

**Teachers' perceptions of the school administrator's leadership styles:
Basis for a leadership development action plan**

Reselyn B. Maglasang*

Cebu Technological University - Main Campus, R. Palma St., Cebu City, Cebu, Philippines

ABSTRACT

Leadership skills are essential qualities that guide individuals in successfully managing and motivating others toward achieving common goals. This study assessed teachers' perceptions of the school administrator's leadership styles at Salazar Colleges of Science and Institute of Technology, Labangon, Cebu City, for the academic year 2024–2025, as the basis for a leadership development action plan. This study utilized a mixed descriptive correlational and qualitative research design, with an adapted questionnaire as the primary data collection tool. A total of 29 teachers participated in the study. Descriptive statistics such as percentages were used to present the respondents' background information. The weighted mean measured teachers' perceptions of the school administrator's leadership styles, focusing on autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire dimensions, as well as the challenges encountered. Pearson moment product correlation r was applied to determine the relationship between teacher profiles and their perceptions of leadership styles. Findings revealed that teachers were undecided about the administrator's autocratic leadership style, while they agreed with the presence of democratic and laissez-faire styles. The overall weighted mean for perceived challenges related to leadership styles was 1.69, interpreted as 'strongly disagree,' indicating minimal challenges. The overall weighted mean of the challenges encountered in the school administrator's leadership styles is strongly disagree. Based on these findings, the researcher recommends the implementation of a leadership development action plan entitled "Shaping Future School Administrators' Leadership Styles" to enhance effective leadership practices within the institution."

Keywords: Administration and Supervision, School Administrator, Leadership Styles, Descriptive Correlational and Qualitative Research Design, Leadership Development Action Plan, Labangon, Cebu City.

Date Submitted: April 20, 2026

Date Accepted: April 24, 2026

Date Published: May 4, 2026

INTRODUCTION

Leadership skills represent essential qualities that guide individuals in managing and motivating others toward the achievement of common goals. Across professional fields including business and education, effective leadership is critical in fostering productive,

*Corresponding author / Email: reselyn.maglasang@deped.gov.ph
DOI: <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05021109>

Recommended citation:

Maglasang, R. B. (2026). Teachers' perceptions of the school administrator's leadership styles: Basis for a leadership development action plan. *Pantao (International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences)* 5 (2), 3531-3549. <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05021109>

collaborative, and innovative environments. The concept of leadership has evolved significantly in recent decades, with modern leaders expected to exhibit not only strategic thinking and decision-making capabilities but also emotional intelligence, communication skills, and adaptability. In educational institutions particularly, leadership functions as an integral component of organizational effectiveness, as it involves the capacity to guide, inspire, and motivate both students and fellow teachers. Effective leadership within schools can profoundly impact the teaching and learning environment, directly influencing teacher performance and overall school outcomes (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). School leaders who exhibit strong leadership skills create a culture of trust, collaboration, and high expectations, which enables teachers to perform at their best (Louis et al., 2010), while institutional leaders such as principals and administrators play a crucial role in setting vision, providing professional development, and fostering supportive conditions for teachers to thrive (Day & Sammons, 2016).

Despite the recognized importance of leadership in educational settings, significant challenges persist in the development and application of leadership skills among educators and school administrators. At the individual level, many teachers lack access to professional development opportunities that specifically target leadership competencies such as decision-making, communication, and conflict resolution (Robinson, 2007). At the organizational level, structural and institutional barriers further constrain the consistent implementation of effective leadership practices. Compounding these difficulties is the reality that certain leadership styles, particularly autocratic and laissez-faire approaches, create barriers to effective communication, reduce teacher morale, and increase resistance to change (Frontiers in Education, 2022), ultimately contributing to dissatisfaction and burnout among teachers and negatively affecting their performance (Sapitri & Purwanto, 2024). It is within this context that the present study investigates teachers' perceptions of school administrators' leadership styles, with the aim of generating a leadership development action plan applicable to Salazar Colleges of Science and Institute of Technology in Labangon, Cebu City.

The study is grounded in three major leadership theories that collectively illuminate different dimensions of effective school administration. The first is Transformational Leadership Theory as advanced by Kandemir (2024), which focuses on how leaders inspire, motivate, and intellectually stimulate followers to achieve higher levels of performance and personal growth. Transformational leaders serve as role models who set high ethical standards, articulate compelling visions of the future, encourage innovation and critical thinking, and provide individualized mentorship to followers. In the educational context, school administrators who exhibit transformational qualities can inspire teachers to perform at their best, create positive school cultures, and guide institutions through periods of change, ultimately enhancing teaching quality and improving student outcomes (Kandemir, 2024). The second theoretical anchor is Instructional Leadership Theory as developed by Hitt and Tucker (2018), which underscores the importance of school leadership in fostering environments conducive to high-quality instruction, student learning, and professional growth for educators. Instructional leaders establish clear educational goals, monitor and evaluate teaching practices, engage teachers in continuous professional development, and align curriculum with student needs and academic standards. Research consistently demonstrates that effective instructional leadership positively impacts teacher performance, student achievement, and overall educational quality (Hitt & Tucker, 2018). The third is Servant Leadership Theory as discussed by Alipio et al. (2023), which, in contrast to traditional models centered on power and control, emphasizes empathy, active listening, stewardship, and a prioritization of followers' well-being and development. Servant leaders create environments where individuals feel valued, respected, and motivated, leading to higher levels of performance, trust, and collaboration. Taken together, these three theories establish that effective school leadership is

multi-dimensional, requiring visionary, instructional, and relational competencies operating in concert.

The study is further grounded in relevant legal frameworks that define and regulate school leadership in the Philippine context. The Governance of Basic Education Act (RA 9155, 2001) provides a foundational basis for understanding the authority and responsibilities of school heads. The law emphasizes decentralization of educational governance, granting school heads the autonomy to manage their institutions in ways responsive to local needs, while simultaneously mandating accountability for instructional leadership, resource management, curriculum implementation, and teacher professional development. RA 9155 also institutionalizes shared governance through School Governing Councils and requires schools to develop School Improvement Plans, situating the school head as the primary driver of educational quality at the school level (RA 9155, 2001). Complementing this is the National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (DO 2, 2015), which establishes a comprehensive set of competencies and standards that school administrators must meet across domains including leadership and management, curriculum and instruction, and personal and professional development. This order mandates continuous monitoring and evaluation of school heads' performance and encourages professional development programs such as leadership training and seminars to address competency gaps (DO 2, 2015). Additionally, the Magna Carta for Public School Teachers (RA 4670, 1966) provides the legal basis for understanding the rights, welfare, and professional development entitlements of teachers, including security of tenure, competitive compensation, health benefits, continuous in-service training, and access to scholarship opportunities. This law recognizes the indispensable role of teachers in the educational system and underscores the obligation of school administrators to create supportive, empowering conditions for teacher growth and effectiveness (RA 4670, 1966).

A review of extant literature reveals consistent evidence that leadership styles adopted by school administrators directly shape teacher motivation, satisfaction, and performance, yet also surfaces important nuances and contradictions that underscore the need for context-sensitive inquiry. Autocratic leadership, characterized by rigid control and minimal teacher input, has been associated with feelings of disempowerment, reduced intrinsic motivation, creativity loss, stress, and diminished job satisfaction among teachers (Magsambol & Calibo, 2023). Gunter (2016) further noted that the absence of autonomy and involvement in decision-making under autocratic models frequently leads to high employee turnover, as workers seek more empowering environments. While autocratic styles may retain limited utility in emergency or high-discipline contexts (Northouse, 2018), their application in educational settings is broadly discouraged given the collaborative nature of teaching and learning. Similarly, laissez-faire leadership, wherein administrators adopt a hands-off approach and avoid decision-making or support, leaves teachers feeling unsupported and neglected, resulting in decreased performance and professional commitment (Oluyemi, 2023). Evidence from Nigerian secondary schools further illustrates that laissez-faire leadership is linked with poor teacher supervision, low motivation, and ineffective instructional practices that negatively affect overall school performance (Oluyemi, 2023).

In contrast, democratic and participative leadership approaches are broadly associated with higher levels of teacher satisfaction, collaboration, and innovation. Wang et al. (2018) demonstrated that schools with democratic leadership structures experienced higher levels of teacher collaboration and improved student outcomes, attributable to the increased autonomy and professional development opportunities such structures afford. However, the literature also reveals that even ostensibly positive leadership styles carry implementation challenges.

Catanus (2024) found that while participative leadership was generally preferred by teachers, some administrators struggled to balance participation with decision-making authority, causing confusion and delays that negatively impacted efficiency and morale. Galuardo (2024) similarly noted in the Santa Maria District that while democratic leadership was prevalent, some school heads faced difficulties adequately addressing teachers' individual needs and conflicts, resulting in reduced engagement and performance inconsistencies. Manzano (2024) further observed that some administrators' reliance on transactional and autocratic approaches strained teacher-administrator relationships, negatively influencing teacher commitment and performance outcomes. With respect to transformational leadership, though widely advocated for its positive effects, Hu (2024) identified challenges arising from inconsistent implementation, as some administrators lack the skills or resources to foster genuine collaboration, producing tokenistic or uneven application of transformational practices. Turner (2023) noted that such inconsistency generates teacher frustration and confusion, undermining performance. Distributed leadership, while empowering, also introduces challenges related to role ambiguity, with Nasrallah and Ali (2024) observing that without clear communication and boundaries, teachers may experience overload and uncertainty that leads to stress and lower performance.

The convergence of theoretical foundations, legal frameworks, and empirical literature reveals a clear and urgent imperative: the need for school administrators to develop and consistently apply leadership styles that are adaptive, relational, and instructionally grounded. Gaps in the literature, particularly the limited attention to the perceptions of teachers as the immediate recipients of administrative leadership in specific institutional and cultural contexts, point to the value of the present inquiry. By investigating how teachers perceive the leadership styles of their school administrators at Salazar Colleges of Science and Institute of Technology in Labangon, Cebu City, this study aims to surface experiential and contextual insights that can inform a targeted and practical leadership development action plan. The findings are expected to offer guidance to organizations, educators, and aspiring leaders on how to enhance leadership capabilities and effectively lead teams toward shared goals, contributing to the broader imperative of sustaining quality, innovation, and accountability in educational leadership (Maglasang, 2026).

Statement of the problem

This study assessed teachers' perceptions of the school administrator's leadership styles at Salazar Colleges of Science and Institute of Technology, Labangon, Cebu City, for the academic year 2024–2025, as the basis for a leadership development action plan.

Specifically, the study aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What was the profile of the respondents in terms of age, gender, teaching experience, highest educational attainment, and relevant training or seminars attended?
2. What were the teacher respondents' perceptions of the school administrators' leadership styles in terms of autocratic leadership, democratic leadership, and laissez-faire leadership?
3. Was there a significant relationship between the respondents' profiles and their perceptions of school administrators' leadership styles?
4. As perceived by the teachers, what challenges were encountered in the school administrator's leadership styles?
5. Based on the findings, what leadership development action plan can be developed?

METHODOLOGY

This section presents the research methodology employed in the study, encompassing the research design, the flow of the study, the environment where the research was conducted, the sources of data, the instrument used, the data collection procedures, the statistical treatment of data, and the scoring procedures applied in the analysis and interpretation of findings.

The study utilized a mixed descriptive correlational and qualitative research design. Descriptive correlational research is a type of research design that seeks to explain the relationship between two or more variables without making any claims about cause and effect. This design was deemed appropriate for the study as it sought to assess the teachers' perceptions of the most applied school administrators' leadership styles at Salazar Colleges of Science and Institute of Technology, Labangon, Cebu City, during the school year 2024 to 2025, as a basis for a leadership development action plan. The approach was further justified by the accessibility and proximity of the participants within the study area, which allowed the researcher to be timely and responsive in the data gathering process.

The research followed a systematic flow guided by the input, process, and output model. The input component comprised the respondents' profile in terms of age, gender, teaching experience, highest educational attainment, and relevant training and seminars attended, as well as the respondents' perceptions of the school administrators' leadership styles in terms of autocratic leadership, democratic leadership, and laissez-faire leadership, and the level of challenges encountered in the school administrators' leadership styles. The process component involved the tabulation, analysis, computation, and evaluation of the gathered data to determine the results pertaining to the teachers' perceptions of the most applied school administrators' leadership styles. The output of the research was intended to provide the researcher with empirical data to craft a leadership development action plan that could enhance and amplify school administrators' leadership styles by fostering the development of key leadership competencies, promoting a positive school culture, and improving overall effectiveness in managing educational environments. This action plan aimed to equip school leaders with the tools and knowledge to adapt their leadership approaches to meet the needs of their staff, students, and the broader school community, fostering a culture of collaboration, accountability, and growth.

The study was conducted at Salazar Colleges of Science and Institute of Technology, located in Labangon, Cebu City. Labangon is situated at approximately 10.2991 latitude and 123.8805 longitude on the island of Cebu, with an elevation estimated at 15.9 meters or 52.2 feet above mean sea level. The population of Labangon grew from 24,753 in 1990 to 32,825 in 2020, representing an increase of 8,072 people over a span of 30 years. The most recent census figures from 2020 indicate a negative growth rate of 0.41%, reflecting a decrease of 652 people from the previous population count of 33,477 recorded in 2015.

The respondents of the study were the elementary and secondary teachers of Salazar Colleges of Science and Institute of Technology. Purposive sampling was employed in the selection of the respondents, given their availability and accessibility to the researcher. The total number of respondents was 29, distributed as follows: elementary teachers numbered 8, accounting for 27.58% of the total respondent population, while secondary teachers numbered 21, comprising 72.41% of the total. Together, these two groups constituted the entire sample of 29 respondents, representing 100.00% of the study population.

The primary data gathering instrument used in the study was a research-based questionnaire adopted and modified from Akram et al. (2016). The questionnaire was composed of three parts. The first part gathered the general information of the respondents. The

second part assessed the school administrators' effective and most applied leadership styles. The third part measured the level of challenges encountered in the school administrators' leadership styles. English served as the medium of instruction for all items in the questionnaire.

Prior to the administration of the research instrument, the researcher secured permission from the school principal of Salazar Colleges of Science and Institute of Technology, Labangon, Cebu City, along with the recommendation and approval of the research adviser. Upon receipt of permission, the preliminary data gathering through the research questionnaire was administered directly to the teacher respondents. The researcher personally assisted the respondents throughout the process of filling out the questionnaires and, when necessary, explained the directions and clarified specific items to ensure accuracy and completeness of responses.

The statistical analysis of the data involved the use of descriptive measures as the primary strategies for calculating, describing, and summarizing the acquired research data in a logical, comprehensible, and efficient manner. The collected data were organized and presented in tabular form. Three statistical treatments were applied. Simple percentage computation was used to describe the profile frequency distribution of the respondents. Weighted mean was used to determine the distribution of results pertaining to the respondents' perceptions of the school administrators' leadership styles and the level of challenges encountered in the school administrator's leadership styles. Chi-square was used to determine the significant relationship between the respondents' profiles and their perceptions of the school administrators' leadership styles.

The scoring procedure employed a Five-Point Likert Scale, which required each participant to react to a series of statements in the questionnaire by expressing one of five response options: strongly agree, agree, moderate, disagree, or strongly disagree, in relation to both the respondents' perceptions of the school administrators' leadership styles and the level of challenges encountered. The scale was interpreted according to the following criteria. A scale of 5, with a range of 4.21 to 5.00, carried the verbal description of Strongly Agree, indicating that the respondents' perceptions on the school administrators' leadership styles and their level of challenges encountered is 80 to 100%. A scale of 4, with a range of 3.41 to 4.20, carried the verbal description of Agree, indicating that the level of perceptions and challenges encountered is 60 to 79%. A scale of 3, with a range of 2.61 to 3.40, was described as Moderate, corresponding to a level of 40 to 59%. A scale of 2, with a range of 1.81 to 2.60, was described as Disagree, corresponding to a level of 30 to 39%. A scale of 1, with a range of 1.00 to 1.80, was described as Strongly Disagree, corresponding to a level of 1 to 29%. These interpretive criteria were consistently applied throughout the data analysis to ensure systematic and accurate interpretation of the results.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results and discussion of the study, which assessed the teachers' perceptions of the school administrators' leadership styles at Salazar Colleges of Science and Institute of Technology, Labangon, Cebu City, for the school year 2024 to 2025. A total of 29 teacher respondents participated in the study, comprising both elementary and secondary teachers selected through purposive sampling. Data were gathered using an adopted and modified questionnaire from Akram et al. (2016) and analyzed through descriptive statistics including simple percentage computation and weighted mean, as well as the Chi-Square Test of Independence to determine significant relationships between the respondents' profiles and their perceptions of school administrators' leadership styles. All results discussed herein are interpreted in direct relation to the objectives of the study and are grounded in the data gathered from the respondents.

Profile of the respondents

The profile of the 29 teacher respondents was examined in terms of age, gender, teaching experience, highest educational attainment, and relevant training and seminars attended. With respect to age, 24 or 82.75% of the total respondents were 21 to 30 years old, four or 13.79% were 31 to 40 years old, and one or 3.44% was 41 to 50 years old, with none falling in the 51 to 60 age brackets, yielding a standard deviation of 4.91. The predominance of younger teachers in the respondent group implies that age significantly shapes their preferences and expectations in school leadership. According to Santos and Delos Reyes (2020), younger teachers tend to favor transformational and participative leadership styles, valuing leaders who are approachable, visionary, and collaborative, as these traits align with their expectations of mutual respect, autonomy, and innovation. Garcia and Tan (2019) further found that teachers under 35 are more likely to perceive democratic or servant leadership as ideal, being less tolerant of authoritarian or transactional approaches, which they may perceive as outdated or rigid. Villanueva (2018) emphasized that age functions as a lens through which professional identity is formed, with younger teachers often seeking mentorship, support, and validation from school leaders who exhibit empathetic leadership and foster a culture of respect.

In terms of gender, 14 or 48.27% of the respondents were male and 15 or 51.72% were female, producing a standard deviation of 0.51, indicating a nearly equal distribution across the two groups. This near-equal distribution suggests that both male and female perspectives are adequately represented in the data. Reyes and Dela Cruz (2021) pointed out that gender affects not only how leadership is perceived but also how feedback and support are valued, with female teachers more likely to appreciate mentoring, encouragement, and a leader who shows care for their well-being, while male teachers often prioritize performance recognition and professional autonomy. Garcia and Tan (2018) further suggested that gendered socialization influences how leadership behaviors are interpreted, noting that assertiveness in male administrators might be viewed as strength by male teachers, while female teachers may interpret the same behavior as aggressive or dismissive, preferring leaders who are approachable and empowering.

With regard to teaching experience, 26 or 89.65% of the respondents had 1 to 5 years of experience, while three or 10.34% had 6 to 10 years, and none had 11 years or beyond, with a standard deviation of 1.55. The overwhelming majority of respondents being relatively new to the profession implies that their perceptions of effective leadership are largely shaped by the immediate need for guidance, structure, and emotional support. Martinez (2018) pointed out that less experienced teachers are more likely to perceive administrators through an evaluative lens, associating leadership effectiveness with direct support in teaching-related tasks, focusing on day-to-day support, presence, and encouragement particularly in fast-paced or underserved environments. Lopez and Villanueva (2021) similarly found that new teachers often look for clear guidance, structure, and emotional support from their administrators, valuing school leaders who are hands-on, responsive, and approachable as they navigate classroom management, curriculum planning, and community expectations for the first time.

Regarding highest educational attainment, seven or 24.13% of the respondents held a bachelor's degree, 17 or 58.62% had units in any master's program, and five or 17.24% held a master's degree, with none having units in a doctorate degree or a doctorate degree, and a standard deviation of 0.65. The majority being in the process of advancing their education implies that these teachers are professionally ambitious and are likely to expect school leaders who value intellectual engagement, shared governance, and continuous learning. Martinez

(2021) emphasized that teachers with postgraduate credentials often have professional aspirations for leadership roles themselves, inclining them to expect distributed leadership, participative decision-making, and a culture of professionalism and continuous learning. Lopez and Reyes (2020) further found that higher educational attainment is correlated with a greater demand for autonomy and academic freedom in the workplace.

In terms of relevant training and seminars attended, 26 or 89.65% of the respondents had attended In-Service Training (INSET), while three or 10.34% had attended NEAP training or seminars, and none had not attended any related training or seminar, with a standard deviation of 0.93. This pattern reflects an actively developing professional workforce, and the breadth of exposure to professional development suggests that the respondents bring informed expectations to their evaluation of school leadership practices. Garcia and Santos (2020) noted that teachers who have attended numerous professional development seminars are more likely to favor transformational and instructional leadership styles, as they become more aware of the importance of visionary leadership, collaborative culture, and instructional supervision, expecting school leaders to function not merely as administrative figures but as mentors, coaches, and change agents.

Respondents' perceptions of school administrators' leadership styles

The respondents' perceptions of the school administrators' leadership styles were assessed across three dimensions: autocratic leadership, democratic leadership, and laissez-faire leadership, each measured through a set of indicators using a Five-Point Likert Scale.

With respect to autocratic leadership, the indicator "Effective supervisors give orders and clarify procedures" obtained the highest mean of 4.41 with a standard deviation of 0.62, interpreted as strongly agree. This was followed by "The supervisor is the chief judge of the achievements of the members of the group," which registered the second highest mean of 4.27 with a standard deviation of 0.78, also interpreted as strongly agree. In contrast, the indicator "It is fair to say that most employees are lazy" received the lowest mean of 1.44 with a standard deviation of 0.83, interpreted as strongly disagree, while "Most employees feel insecure about their work and need direction" yielded a mean of 2.03 with a standard deviation of 1.06, interpreted as disagree. "As a rule, supervisors must be given rewards or punishments in order to motivate them to achieve organizational objectives" produced a mean of 2.31 with a standard deviation of 1.14, interpreted as disagree, and "Employees need to be supervised closely, or they are not likely to do their work" registered a mean of 2.37 with a standard deviation of 1.17, also interpreted as disagree. The overall mean for autocratic leadership was 2.80 with a standard deviation of 0.96, interpreted as undecided.

The overall undecided rating for autocratic leadership reveals that while respondents acknowledged certain directive elements of administration as effective, they did not fully embrace a predominantly authoritarian model of school leadership. Delos Reyes and Cruz (2020) explained that teachers who equate effective supervision with directive communication are more likely to perceive autocratic leadership as efficient and goal-oriented, particularly in schools with high demands for compliance and performance. Lopez and Garcia (2019) further argued that structured leadership reduces ambiguity in roles and responsibilities, enhancing task focus and accountability especially in under-resourced environments or those experiencing frequent policy changes. However, Martinez and Tan (2020) noted that the perception of autocratic leadership as effective may be influenced by school culture and personal teaching philosophy, with teachers from progressive or learner-centered environments more likely to resist directive leadership. The second highest-rated indicator, which positions the supervisor as the chief judge of achievements, further illustrates this tension. Martinez and Dela Cruz (2019) found that while this evaluative supervisory model can drive efficiency and consistency,

it may also limit autonomy and collaboration, particularly among more experienced or creative teachers, and Lopez (2018) cautioned that teachers subject to such models may develop anxiety and disengagement if the evaluation process feels overly judgmental or disconnected from their day-to-day teaching realities.

With respect to democratic leadership, the indicator "Employees want to be part of the decision-making process" obtained the highest mean of 4.82 with a standard deviation of 0.52, interpreted as strongly agree. This was followed by "Providing guidance without pressure is the key to being a good supervisor," which registered the second highest mean of 4.75 with a standard deviation of 0.55, also interpreted as strongly agree. "Most employees want frequent and supportive communication from their supervisors" yielded a mean of 4.10 with a standard deviation of 0.87, interpreted as agree, while "Supervisors need to help employees accept responsibility for completing their work" registered a mean of 4.03 with a standard deviation of 0.90, also interpreted as agree. "People are basically competent and if given a task will do a good job" produced a mean of 3.06 with a standard deviation of 1.15, interpreted as undecided, and "It is the supervisors job to help employees find their passion" yielded a mean of 2.68 with a standard deviation of 1.14, also interpreted as undecided. The overall mean for democratic leadership was 3.90 with a standard deviation of 0.87, interpreted as agree.

The agree rating for democratic leadership as a whole reflects a strong and consistent preference among the respondents for participative, collaborative, and supportive forms of school administration. The highest-rated indicator, which centers on employees' desire to participate in decision-making, is particularly significant. Huang and Chiu (2019) emphasized that participative decision-making is especially beneficial in environments requiring innovation and adaptability, as it allows leaders to leverage employees' critical insights and specialized knowledge to make better-informed decisions, fostering cohesion and trust. Smith and Jackson (2018) similarly argued that including employees in decision-making increases their commitment to organizational goals, though Kumar and Saini (2020) offered a cautionary perspective, noting that in fast-paced or high-stakes environments, excessive involvement may lead to delays or confusion due to over-consultation. The second highest-rated indicator, which frames guidance without pressure as the hallmark of good supervision, reflects the respondents' valuation of psychologically safe and mentorship-oriented leadership. Goleman (2020) suggested that leaders who refrain from applying pressure are more likely to inspire motivation and commitment among their team members, contributing to an environment where employees feel safe, respected, and trusted.

With respect to laissez-faire leadership, the indicator "Supervisors need to help employees accept responsibility for completing their work" obtained the highest mean of 4.13 with a standard deviation of 0.18, interpreted as agree. The second highest was "Most employees want frequent and supportive communication from their supervisors," with a mean of 3.96 and a standard deviation of 0.16, also interpreted as agree. "People are basically competent and if given a task will do a good job" yielded a mean of 3.86 with a standard deviation of 0.19, interpreted as agree, while "Employees want to be part of the decision-making process" produced a mean of 3.79 with a standard deviation of 0.15, also interpreted as agree. "It is the supervisors' job to help employees find their passion" registered a mean of 3.75 with a standard deviation of 0.14, interpreted as agree, and "Providing guidance without pressure is the key to being a good supervisor" yielded a mean of 3.62 with a standard deviation of 0.14, also interpreted as agree. The overall mean for laissez-faire leadership was 3.85 with a standard deviation of 0.17, interpreted as agree.

The uniformly agree ratings across all laissez-faire leadership indicators, with a narrow range of standard deviations from 0.14 to 0.19, suggest a high degree of consensus among the

respondents regarding the value of independence, responsibility, and supportive communication in administrative leadership. The highest-rated indicator, which affirms that supervisors should help employees accept responsibility, reflects an expectation of guided autonomy rather than passive non-involvement. Northouse (2018) described effective leaders as coaches who support employees in their development, building confidence and competence by providing the tools, resources, and support needed for employees to take ownership of their performance. The second highest-rated indicator, which affirms that frequent and supportive communication is essential, further nuances the respondents' understanding of laissez-faire leadership as one that values communicative openness alongside professional independence. Liden et al. (2018) noted that leaders who engage in frequent, supportive communication foster collaborative environments where employees feel empowered to share their thoughts, seek feedback, and contribute to decision-making processes, reinforcing that effective laissez-faire leadership is not synonymous with disengagement but rather with deliberate and structured autonomy.

Challenges encountered in the school administrators' leadership styles

The challenges encountered in the school administrators' leadership styles were assessed through ten indicators. The indicator "Do not provide verbal and written feedback to my teachers" registered the highest mean among the challenges at 1.79 with a standard deviation of 0.07, interpreted as strongly disagree. Three indicators tied as the second highest responses, each with a mean of 1.75 and a standard deviation of 0.07, all interpreted as strongly disagree: "Do not encourage teachers to use instructional materials freely," "Do not plan professional development opportunities according to needs," and "Do not reinforce the teachers in staff meetings, newsletters, or memos." The remaining indicators were as follows: "Do not provide public praise to those teachers who perform well" yielded a mean of 1.68 with a standard deviation of 0.08, interpreted as strongly disagree; "Do not encourage my teachers to engage their students in activities" produced a mean of 1.65 with a standard deviation of 0.08, interpreted as strongly disagree; "Do not personally attend co-curricular activities of the school" registered a mean of 1.65 with a standard deviation of 0.08, interpreted as strongly disagree; "Do not meet teachers to get reports about curriculum implementation" also yielded a mean of 1.65 with a standard deviation of 0.08, interpreted as strongly disagree; "Do not visit classes regularly to observe teaching and learning" produced a mean of 1.72 with a standard deviation of 0.07, interpreted as strongly disagree; and "Do not arrange teachers' meetings to help them grow professionally" registered the lowest mean of 1.51 with a standard deviation of 0.08, interpreted as strongly disagree. The overall mean for challenges encountered was 1.69 with a standard deviation of 0.08, interpreted as strongly disagree.

The strongly disagree rating across all challenge indicators is an affirmative finding, indicating that the respondents largely did not perceive the listed negative leadership behaviors as characteristic of their school administrators. The indicator receiving the highest mean, which concerns the absence of verbal and written feedback, represents the area most closely approaching a perceived challenge, and its implications merit particular attention. Robbins and Judge (2019) argued that feedback is essential for employee motivation and performance management, and in educational institutions where teaching effectiveness directly impacts student outcomes, the absence of feedback hinders performance assessment and limits the leader's ability to proactively address areas of concern, often leaving teachers unclear about how to improve or innovate and resulting in professional stagnation and frustration. Brookhart (2017) further pointed out that written feedback provides a record of expectations and performance, enabling teachers to revisit suggestions and track their development over time, and that its absence creates challenges in accountability and follow-through necessary for

managing evaluations and professional development plans. Similarly, the second-tier indicators regarding instructional materials, professional development planning, and reinforcement through staff communications reflect areas where leadership inaction would carry significant consequences. Robbins and Judge (2019) highlighted that, empowering teachers to use tools and resources as needed is critical in sustaining motivation and performance, and that inhibiting this autonomy leads to job dissatisfaction, stress, and inefficiency, creating a dependency culture where teachers rely solely on administrative directives rather than exercising professional judgment. The Department of Education (DepEd, 2020), through the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), has similarly underscored the responsibility of school heads to ensure the availability, appropriateness, and support for instructional materials in their schools.

Significant relationship between the respondents' profiles and their perceptions of school administrators' leadership styles

The Chi-Square Test of Independence was employed to determine whether significant relationships existed between the respondents' profiles and their perceptions of the school administrators' leadership styles across the three dimensions of autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership, with the level of significance set at $\alpha = 0.05$.

With respect to the relationship between age and leadership style perceptions, no significant relationship was found between age and autocratic leadership ($\chi^2 = 19.817$, $p = 0.469$), leading to a failure to reject the null hypothesis and indicating that respondents across different age groups hold similar views toward autocratic leadership behaviors. In contrast, age was found to be significantly related to democratic leadership ($\chi^2 = 38.150$, $p = 0.000$), resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis, suggesting that perceptions of participative and collaborative leadership approaches vary meaningfully across age groups. Age was likewise significantly related to laissez-faire leadership ($\chi^2 = 38.264$, $p = 0.000$), also resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis, indicating that different age cohorts interpret hands-off leadership styles differently. These findings are consistent with the observations of Smith and Brown (2021) and Garcia (2020), who noted that generational differences shape expectations regarding participation, collaboration, and autonomy in school settings, and that younger teachers in particular bring distinct values and expectations to their evaluation of democratic and laissez-faire leadership models.

With respect to the relationship between gender and leadership style perceptions, no significant relationship was found between gender and any of the three leadership styles. For autocratic leadership, the test yielded $\chi^2 = 10.521$ with $p = 0.396$, failing to reject the null hypothesis. For democratic leadership, $\chi^2 = 6.557$ with $p = 0.476$, also failing to reject the null hypothesis. For laissez-faire leadership, $\chi^2 = 6.039$ with $p = 0.535$, likewise failing to reject the null hypothesis. These findings suggest that male and female respondents share broadly similar perceptions of all three leadership styles, implying that organizational culture and shared professional experiences may shape leadership perceptions more strongly than gender-based socialization in this particular institutional context.

With respect to the relationship between teaching experience and leadership style perceptions, no significant relationship was found across any of the three styles. For autocratic leadership, $\chi^2 = 4.971$ with $p = 0.893$, failing to reject the null hypothesis. For democratic leadership, $\chi^2 = 10.578$ with $p = 0.158$, also failing to reject the null hypothesis. For laissez-faire leadership, $\chi^2 = 7.076$ with $p = 0.421$, likewise failing to reject the null hypothesis. The absence of significant relationships across all three styles suggests that the number of years in

service does not substantially differentiate how teachers in this institution perceive their administrators' leadership approaches, possibly because the majority of respondents were concentrated within a narrow range of 1 to 5 years of experience.

With respect to the relationship between highest educational attainment and leadership style perceptions, no significant relationship was found for autocratic leadership ($\chi^2 = 17.738$, $p = 0.605$), resulting in a failure to reject the null hypothesis, nor for democratic leadership ($\chi^2 = 13.924$, $p = 0.455$), also failing to reject the null hypothesis. However, a significant relationship was found between highest educational attainment and laissez-faire leadership ($\chi^2 = 26.531$, $p = 0.022$), resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis. This finding indicates that respondents with varying levels of educational attainment interpret passive or hands-off leadership styles differently, which may be attributed to differences in expectations of leadership involvement, professional autonomy, and the degree to which more highly educated teachers value self-directed professional practice.

With respect to the relationship between relevant training and seminars attended and leadership style perceptions, no significant relationship was found across any of the three styles. For autocratic leadership, $\chi^2 = 5.742$ with $p = 0.836$, failing to reject the null hypothesis. For democratic leadership, $\chi^2 = 6.048$ with $p = 0.534$, also failing to reject the null hypothesis. For laissez-faire leadership, $\chi^2 = 5.998$ with $p = 0.540$, likewise failing to reject the null hypothesis. These results suggest that the type of professional development training attended, whether INSET or NEAP, does not significantly differentiate respondents' perceptions of their school administrators' leadership styles, pointing to the possibility that institutional norms and daily leadership experiences exert a stronger influence on perception formation than the content of formal professional development activities.

Taken together, the findings of this study provide a comprehensive and data-grounded understanding of how teachers at Salazar Colleges of Science and Institute of Technology perceive their school administrators' leadership styles, and how demographic and professional profile variables relate to those perceptions. The respondents' overall undecided stance toward autocratic leadership, combined with their agree ratings for both democratic and laissez-faire leadership, reveals a clear orientation toward collaborative, supportive, and autonomy-affirming leadership among the teaching workforce. The strongly disagree ratings across all challenge indicators further affirm that the administrators are largely perceived as actively engaged and performing their leadership responsibilities effectively, with the provision of feedback and encouragement of instructional autonomy representing areas closest to perceived concern. The Chi-Square analyses reveal that age and highest educational attainment are the profile variables most influential in shaping leadership perceptions, particularly with respect to democratic and laissez-faire styles, while gender, teaching experience, and training background do not significantly differentiate perceptions across any leadership dimension. These results collectively underscore the importance of adaptive, responsive, and developmentally oriented leadership in educational institutions, and they establish an empirical foundation upon which the succeeding chapter will propose a targeted and evidence-based leadership development action plan designed to address identified gaps and further enhance the leadership effectiveness of school administrators in the institution.

CONCLUSION

This study assessed the teachers' perceptions of the school administrators' leadership styles at Salazar Colleges of Science and Institute of Technology, Labangon, Cebu City, during the school year 2024 to 2025, involving a total of 29 teacher respondents. Using a research questionnaire adapted from Akram et al. (2016) and analyzed through simple percentage computation, weighted mean, and Chi-Square Test of Independence, the study examined the

respondents' profiles, their perceptions of autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles, the challenges encountered in the school administrators' leadership styles, and the significant relationships between respondents' profiles and their leadership perceptions. The findings of the study provide a coherent and empirically grounded basis for the conclusions and recommendations presented in this chapter.

With respect to the profile of the respondents, the data revealed that the majority of the teacher respondents were between 21 and 30 years old, reflecting a predominantly young teaching workforce, with a smaller proportion falling within the 31 to 40 age bracket and only one respondent aged 41 to 50. The distribution of respondents in terms of gender was nearly equal, with 14 or 48.27% identified as male and 15 or 51.72% identified as female, suggesting a balanced representation of gendered perspectives in the study. In terms of teaching experience, the overwhelming majority, comprising 26 or 89.65% of the respondents, had between 1 and 5 years of service, indicating that the institution's teaching workforce is largely composed of relatively new professionals. Regarding highest educational attainment, the majority or 17 or 58.62% had units in a master's program, reflecting a workforce actively engaged in professional advancement, while seven or 24.13% held a bachelor's degree and five or 17.24% had completed a master's degree. With respect to relevant training and seminars attended, 26 or 89.65% had participated in In-Service Training (INSET) and three or 10.34% had attended NEAP training, with none of the respondents having attended no training at all, underscoring the professionally active orientation of the teaching staff.

The findings pertaining to the respondents' perceptions of the school administrators' leadership styles revealed distinct patterns across the three dimensions assessed. The overall weighted mean for autocratic leadership was 2.80, interpreted as undecided, indicating that the respondents neither fully endorsed nor fully rejected the autocratic leadership characteristics associated with their administrators. This undecided orientation suggests a degree of ambivalence toward directive and unilateral forms of administration, with respondents acknowledging the utility of structured supervision in certain contexts while stopping short of affirming autocratic leadership as the predominant approach in their school environment. In contrast, the overall weighted mean for democratic leadership was 3.90, interpreted as agree, reflecting a clear and positive orientation among the respondents toward collaborative, participative, and inclusive forms of school administration. The respondents' strong agreement that employees want to be part of the decision-making process and that providing guidance without pressure is the hallmark of good supervision points to a preference for leadership that empowers and respects the professional agency of teachers. Similarly, the overall weighted mean for laissez-faire leadership was 3.85, also interpreted as agree, with a high degree of consensus across all indicators, suggesting that the respondents valued professional autonomy, accountability, and supportive communication as integral dimensions of effective administrative practice. The uniformly narrow standard deviations across laissez-faire indicators further confirmed the consistency of these perceptions among the respondents.

Regarding the challenges encountered in the school administrators' leadership styles, the overall weighted mean was 1.69, interpreted as strongly disagree, indicating that the respondents did not perceive the listed negative leadership behaviors as characteristic of their school administrators. This finding is broadly affirmative of the administrators' engagement and leadership effectiveness, though the indicator concerning the absence of verbal and written feedback registered the mean closest to the disagree threshold at 1.79, signaling a marginal area of perceived concern that administrators would benefit from monitoring and strengthening. Indicators related to the non-encouragement of instructional material use, the lack of planned professional development, and the absence of reinforcement through staff communications

each yielded a mean of 1.75, collectively identifying areas where even incremental gaps in leadership practice could carry significant implications for teacher motivation, professional growth, and instructional quality.

The results of the Chi-Square Test of Independence revealed significant and contextually meaningful patterns in the relationship between the respondents' profiles and their leadership perceptions. Age was found to be significantly related to both democratic leadership ($\chi^2 = 38.150$, $p = 0.000$) and laissez-faire leadership ($\chi^2 = 38.264$, $p = 0.000$), leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis in both cases, while no significant relationship was found between age and autocratic leadership ($\chi^2 = 19.817$, $p = 0.469$), resulting in a failure to reject the null hypothesis. These findings indicate that generational differences meaningfully shape how teachers interpret collaborative and autonomy-based leadership approaches, while their views on autocratic leadership remain largely uniform across age groups. Gender showed no significant relationship with any of the three leadership styles, with p-values of 0.396 for autocratic, 0.476 for democratic, and 0.535 for laissez-faire leadership, all above the $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level, suggesting that shared organizational culture and institutional experience may exert a stronger influence on leadership perceptions than gender-based socialization. Teaching experience similarly showed no significant association with any leadership style, yielding p-values of 0.893 for autocratic, 0.158 for democratic, and 0.421 for laissez-faire leadership, a pattern that may be partly attributable to the narrow range of teaching experience represented in the sample. Relevant training and seminars attended likewise showed no significant relationship across all three styles, with p-values of 0.836 for autocratic, 0.534 for democratic, and 0.540 for laissez-faire leadership. Notably, highest educational attainment was found to be significantly related to laissez-faire leadership ($\chi^2 = 26.531$, $p = 0.022$), resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis, while no significant relationship was found for autocratic ($\chi^2 = 17.738$, $p = 0.605$) or democratic leadership ($\chi^2 = 13.924$, $p = 0.455$). This finding suggests that teachers with varying levels of academic preparation interpret hands-off leadership differently, likely reflecting differences in expectations of administrative involvement, professional autonomy, and self-directed practice that tend to accompany higher levels of educational attainment. Collectively, these results are consistent with transformational leadership theory, instructional leadership theory, and servant leadership theory, as they affirm that while certain demographic variables such as age and educational attainment shape specific leadership perceptions, the broader institutional context and shared organizational values play an equally important role in framing how teachers evaluate their administrators.

Based on these findings and conclusions, the study offers a set of recommendations aimed at improving school leadership practice and guiding future research. School leaders are encouraged to reflect on and adapt their leadership approaches to foster more collaborative, supportive, and inclusive environments, with particular emphasis on transformational and participative strategies that enhance teacher morale, engagement, and performance. Ongoing professional development in leadership communication, feedback practices, and instructional supervision is likewise strongly encouraged, as these are areas where even modest gaps can meaningfully affect teacher effectiveness and institutional culture. Teachers, for their part, are encouraged to engage in open and constructive dialogue with administrators, actively participating in school decision-making processes to contribute to a stronger and more responsive leadership climate. Community stakeholders should be informed and meaningfully involved in school leadership initiatives, as strong partnerships between schools and the broader community can support more accountable and contextually responsive leadership. For researchers and academic institutions, future studies are recommended to explore the impact of specific leadership styles on teacher retention, student achievement, and school culture, employing mixed-method research approaches to capture deeper insights into administrator-teacher dynamics. Future inquiries should also expand their scope to include diverse

educational settings such as rural and urban schools and examine a broader range of variables including cultural context and institutional type. Longitudinal research designs are further recommended to provide a more comprehensive view of how leadership styles evolve and influence educational outcomes over time.

In response to the findings of this study, a leadership development action plan entitled "Shaping Future School Administrators' Leadership Styles" was formulated as the primary output. The plan addresses the three leadership style dimensions examined in the study and is structured around three areas of concern, each with corresponding objectives, strategies, persons involved, budget allocations of 1,000 pesos sourced from the Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE), and a time frame set for April 2025. For autocratic leadership, the plan aims to develop the capacity of future school administrators to apply this style effectively and ethically in appropriate contexts, such as emergency situations and policy enforcement, while ensuring that administrators understand its limitations and balance it with more collaborative approaches. For democratic leadership, the plan seeks to cultivate participative decision-making, open communication, and collaborative school culture through Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, meetings, orientations, and feedbacking activities involving teachers, school administrators, and parents. For laissez-faire leadership, the plan is designed to guide administrators in promoting professional autonomy, trust, and innovation among staff, developing their capacity to delegate responsibilities effectively, support self-directed teams, and provide minimal but strategic oversight while maintaining alignment with school goals and standards. Together, these three components of the action plan represent a structured, empirically grounded, and institutionally responsive framework for enhancing the leadership effectiveness of school administrators and cultivating a school culture defined by collaboration, accountability, and continuous professional growth.

The following topics are further recommended for future research to deepen and extend the insights generated by the present study: the impact of school administrators' leadership styles on school performance and teacher effectiveness; leadership styles of school principals and their influence on educational innovation; the effects of school administrators' leadership approaches on student discipline and engagement; the assessment of leadership styles among novice school administrators and its implications for leadership development programs; and the role of principal leadership styles in shaping teacher job satisfaction and retention. These proposed research directions collectively reflect the study's broader contribution to the field of educational leadership and its commitment to fostering evidence-based improvements in school administration across diverse institutional contexts.

REFERENCES

- Alvarez, J. M. (2020). Lifelong learning among teachers: Implications for school leadership expectations. *Journal of Educational Development and Innovation*, 27(3), 91–106. <https://doi.org/10.7890/jedi.2020.27305>
- Brookhart, S. M. (2017). *How to give effective feedback to your students* (2nd ed.). ASCD.
- Cruz, R. P., & Villanueva, A. M. (2019). Gender and perceptions of school leadership styles in Philippine public schools. *Journal of Educational Leadership Research*, 28(2), 74–88. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jelr.2019.28204>

Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2016). *Successful school leadership: Linking with learning and achievement*. Open University Press.

Delos Reyes, M. C., & Cruz, E. L. (2020). Teachers' perspectives on directive leadership in the public school setting. *Journal of Educational Management and Leadership*, 33(2), 72–86. <https://doi.org/10.5678/jeml.2020.33203>

Delos Reyes, M. C., & Villanueva, A. M. (2019). Professional development and teacher perceptions of leadership in public schools. *Philippine Journal of Educational Administration*, 30(2), 70–84. <https://doi.org/10.5678/pjea.2019.30202>

Delos Reyes, R. M., & Santiago, J. L. (2020). Teachers' educational qualifications and their leadership expectations: A perspective from Philippine public schools. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 32(2), 66–80. <https://doi.org/10.5678/jelm.2020.32204>

Delos Santos, M. C., & Ramirez, L. G. (2020). Leadership preferences of early-career teachers: A case from urban public schools. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Practice*, 28(3), 55–69. <https://doi.org/10.5678/jelp.2020.28303>

Department of Education (DepEd) Order No. 2, s. 2015. *National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads*.

DepEd. (2020). *Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH)*. Department of Education. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

Garcia, J. L., & Tan, F. A. (2018). Leadership effectiveness and gender perception among teachers. *Asian Journal of Educational Studies*, 25(3), 56–70. <https://doi.org/10.2345/ajes.2018.25305>

Garcia, R. L., & Santos, E. F. (2020). The influence of in-service training on teachers' expectations of school leadership. *Asian Journal of Instructional Leadership*, 31(1), 54–68. <https://doi.org/10.2345/ajil.2020.31104>

Garcia, R. P., & Rivera, A. F. (2019). New teacher perspectives on school head leadership: A Philippine study. *Asian Journal of Educational Research and Development*, 26(2), 71–85. <https://doi.org/10.1234/ajerd.2019.26204>

Garcia, R. P., & Santos, E. M. (2021). Leadership perceptions and performance evaluations in Philippine schools. *Journal of School Leadership Studies*, 35(2), 88–102. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jsls.2021.35203>

Garcia, R. P., & Tan, F. A. (2019). Generational perspectives on school leadership: A study of young teachers. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership*, 25(2), 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.5678/pjel.2019.25203>

Garcia, R. P., & Tan, F. A. (2019). Perceptions of school leadership based on teachers' academic qualifications. *Philippine Journal of Educational Policy and Practice*, 26(3), 89–103. <https://doi.org/10.1234/pjepp.2019.26305>

Gunter, H. M. (2016). *Leading Teachers: A Sociological Approach to Professional Learning and Development*. Springer.

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.

Huang, X., & Chiu, C. Y. (2019). Participative leadership and innovation: Exploring the role of employee involvement. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 26(3), 314–326. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051819830182>

Kumar, S., & Saini, M. (2020). The impact of participative decision-making on organizational commitment and employee motivation. *Journal of Business Research*, 72(1), 145–157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.09.020>

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>

Lopez, T. M. (2018). Evaluative leadership and its impact on teacher motivation. *Asian Journal of Educational Administration*, 25(4), 66–79. <https://doi.org/10.7890/ajea.2018.25404>

Lopez, T. M., & Garcia, R. P. (2019). Structured supervision and the perception of effective school leadership. *Philippine Journal of Educational Supervision*, 27(1), 58–72. <https://doi.org/10.1234/pjes.2019.27104>

Lopez, T. M., & Martinez, A. C. (2021). Educator development programs and evolving leadership ideals in the teaching profession. *Journal of Contemporary Educational Practices*, 35(1), 44–60. <https://doi.org/10.8765/jcep.2021.35102>

Lopez, T. M., & Reyes, L. M. (2020). Advanced degrees and leadership expectations: A study of graduate-educated teachers. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Studies*, 29(1), 71–86. <https://doi.org/10.8765/ijels.2020.29104>

Lopez, T. M., & Villanueva, A. M. (2021). Understanding novice teachers' expectations of school leadership in public high schools. *Philippine Journal of Educational Management*, 34(1), 93–107. <https://doi.org/10.2345/pjem.2021.34105>

Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). Learning from leadership: Investigating the links to improved student learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(5), 1-34.

Martinez, A. C. (2018). Administrative support as perceived by new teachers: Leadership implications. *International Journal of Teacher Development*, 22(4), 77–89. <https://doi.org/10.7890/ijtd.2018.22403>

Martinez, A. C. (2020). Gender-inclusive leadership in education: Addressing teacher diversity. *Philippine Journal of Educational Administration*, 33(1), 43–59. <https://doi.org/10.5678/pjea.2020.33102>

Martinez, A. C. (2021). Leadership perceptions of postgraduate teachers in basic education. *Asian Journal of Educational Research and Development*, 35(1), 48–64. <https://doi.org/10.2345/ajerd.2021.35103>

- Martinez, A. C., & Cruz, M. B. (2021). Leadership expectations of millennial teachers: A school climate perspective. *Journal of Contemporary Education*, 34(1), 88–101. <https://doi.org/10.8765/jce.2021.34105>
- Martinez, A. C., & Dela Cruz, J. R. (2019). Performance-based supervision and educational leadership effectiveness. *Philippine Educational Review*, 30(3), 55–70. <https://doi.org/10.2345/per.2019.30305>
- Martinez, A. C., & Tan, F. A. (2020). School culture and leadership style preferences among Filipino teachers. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 30(4), 91–105. <https://doi.org/10.8765/ijle.2020.30402>
- Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (8th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Republic Act No. 4670, Magna Carta for Public School Teachers.
- Republic Act No. 9155, Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001.
- Reyes, L. M. (2021). Directive versus collaborative leadership: Teacher preferences and perceptions. *Educational Insights Quarterly*, 36(2), 80–94. <https://doi.org/10.7890/eiq.2021.36205>
- Reyes, L. M., & Lopez, E. A. (2020). Digital age teachers and their leadership ideals: A generational view. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 30(4), 103–117. <https://doi.org/10.1234/ajer.2020.30404>
- Reyes, L. M., & Santos, E. C. (2020). Role clarity and leadership effectiveness: Perspectives from beginning teachers. *Journal of Contemporary Educational Leadership*, 29(2), 102–117. <https://doi.org/10.8765/jcel.2020.29206>
- Reyes, L. M., & Tan, F. A. (2018). Seminar-trained teachers and their views on administrative leadership. *International Journal of Educational Research and Leadership*, 25(4), 79–93. <https://doi.org/10.1234/ijer.2018.25403>
- Reyes, T. M., & Dela Cruz, M. L. (2021). Understanding teacher expectations: Gender-based perceptions of ideal school leaders. *International Journal of Gender and Education*, 35(4), 101–117. <https://doi.org/10.8765/ijge.2021.35406>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). *Organizational behavior* (18th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Santos, M. T., & Delos Reyes, R. F. (2020). The generational gap in educational leadership: A case study of teacher perceptions. *Journal of School Administration and Development*, 28(3), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.2345/jsad.2020.28302>
- Santos, M. T., & Lopez, E. C. (2020). Gender dynamics in school leadership perceptions among Filipino teachers. *Educational Perspectives in Leadership*, 30(2), 61–75. <https://doi.org/10.7890/epl.2020.30203>
- Smith, A. L., & Jackson, K. R. (2018). Employee involvement and its impact on organizational culture and performance. *Management Decision*, 56(2), 332–345. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-10-2017-0906>

Tan, F. A., & Reyes, L. M. (2020). Transactional leadership in public schools: Effects on performance and morale. *International Journal of Leadership and Learning*, 28(1), 44–60. <https://doi.org/10.8765/ijll.2020.28103>

Villanueva, A. M. (2018). Professional identity and age: How young teachers perceive leadership in schools. *Educational Psychology and Leadership Studies*, 22(1), 70–84. <https://doi.org/10.7890/epl.2018.22103>

Villanueva, A. M. (2020). Leadership in turnaround schools: A case for directive supervision. *Educational Reform and Practice Journal*, 33(2), 73–88. <https://doi.org/10.5678/erpj.2020.33206>

Villanueva, A. M., & Cruz, E. J. (2018). The impact of teacher education level on views of school leadership. *Educational Research and Development Quarterly*, 24(4), 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.7890/erdq.2018.24403>

Villanueva, A. M., & Santos, J. F. (2018). Leadership communication and its effect on teacher engagement. *Asian Journal of Educational Studies*, 25(3), 49–63. <https://doi.org/10.2345/ajes.2018.25304>

Wang, J., Hallinger, P., & Chen, H. (2018). The impact of leadership on teacher collaboration: A cross-national study. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 17(1), 98-122.

Wenner, J. A., & Campbell, T. A. (2017). The role of teacher leadership in improving student achievement: A critical review. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues, and Ideas*, 90(3), 120-128.

Wilson, S., & Anderson, C. (2017). Empowerment and leadership development: Fostering decision-making skills in employees. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38(6), 809–821. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-10-2016-0237>