



Leadership Support, Decision-Making Participation, Work Environment, and Teaching Performance of Educators

Rona J. Sayosa¹, Trudy C. Cerbo²

¹DepEd Negros Island Region, Philippines

²La Carlota City College, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100700618>

Received: 29 July 2026; Accepted: 03 August 2026; Published: 08 August 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship among leadership support, decision-making participation, work environment, and teaching performance of educators in one of the schools division in Negros Island Region. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, the study involved 128 elementary school teachers selected through total enumeration. Data were gathered through a validated researcher-made questionnaire. The findings revealed that leadership support, decision-making participation, and work environment were all rated very high. Teaching performance was rated outstanding. Results further showed significant relationships between leadership support and teaching performance, decision-making participation and teaching performance, and work environment and teaching performance. Although the relationships were weak, they indicate that supportive leadership, active teacher involvement, and a positive work environment contribute to improved teaching performance. The findings may serve as a basis for developing programs and policies that enhance teacher effectiveness and overall school performance.

Keywords: Leadership Support, Decision-Making Participation, Work Environment, Teaching Performance, Educators, School Leadership, Participatory Governance, School Climate.

INTRODUCTION

In the Philippines, teacher participation in decision-making has gained attention as an important component of effective school management. Teachers bring valuable classroom-based insights that can enhance institutional policies and practices. Studies show that involving teachers in decision-making increases their sense of ownership, professional autonomy, and job satisfaction. However, despite its recognized importance, many education systems still show limited teacher involvement in governance, creating a gap between policy and practice (OECD, 2024).

The work environment also plays a significant role in shaping teaching performance. Both physical conditions, such as facilities and instructional resources, and non-physical aspects, including collegial relationships and organizational culture, influence teachers' productivity and well-being. A supportive and positive work environment can enhance motivation and performance, while a stressful or resource-limited environment may lead to burnout and reduced teaching effectiveness (Kao et al., 2023).

In the Philippine context, leadership support is recognized as essential in improving educational quality and teacher performance. School leaders are expected to guide teachers, manage resources, and promote professional growth. However, challenges such as heavy workloads, limited resources, and inconsistent implementation of shared decision-making practices continue to affect teachers' performance. These realities highlight the need to further examine how leadership and participation influence teaching outcomes within the national setting (Yongco, 2026; Aquino, 2025).

At the local level, schools often experience varying conditions that impact educators' daily work. Some teachers may have limited access to instructional materials, professional development opportunities, or meaningful participation in school decisions. These conditions can affect their motivation and effectiveness. Conversely,



schools that foster supportive leadership, inclusive participation, and positive working environments tend to produce more engaged and high-performing teachers.

Despite existing studies on leadership, work environment, and teacher performance, there is still a gap in research that examines these variables collectively, particularly in localized contexts. Many studies treat these factors separately, overlooking their combined influence on teaching performance. Thus, this study aims to explore how leadership support, decision-making participation, and work environment interact to influence educators' teaching performance, providing insights that may help improve educational practices and policies.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a quantitative, descriptive–correlational research design to explore how leadership support, decision-making participation, and work environment relate to teaching performance among educators. The respondents were the 128 elementary school teachers from the elementary schools of a certain cluster in a large division in the Negros Island Region. Since the entire population was involved as respondents, total enumeration was used and there was no need to determine a separate sample size.

Data were gathered using a researcher-made survey questionnaire divided into three parts: leadership support covering three sub-variables (instructional support, professional development support, and administrative support); decision-making participation including three sub-variables (involvement in school planning, participation in policy formulation, and shared decision-making processes); and work environment focusing on three sub-variables (physical working conditions, collegial relationships, and organizational support). Respondents indicated their answers using a five-point Likert scale: (5) Strongly Agree, (4) Agree, (3) Neutral, (2) Disagree, and (1) Strongly Disagree.

The research instrument underwent a content validation process involving five qualified evaluators, achieving a Content Validity Ratio (CVR) of 1.00 for the questionnaires on Leadership Support, Decision-Making Participation, and Work Environment, which confirmed that the instrument possessed satisfactory content validity and indicated that the items were appropriate and essential for measuring the intended constructs.

Internal consistency was established through a pilot test conducted on 30 individuals who shared characteristics similar to those of the target respondents but were not included in the actual study, yielding Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.964 for leadership support, 0.948 for decision-making participation, and 0.950 for work environment, demonstrating high reliability.

For the data collection process, the researcher first secured a formal letter of approval from the Schools Division Superintendent before distributing the questionnaires to elementary school teachers. With the assistance of the school administration, the questionnaires were personally distributed by the researcher and retrieved immediately after the respondents had completed them. Before answering, the respondents were informed about the purpose and significance of the study to ensure that they would provide honest and well-considered responses. Once all responses were gathered, the data were systematically organized, tabulated, and prepared for analysis.

These were then carefully examined to help address and answer the research questions of the study. The mean was used to determine the level of leadership support as perceived by educators, the level of decision-making participation of educators, the level of work environment of educators, and the level of teaching performance of educators.

Spearman's Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient was used to determine the significant relationship between the level of leadership support and the level of teaching performance of educators, the significant relationship between the level of decision-making participation and the level of teaching performance of educators, and the significant relationship between the level of work environment and the level of teaching performance of educators.



RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Level of Leadership Support as

Perceived by Educators

Table 1. Level of Leadership Support as Perceived by Educators as a Whole and In Terms of Instructional Support, Professional Development Support, and Administrative Support.

Leadership Support	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Instructional Support <i>The school head...</i>	4.72	0.41	Very High
1. helps teachers improve teaching strategies and classroom practices.	4.75	0.43	Very High
2. provides guidance to improve student learning.	4.76	0.43	Very High
3. observes classes and provide constructive feedback.	4.69	0.50	Very High
4. addresses instructional concerns raised by teachers.	4.73	0.45	Very High
5. supports the use of effective and innovative teaching methods.	4.70	0.53	Very High
Professional Development Support <i>The school head...</i>	4.80	0.35	Very High
1. encourages teachers to attend seminars, trainings, and workshops.	4.88	0.32	Very High
2. provides opportunities to enhance professional skills.	4.80	0.40	Very High
3. supports teachers in pursuing further studies or certifications.	4.77	0.42	Very High
4. offers professional development activities that are relevant to teaching needs.	4.76	0.43	Very High
5. motivates teachers to continuously improve their competencies.	4.77	0.43	Very High
Administrative Support <i>The school head...</i>	4.74	0.44	Very High



1. provides clear instructions regarding school policies and procedures.	4.77	0.4 2	Very High
2. ensures administrative tasks are well-organized and clearly communicated to teachers.	4.70	0.5 1	Very High
3. responds promptly to teachers' concerns and requests.	4.70	0.5 1	Very High
4. supports teachers in managing workload and responsibilities.	4.70	0.5 3	Very High
5. treats teachers fairly and with respect.	4.81	0.3 9	Very High
As a Whole	4.75	0.3 7	Very High
<i>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</i>			

Table 1 presents the level of leadership support as perceived by educators in terms of instructional support, professional development support, and administrative support. Among the three dimensions, professional development support obtained the highest mean ($M = 4.80$, $SD = 0.35$), interpreted as very high. This indicates that school heads place considerable emphasis on enhancing teachers' professional competencies and career growth. The highest-rated indicator was encouraging teachers to attend seminars, trainings, and workshops ($M = 4.88$, $SD = 0.32$), followed by providing opportunities to enhance professional skills ($M = 4.80$, $SD = 0.40$). These findings imply that school leaders recognize the importance of continuous learning and actively support teachers in developing their knowledge and instructional capabilities. Such support may contribute to increased teacher confidence, improved instructional practices, and greater readiness to address the evolving demands of education.

These findings are consistent with the study of Kraft (2020), which found that leadership practices that prioritize teacher learning and professional growth contribute positively to teacher effectiveness, instructional quality, and school improvement.

In terms of administrative support, the dimension obtained a mean of 4.74 ($SD = 0.44$), interpreted as very high. Educators generally agreed that school heads effectively manage school operations while assisting teachers. The highest-rated indicator was treating teachers fairly and with respect ($M = 4.81$, $SD = 0.39$), followed by providing clear instructions regarding school policies and procedures ($M = 4.77$, $SD = 0.42$). These results suggest that teachers value leadership characterized by fairness, transparency, and effective communication. When administrative processes are organized and clearly communicated, teachers may experience reduced work-related stress and become more focused on instructional responsibilities. The findings further imply that supportive administrative leadership contributes to a positive organizational climate and stronger teacher morale.

This result supports the findings of Hallinger (2020), who emphasized that effective school leadership promotes organizational stability, teacher satisfaction, and improved educational outcomes through supportive administrative practices.

Meanwhile, instructional support obtained a mean of 4.72 ($SD = 0.41$), also interpreted as very high. Teachers perceived that school heads actively support instructional improvement and student learning. Among the indicators, guiding to improve student learning received the highest rating ($M = 4.76$, $SD = 0.43$), followed closely by helping teachers improve teaching strategies and classroom practices ($M = 4.75$, $SD = 0.43$). Addressing instructional concerns raised by teachers ($M = 4.73$, $SD = 0.45$) also received a very high rating. These findings indicate that school heads are actively engaged in instructional leadership and are responsive to



teachers' instructional needs. Such practices may strengthen teachers' instructional competence, encourage the use of effective teaching approaches, and ultimately enhance student learning outcomes.

The findings align with the study of Robinson (2021), which highlighted that instructional leadership remains one of the strongest predictors of improved teaching performance and student achievement.

Overall, leadership support obtained a mean ($M = 4.75$, $SD = 0.37$), interpreted as very high. This indicates that educators strongly perceive their school heads as supportive in providing guidance, resources, and assistance necessary for effective teaching and professional growth. The findings suggest that school leaders play a significant role in fostering a positive work environment that promotes teacher effectiveness and commitment.

The findings revealed that educators perceived leadership support as very high across all dimensions, with professional development support emerging as the most highly rated area. This suggests that school heads are viewed as effective leaders who provide meaningful support in instructional, professional, and administrative aspects of teachers' work. The results further imply that sustaining strong leadership practices may strengthen teacher motivation, enhance professional competence, and contribute to a more productive and effective learning environment.

The findings support the study of Leithwood (2020), which emphasized that supportive leadership positively influences teacher commitment, professional growth, and school effectiveness. Similarly, the result is consistent with the work of Grissom (2021), who found that leadership support significantly contributes to teacher performance, job satisfaction, and organizational success. These findings suggest that maintaining strong and supportive school leadership is essential in promoting teacher development, instructional excellence, and overall school improvement.

Level of Decision-Making Participation of Educators

Table 2. Level of Decision-Making Participation of Educators as a Whole and in terms of Involvement in School Planning, Participation in Policy Formulation, and Shared Decision-Making Processes.

Decision Making Participation		Mean	SD	Interpretation
	Involvement in School Planning	4.69	0.48	Very High
	1. The teachers are involved in planning school programs and activities.	4.73	0.46	Very High
	2. The teachers are consulted in developing school goals and plans.	4.66	0.54	Very High
	3. The teachers are encouraged to share ideas during planning meetings.	4.70	0.55	Very High
	4. The teachers' inputs are reflected in school plans.	4.66	0.52	Very High
	5. The teachers actively participate in setting school priorities.	4.69	0.51	Very High
	Participation in Policy Formulation	4.64	0.52	Very High



6. The teachers are involved in creating or revising school policies.	4.63	0.5 8	Very High
7. The teachers are given the opportunity to express their opinions on school rules and guidelines.	4.68	0.5 2	Very High
8. The teachers' perspectives are considered in policy decisions.	4.56	0.6 4	Very High
9. The teachers are informed and consulted before new policies are implemented.	4.59	0.5 5	Very High
10. The teachers' feedback is valued in policy formulation.	4.72	0.5 2	Very High
Shared Decision-Making Processes	4.59	0.5 5	Very High
6. The teachers work together with school leaders in making important decisions.	4.68	0.5 3	Very High
7. The teachers engage in collaborative decision-making rather than top-down processes.	4.64	0.5 3	Very High
8. The teachers share responsibility for decisions that affect the school.	4.48	0.6 9	Very High
9. The teachers feel a sense of ownership over decisions made in the school.	4.62	0.5 8	Very High
10. The teachers strengthen trust with school leaders through shared decision-making.	4.53	0.7 6	Very High
As a Whole	4.64	0.5 0	Very High
<i>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</i>			

As Table 2 presents the level of decision-making participation of educators in terms of involvement in school planning, participation in policy formulation, and shared decision-making processes. Among the three dimensions, involvement in school planning obtained the highest mean ($M = 4.69$, $SD = 0.48$), interpreted as very high. This indicates that teachers are highly engaged in planning school programs, activities, and priorities. The highest-rated indicator was teachers being involved in planning school programs and activities ($M = 4.73$, $SD = 0.46$), followed by teachers being encouraged to share ideas during planning meetings ($M = 4.70$, $SD = 0.55$). These findings imply that school leaders recognize the value of teacher participation in the planning process and provide opportunities for educators to contribute to the direction of the school. Such involvement may strengthen teachers' commitment to school initiatives and foster a stronger sense of responsibility toward achieving institutional goals.

This finding supports the study of Berkovich (2021), which emphasized that teacher involvement in school planning enhances organizational commitment, collaboration, and the successful implementation of school programs.



In terms of participation in policy formulation, the dimension obtained a mean of 4.64 (SD = 0.52), interpreted as very high. Teachers generally agreed that they are given opportunities to participate in developing and reviewing school policies. The highest-rated indicator was teachers' feedback being valued in policy formulation (M = 4.72, SD = 0.52), followed by being given opportunities to express opinions on school rules and guidelines (M = 4.68, SD = 0.52). Although all indicators received very high ratings, the consideration of teachers' perspectives in policy decisions (M = 4.56, SD = 0.64) obtained the lowest mean within the dimension. Nevertheless, the result indicates that teachers perceive school leaders as open to consultation and feedback during policy development. This may contribute to policies that are more responsive to the needs of educators and the school community.

These findings are consistent with the study of Nguyen (2022), which found that teacher participation in policy development promotes transparency, acceptance of policies, and stronger organizational trust.

For shared decision-making processes, the mean score was (M = 4.59, SD = 0.55), interpreted as very high. This suggests that collaborative decision-making practices are evident within the school. The highest-rated indicator was teachers working together with school leaders in making important decisions (M = 4.68, SD = 0.53), followed by teachers engaging in collaborative decision-making rather than top-down processes (M = 4.64, SD = 0.53). The lowest-rated indicator was teachers sharing responsibility for decisions that affect the school (M = 4.48, SD = 0.69), although it remained within the very high category. These findings indicate that teachers perceive a strong partnership between faculty members and school leaders in addressing school concerns and making significant decisions. Such collaboration may strengthen trust, improve communication, and create a greater sense of ownership among educators.

The findings support the work of Harris (2020), who emphasized that shared decision-making fosters professional collaboration, strengthens trust, and enhances school effectiveness by involving teachers in leadership processes.

Overall, decision-making participation obtained a mean (M = 4.64, SD = 0.50), interpreted as very high. This indicates that educators perceive themselves as actively involved in important school decisions and organizational processes. The findings suggest that schools promote a participatory culture where teachers are encouraged to contribute their ideas, insights, and expertise in matters affecting the institution.

The findings revealed that educators perceived their level of decision-making participation as very high, with involvement in school planning emerging as the most highly rated dimension. This indicates that teachers are actively engaged in shaping school programs, policies, and decisions. The results further suggest that maintaining inclusive decision-making practices may strengthen teacher empowerment, increase organizational commitment, and promote a collaborative school culture.

The findings support the study of Leithwood (2021), which highlighted that participative leadership practices encourage teacher engagement, professional commitment, and school improvement. Similarly, the results are consistent with the study of Torres (2022), which found that schools that involve teachers in decision-making processes tend to experience stronger collaboration, greater trust, and higher organizational effectiveness. These findings suggest that encouraging meaningful teacher participation in school decisions remains essential in building a positive, responsive, and productive educational environment.

Level of Work Environment of Educators

Table 3. Level of Work Environment of Educators as a Whole and in terms of Physical Working Conditions, Collegial Relationships, and Organizational Support

Work Environment		Mean	SD	Interpretation
	Physical Working Conditions	4.51	0.60	Very High



1. The classrooms and facilities are safe and conducive to teaching and learning.	4.39	0.7 3	Very High
2. The teachers have adequate teaching materials and resources.	4.53	0.6 8	Very High
3. The school environment supports comfort and productivity for the teachers.	4.49	0.7 3	Very High
Table 3 continuation			
4. The physical facilities are well-maintained for effective use.	4.55	0.6 7	Very High
5. The teachers' working space allows them to perform their duties effectively.	4.61	0.6 3	Very High
Collegial Relationships	4.64	0.4 8	Very High
11. The teachers treat each other with respect.	4.67	0.5 8	Very High
12. The teachers demonstrate a spirit of cooperation and teamwork.	4.64	0.5 0	Very High
13. The teachers feel comfortable seeking help or advice from colleagues.	4.68	0.5 3	Very High
14. The teachers build positive relationships that contribute to a healthy work environment.	4.59	0.5 5	Very High
15. The teachers support one another professionally and personally.	4.63	0.5 3	Very High
Organizational Support	4.63	0.4 8	Very High
11. The school values the teachers' contributions and efforts.	4.63	0.5 3	Very High
12. The teachers feel recognized for the work they do.	4.61	0.5 4	Very High
13. The school provides support when the teachers face work-related challenges.	4.65	0.4 9	Very High
14. The school policies promote the teachers' welfare and well-being.	4.62	0.5 3	Very High
15. The organization creates a supportive and motivating environment for the teachers.	4.62	0.5 3	Very High
As a Whole	4.60	0.4 9	Very High
<i>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</i>			



Table 3 presents the level of work environment of educators, among the three dimensions, collegial relationships obtained the highest mean ($M = 4.64$, $SD = 0.48$), interpreted as very high. The relatively low standard deviation suggests that teachers' responses are closely clustered around the mean, indicating a shared perception of strong collegial support. In particular, feeling comfortable seeking help or advice from colleagues ($M = 4.68$, $SD = 0.53$), treating each other with respect ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.58$), and supporting one another professionally and personally ($M = 4.63$, $SD = 0.53$) received the highest ratings.

These findings imply that teachers consistently experience positive professional relationships, teamwork, and collaboration within the school. This supports the study of Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2021), which emphasized that strong collegial relationships contribute to teacher well-being, job satisfaction, and reduced workplace stress.

In terms of organizational support, the dimension obtained a mean ($M = 4.63$, $SD = 0.48$), interpreted as very high. The low standard deviation indicates a relatively uniform perception among teachers regarding the support they receive from the school. Teachers generally agreed that the school provides assistance when they face work-related challenges ($M = 4.65$, $SD = 0.49$) and values their contributions and efforts ($M = 4.63$, $SD = 0.53$). These results suggest that organizational support is consistently experienced across respondents, contributing to teacher motivation, commitment, and job satisfaction.

This finding aligns with the study of Collie (2021), which found that strong organizational support is linked to higher teacher engagement and effectiveness.

For physical working conditions, the dimension obtained a mean ($M = 4.51$, $SD = 0.60$), interpreted as very high. The slightly higher standard deviation compared to the other dimensions suggests more variation in teachers' perceptions of physical facilities and resources, although responses still generally fall within a positive range. The highest-rated indicator was having a working space that allows teachers to perform their duties effectively ($M = 4.61$, $SD = 0.63$), followed by well-maintained physical facilities ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 0.67$). These findings imply that while most teachers perceive the physical environment as adequate and supportive, some differences in experiences may exist regarding facilities and resources.

The level of work environment of educators was generally rated very high, with an overall mean ($M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.49$), indicating that teachers perceive their workplace as supportive, collaborative, and generally consistent across respondents, with minimal variation in their responses.

Overall, the findings revealed that the work environment of educators was rated very high across all dimensions, with relatively low standard deviations indicating generally consistent responses among teachers. This suggests that the positive work environment is widely experienced, particularly in terms of collegial relationships and organizational support, while physical conditions show slightly more variability. The results further imply that maintaining strong collaboration, institutional support, and improved facilities may further enhance teacher well-being and performance.

The findings support the study of Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2021), which emphasized that a stable and supportive work environment contributes to teacher well-being and reduces burnout. Similarly, Collie (2021) found that positive school climates characterized by strong relationships and organizational support promote teacher engagement and effectiveness. These findings highlight the importance of sustaining a consistent and supportive work environment to enhance teacher satisfaction and overall school performance.

Level of Involvement Level of Teaching Performance of Educators

Table 4. Level of Teaching Performance of Educators.

Teaching Performance	f	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Outstanding	111	4.67	0.17	Outstanding
Very Satisfactory	17			



Satisfactory	0			
Unsatisfactory	0			
Poor	0			
Total	128			

Legend: (4.5-5.0)-Outstanding; (3.50-4.49)-Very Satisfactory; (2.50-3.49) Satisfactory (1.50 – 2.49) Unsatisfactory; (1.00 – 1.49)-Poor

Table 4 presents the level of teaching performance of educators. The distribution of responses shows that the majority of educators were rated outstanding ($f = 111$), while ($f = 17$) were rated very satisfactory. No educators were rated satisfactory, unsatisfactory, or poor. The overall mean score ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.17$) is interpreted as outstanding, indicating that educators consistently demonstrate exceptional performance in carrying out their instructional duties and professional responsibilities.

The findings suggest that educators possess a high level of competence, commitment, and effectiveness in teaching. The very small standard deviation further indicates that performance ratings are relatively consistent among educators, reflecting a uniformly high standard of teaching across the schools involved in the study. This may be attributed to teachers' dedication to instructional excellence, adherence to professional standards, and active engagement in activities that support student learning and development.

The results also imply that school leaders and educational institutions have established supportive conditions that enable teachers to perform at their best. Effective instructional supervision, continuous professional development opportunities, and collaborative school environments may have contributed to the outstanding performance ratings obtained by the educators. Maintaining these practices is important to sustain high levels of teaching quality and ensure continuous improvement in educational outcomes.

These findings further suggest that teachers are not only meeting but exceeding the expected standards of performance. As a result, learners are more likely to benefit from well-prepared instruction, effective classroom management, and meaningful learning experiences. Nevertheless, continuous monitoring, recognition programs, and professional learning opportunities should remain a priority to preserve and strengthen the culture of excellence among educators.

The findings are consistent with the study of Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2021), which emphasized that teachers who experience professional support, positive working conditions, and strong motivation tend to demonstrate higher levels of performance and instructional effectiveness. Similarly, the results support the findings of Collie (2021), who reported that supportive school environments and opportunities for professional growth contribute significantly to teacher effectiveness, job satisfaction, and overall performance. These findings indicate that fostering a supportive and growth-oriented educational environment remains essential in sustaining outstanding teaching performance and promoting educational excellence.

Relationship Between Leadership Support and Teaching Performance of Educators

Table 5. Relationship Between Leadership Support and Teaching Performance of Educators.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Leadership Support vs. Teaching Performance	0.207	0.019	Reject H_0	Significant



The Table 5 presents the relationship between leadership support and teaching performance of educators using Spearman's rho correlation. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of ($r_s = 0.207$) with a p-value of 0.019. Since the p-value is less than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected. This indicates that there is a significant relationship between leadership support and teaching performance.

This finding implies that leadership practices in schools contribute to shaping the working conditions that enable teachers to perform effectively. Supportive leadership behaviors such as mentoring teachers, providing timely feedback, encouraging participation in training, and addressing instructional concerns help build teachers' confidence and improve their instructional practices. However, the weak correlation also suggests that teaching performance is influenced by other factors beyond leadership support, such as teacher competence, motivation, classroom environment, and access to resources.

The results further suggest that schools should continue strengthening leadership support systems while also considering other dimensions that affect teacher performance. A balanced approach that combines effective leadership, continuous professional development, and a supportive organizational environment may lead to more sustained improvements in teaching performance.

This finding is consistent with the study of Leithwood et al. (2020), which emphasized that school leadership has a measurable impact on teacher effectiveness by shaping the conditions for teaching and learning. Similarly, the result supports the findings of Grissom, Egalite, and Lindsay (2021), who reported that effective leadership practices contribute to improved teacher performance, instructional quality, and overall school success. These findings highlight the importance of sustaining strong leadership support as part of broader efforts to enhance educational outcomes.

Relationship Between Decision-Making Participation and Teaching Performance of Educators

Table 6. Relationship Between Decision-Making Participation and Teaching Performance of Educators.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Decision Making Participation vs. Teaching Performance	0.133	0.009	Reject H_0	Significant

Table 6 presents the relationship between decision-making participation and teaching performance of educators using Spearman's rho correlation. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of ($r_s = 0.133$) with a p-value of 0.009. Since the p-value is less than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected. This indicates that there is a significant relationship between decision-making participation and teaching performance.

This finding implies that participatory leadership practices can enhance teachers' sense of ownership and professional responsibility. However, the weak correlation also suggests that decision-making participation alone is not sufficient to strongly influence teaching performance. Other factors such as instructional competence, leadership support, workload, and access to resources may also play a more dominant role in shaping performance outcomes.

The results further suggest that schools should continue promoting inclusive and collaborative decision-making processes while also strengthening other supporting factors that directly influence teaching effectiveness. Encouraging meaningful teacher involvement in school governance may help sustain motivation and professional engagement, but it should be complemented with targeted training, instructional support, and continuous performance monitoring.

This finding is consistent with the study of Leithwood et al. (2020), which emphasized that participative leadership contributes to improved teacher engagement and school effectiveness, although its impact is often mediated by other organizational and instructional factors. Similarly, Harris and Jones (2020) found that collaborative leadership practices enhance teacher commitment and professional engagement, which can indirectly support instructional performance and school improvement.

Relationship Between Work Environment and Teaching Performance of Educators

Table 7. Relationship Between Work Environment and Teaching Performance of Educators.

Variable	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Work Environment vs. Teaching Performance	0.143	0.011	Reject H_0	Significant

Table 7 presents the relationship between work environment and teaching performance of educators using Spearman's rho correlation. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of ($r_s = 0.143$) with a p-value of 0.011. Since the p-value is less than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected. This indicates that there is a significant relationship between work environment and teaching performance.

This finding implies that improving the work environment can contribute to enhancing teacher performance, even if the effect is indirect or limited in strength. When teachers feel comfortable, respected, and supported in their workplace, they are more likely to demonstrate higher levels of motivation, engagement, and instructional effectiveness. However, the weak correlation also suggests that teaching performance is shaped by multiple other factors such as leadership support, professional development, and individual teacher competence.

The results further suggest that school administrators should continue strengthening workplace conditions by promoting a positive organizational climate, reducing unnecessary workload stress, and ensuring that teachers have access to sufficient instructional resources. While improving the work environment alone may not fully guarantee high teaching performance, it plays an important supporting role in overall teacher effectiveness.

This finding is consistent with the study of Bakker and Demerouti (2020), which emphasized that a healthy work environment contributes to employee engagement and performance by reducing job demands and strengthening available resources. Similarly, Collie (2021) found that supportive school environments are linked to higher teacher well-being, engagement, and instructional effectiveness, which ultimately influence teaching performance. These findings highlight the importance of maintaining a positive work environment as part of broader efforts to enhance teacher performance and educational outcomes.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

The school heads consistently provide strong instructional, professional, and administrative assistance that enhances teacher confidence and effectiveness.

Teachers are highly involved in decision-making processes, showing strong participation in school planning, policy formulation, and shared governance, which strengthens their sense of ownership and responsibility.

The work environment of educators is very favorable, characterized by strong collegial relationships, solid organizational support, and adequate physical working conditions that promote a positive school climate.



Teachers demonstrate outstanding teaching performance, reflecting high levels of competence, commitment, and consistency in delivering effective instruction.

The stronger leadership support is associated with better teacher performance in the classroom.

Teacher involvement contributes to performance but is not the sole influencing factor.

A positive and supportive school environment contributes to improved teaching outcomes, even if its effect is limited in strength.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher wishes to express her deepest gratitude to the Heavenly Father, the Almighty God, for His abundant blessings, guidance, wisdom, and strength throughout the completion of this study. Without His grace and providence, this endeavor would not have been possible.

The researcher also expresses sincere gratitude to the research adviser and language critic, statistician, members of the panel committee, colleagues, friends, and family for their guidance, constructive feedback, encouragement, and unwavering support throughout every stage of the study.

The researcher also extends heartfelt appreciation to the research respondents and partner institutions for their willingness to take part in this study. Their trust, cooperation, and valuable insights served as the foundation for the successful completion of this research.

REFERENCES

1. Aquino, J. M. D. R. (2025). Best practices of high-performing higher education institutions in the Philippines towards the development of a harmonized quality-assured instructional leadership framework. *Frontiers in Education*.
2. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2020). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 25(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000176>
3. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
4. Barrett, P., Davies, F., Zhang, Y., & Barrett, L. (2020). The impact of classroom physical environment on learning outcomes: A systematic review. *Education Sciences*, 10(9), 233. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10090233>
5. Berkovich, I. (2021). School leaders and teacher participation in decision-making: The mediating role of school culture. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(6), 1004–1021.
6. Chang, C.-M., Liu, L.-W., Hsieh, H.-H., & Chen, K.-C. (2020). A multilevel analysis of organizational support on the relationship between person-environment fit and performance of university physical education teachers. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(6), 2041. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17062041>
7. Collie, R. J., Shapka, J. D., & Perry, N. E. (2022). School climate influences on teacher burnout: Considerations for work environment and policy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 116, 103774.
8. Grissom, J. A., Egalite, A. J., & Lindsay, C. A. (2021). *How principals affect students and schools: A systematic synthesis of two decades of research*. The Wallace Foundation..
9. Hallinger, P. (2020). Leadership and school improvement: Supporting teacher effectiveness and organizational development. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(6), 1–18.
10. Harris, A. (2020). Distributed leadership and collaborative decision-making in schools. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(4), 300–315.
11. Kao, Y., et al. (2023). Work environment and teacher performance in educational organizations. *Administrative Sciences*.
12. Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2020). The effect of teacher coaching and professional development on instructional practice and student achievement. *Review of Educational Research*, 90(4), 547–588.



13. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
14. Nguyen, D., Pietsch, M., & Gümüş, S. (2022). Collective teacher efficacy and participation in school decision-making: Implications for school improvement. *Educational Studies*, 48(5), 640–657. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2020.1740977>
15. OECD. (2020). *Improving school leadership and teacher involvement in school development*. OECD Publishing.
16. OECD. (2021). *Education at a glance 2021: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/b35a14e5-en>
17. OECD. (2024). *Developing teacher expertise: Results from TALIS 2024*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/results-from-talis-2024_90df6235-en
18. OECD. (2024). *Education policy outlook 2024: Shaping responsive and resilient education systems*. OECD Publishing.
19. OECD. (2024). *Teacher leadership and autonomy: Results from TALIS 2024*. OECD Publishing.
20. Pietsch, M., et al. (2022). Teachers involved in school improvement: Analyzing mediating mechanisms of teacher involvement. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 116, 103774. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103774>
21. Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2021). Teacher motivation, self-efficacy, burnout, and school context: Links with teacher engagement and performance. *Social Psychology of Education*, 24(5), 1389–1412. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-021-09663-5>
22. Torres, D. G. (2022). Teacher participation and collaborative leadership: Pathways toward school effectiveness. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 25(4), 590–607.
23. Yongco, J. S. (2026). Impact of leadership styles on teacher performance and student achievement in Philippine secondary schools. *Discover Sustainability*.