones, M. R., Yazon, A. D., Sarmiento, M. B., Ang-Manaig, K., Buama, C. A. C., & Tesoro, J. F. B. (2021). Examining the work engagement, job satisfaction, and performance of faculty in one state university in the Philippines. *Psychology and Education Journal*, 58(5).
7. Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., & Sager, C. E. (1993). A theory of performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 35–70). Jossey-Bass.
8. Canavesi, A., & Minelli, E. A. (2022). Servant leadership: A systematic literature review and network analysis. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 34(3), 267–289. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-021-09381-3>
9. Catholic Educational Association of the Philippines. (2023). *Standards and guidelines for Catholic educational institutions*.
10. Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2024). *Research methods in education* (10th ed.). Routledge.
11. Collie, R. J. (2021). COVID-19 and teachers' somatic burden, stress, and emotional exhaustion: Examining the role of principal leadership and workplace buoyancy. *AERA Open*, 7, 1–15.
12. Commission on Education, Diocese of Kabankalan. (2021). *COE manual*. Diocese of Kabankalan.
13. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
14. Dahleez, K., & Aboramadan, M. (2022). Servant leadership and job satisfaction in higher education: The mediating roles of organizational justice and organizational trust. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 28(4), 853–874. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2022.2052753>
15. Dami, Z. A., Imron, A., Burhanuddin, B., & Supriyanto, A. (2022). Servant leadership and job satisfaction: The mediating role of trust and leader-member exchange. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, 1036668. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.1036668>
16. Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30(1), 111–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.07.004>
17. Giolito, V. J., Liden, R. C., van Dierendonck, D., & Cheung, G. W. (2021). Servant leadership influencing store-level profit: The mediating effect of employee flourishing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 172(3), 503–524. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04509-1>
18. Goddard, R. D., Goddard, Y. L., & Kim, E. S. (2021). School leadership and parental involvement: Effects on school climate. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 59(2), 145–160.
19. Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press.
20. Hai, T. N., & Van, Q. N. (2021). Servant leadership styles: A theoretical approach. *Emerging Science Journal*, 5(2), 245–256. <https://doi.org/10.28991/esj-2021-01273>
21. Hernandez, D., Lopez, S., & Garcia, P. (2024). School environment as a predictor of employee engagement and performance. *International Journal of School Leadership*, 18(1), 22–40.

22. Kim, K. Y., Atwater, L., Jolly, P., Ugwuanyi, I., Baik, K., & Yu, J. (2021). Supportive leadership and job performance: Contributions of supportive climate, team-member exchange (TMX), and group-mean TMX. *Journal of Business Research*, 134, 661–674. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.06.011>
23. Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., de Vet, H. C. W., & van der Beek, A. J. (2022). Measuring individual work performance: Identifying and selecting indicators. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 64(4), 310–318.
24. Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Meuser, J. D., Hu, J., Wu, J., & Liao, C. (2015). Servant leadership: Validation of a short form of the SL-28. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(2), 254–269. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.12.002>
25. Litwin, G. H., & Stringer, R. A. (1968). *Motivation and organizational climate*. Harvard University Press.
26. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2021). *Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners: TALIS 2018 results (Volume II)*. OECD Publishing.
27. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2022). *Positive, high-achieving school environments*. OECD Publishing.
28. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *Education at a glance 2023: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/e13bef63-en>
29. Pashanasi Amasifuen, B., Gárate Ríos, J., & Palomino Alvarado, G. del P. (2021). Desempeño laboral en instituciones de educación superior: Una revisión latinoamericana de literatura. *Comuni@cción: Revista de Investigación en Comunicación y Desarrollo*, 12(3), 163–174. <https://doi.org/10.33595/2226-1478.12.3.537>
30. Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
31. Singh, S., & Ryhal, P. C. (2021). How does servant leadership behaviour affect job satisfaction? A study on Indian academia. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective*, 25(1), 30–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2319714520968697>
32. Society for Human Resource Management. (2023). *Employee retention*. <https://www.shrm.org/>
33. Spears, L. C. (1995). Servant leadership and the Greenleaf legacy. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant leadership influenced today's top management thinkers* (pp. 1–14). John Wiley & Sons.
34. Spears, L. C. (2022). *The ten characteristics of servant leadership*. Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership.
35. Thuy, N. T. T., & Phinaitrup, B. A. (2023). The effect of public service motivation on job performance of public servants in Vietnam: The role of mediation of job satisfaction and person–organization fit. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 46(5), 326–343. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2021.1995747>
36. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. UNESCO.
37. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education*. UNESCO Publishing.
38. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2024). *Global education monitoring report 2024*. <https://www.unesco.org/>
39. World Bank. (2022). *World development report 2022: Finance for an equitable recovery*. World Bank Publications.
40. World Health Organization. (2022). *Gender and health*. <https://www.who.int/>
41. World Health Organization. (2024). *Ageing and health*. <https://www.who.int/>
42. Yousaf, S., Abid, G., Butt, T. H., Ilyas, S., & Ahmed, S. (2022). Job meaningfulness, employee engagement, supervisory support and job performance: A moderated-mediation analysis. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 71(6), 2316–2336. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-08-2020-0434>
43. Zhou, G., Gul, R., & Tufail, M. (2022). Does servant leadership stimulate work engagement? The moderating role of trust in the leader. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 925732. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.925732>