

**Leadership styles in educational administration and
their impact on teacher job satisfaction**

Mark Anthony M. Reyes*

Cebu Technological University-Main Campus, Cebu City, Cebu, Philippines

ABSTRACT

Behind every motivated teacher lies a leader who inspires, supports, and empowers. This study examined the relationship between perceived leadership styles of school heads and teacher job satisfaction in District 5, Lapu-Lapu City Division, during School Year 2025-2026. Using an embedded mixed-methods design with quantitative dominance, the study gathered data from 6 school heads and 72 teachers through validated questionnaires, complemented by interviews with administrators. School heads most strongly perceived themselves as employing participative, servant, and transformational styles. Teachers reported overall "Satisfied" job satisfaction, with the highest ratings in Job Responsibilities and Work Engagement, while Security and Community Linkages showed lower means. Pearson correlation revealed significant positive relationships between teacher satisfaction and transformational leadership ($r = 0.292, p < 0.05$), servant leadership ($r = 0.233, p < 0.05$), and participative leadership ($r = 0.230, p < 0.05$). Thematic analysis identified administrative challenges: financial constraints, adaptive leadership demands, communication gaps, and policy compliance pressures. Interviews further explained that financial limitations and policy pressures hindered consistent leadership implementation, potentially accounting for lower satisfaction in Security and Community Linkages. The study concludes that transformational and servant leadership styles are significantly associated with higher teacher satisfaction; however, systemic hurdles impede consistent application. Recommendations include mentorship programs for new school heads, servant leadership workshops, transformational coaching, communication seminars, and resource mobilization initiatives. Proactive strategies such as streamlined policy procedures and stronger school-community partnerships are also proposed to foster a more supportive educational environment.

Keywords: Administration and supervision, leadership styles, job satisfaction, mixed-method, enhancement plan, Lapu-Lapu City, Cebu, Philippines.

Date Submitted: August 6, 2026

Date Accepted: August 12, 2026

Date Published: September 4, 2026

*Corresponding author / Email: mark.reyes@deped.gov.ph
DOI: <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05031514>

Recommended citation:

Reyes, M. A. M. (2026). Leadership styles in educational administration and their impact on teacher job satisfaction. *Pantao (International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences)* 5 (3), 3988-4005.
<http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05031514>

INTRODUCTION

Effective leadership is paramount to the success and sustainability of educational institutions. School heads' leadership styles significantly impact the overall school climate, teacher productivity, and staff morale, serving as a cornerstone for fostering a conducive learning environment (Dayanan & Baynosa, 2025; Mendoza & Jesus, 2024). Complementing leadership, teachers' job satisfaction, encompassing factors such as security, work engagement, job responsibilities, and community linkages, is critical for both the retention and overall effectiveness of the teaching workforce. High levels of job satisfaction directly influence teachers' motivation, commitment, and performance within schools, profoundly affecting student outcomes (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2022). Cultivating such satisfaction requires supportive leadership that balances workloads, recognizes achievements, and fosters a positive, inclusive work environment (Glaveli et al., 2023).

Despite the well-established importance of these two constructs, recent international studies continue to highlight gaps in understanding how specific leadership styles intricately influence teacher job satisfaction (Shi et al., 2024). While transformational and participative leadership styles are consistently linked to improved teacher satisfaction and motivation, a notable gap remains in understanding how transactional, authoritative, and servant leadership styles function across diverse cultural and institutional contexts (Gingo & Dioso, 2025; Rahman, 2023). Studies suggest that authoritarian leadership may negatively affect teacher morale and job satisfaction; however, more quantitative, context-specific research is needed to fully understand these dynamics (Gingo & Dioso, 2025). Moreover, many international studies focus on urban and large divisions, overlooking the unique dynamics of more diverse settings, including rural or smaller divisions (Mulyani & Wiart, 2021; Rexha, 2024).

In the Philippine context, the education system faces substantial challenges. There is a pressing need for extensive empirical evidence linking school heads' leadership styles with teachers' job satisfaction in nuanced ways for various local contexts. Recent studies indicate significant concerns regarding teacher migration and retention in the Philippines, often driven by a search for better financial opportunities and comprehensive well-being provisions (Acosta et al., 2020; Anog et al., 2024; Cahilog et al., 2023). This "brain drain" of skilled Filipino educators directly affects education quality and contributes to persistent gaps in student learning outcomes (Acosta et al., 2020; Frianeza et al., 2024). Strengthening school leadership is deemed essential to improve education outcomes, especially given the identified deficits in qualified principals and teacher shortages across thousands of schools (Galila et al., 2025; Mendoza & Jesus, 2024). While preliminary Philippine studies indicate positive impacts of transformational and participative styles on teacher morale, the direct effects of mixed leadership styles and the need for statistical rigor remain underexplored (Gingo & Dioso, 2025).

Furthermore, the influence of transactional and delegative styles on job satisfaction warrants deeper investigation, particularly considering the hierarchical nature of Philippine school administration (Gingo & Dioso, 2025; Mariano & Oco, 2024). Evidence also points to an urgent need to understand how leadership styles specifically affect different dimensions of job satisfaction, such as security and community linkages, within Philippine public schools (Mendoza & Jesus, 2024). Studies from neighboring Southeast Asian countries, such as Indonesia and Malaysia, similarly underscore the scarcity of literature demonstrating these crucial relationships within specific national contexts (Asmuri & Hamzah, 2022; Hariri, 2023).

At the local level in District 5, Lapu-Lapu City Division, evidence of persistent career advancement challenges for teachers underscores the research gap, as this critical dimension of job satisfaction is directly linked to the leadership and administrative support of school heads. While national policies like the Expanded Career Progression (ECP) program aim to address

promotion bottlenecks, 57 veteran teachers who remained at the Teacher I rank for decades were only promoted close to retirement, highlighting a severe lag in career mobility that affects teacher morale and professional growth. This issue is compounded by reported resource constraints, such as overcrowded classrooms and inadequate facilities, which not only increase teacher workload but also require strong, responsive leadership to mitigate their negative impact on job satisfaction.

Therefore, this study examines the perceived administrative and supervisory leadership styles of school heads and their relationship to teachers' job satisfaction in District 5, Lapu-Lapu City Division during the School Year 2025–2026, providing a solid foundation for actionable recommendations.

Statement of the problem

This study examined the perceived administrative and supervisory leadership styles of school heads and their relationship with teachers' job satisfaction in District 5, Lapu-Lapu City Division during the School Year 2025–2026, as basis for developing an enhancement plan.

Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

1. As perceived by the school heads, what is their leadership style based on authoritative, participative, delegative, servant, transformational, and transactional leadership?
2. What is the level of teachers' job satisfaction in terms of security, work engagement, job responsibilities, and community linkages?
3. Is there a significant relationship between perceived school heads' leadership styles and the job satisfaction of teachers?
4. What administrative challenges in school administration do school heads encounter when implementing certain leadership styles?
5. Based on the findings, what enhancement plan can be proposed?

METHODOLOGY

Research design

This study employed an embedded mixed-methods research design, with a quantitative descriptive-correlational approach as the primary method and a qualitative phenomenological approach as the supporting component. Survey questionnaires were used to assess school heads' leadership styles and teachers' job satisfaction and to determine the relationship between these variables among participants in District 5, Lapu-Lapu City Division during School Year 2025–2026. To enrich the quantitative findings, semi-structured interviews were conducted with selected school heads to explore the administrative challenges they experienced in applying different leadership styles. By integrating statistical data with participants' lived experiences, the study provided a comprehensive understanding of how leadership styles influence teacher job satisfaction and served as a basis for developing an enhancement plan to improve leadership practices and teacher satisfaction in the district.

Respondents and locale of the study

This study was conducted in District 5, Marigondon, Lapu-Lapu City Division, which includes Marigondon Elementary School, Marigondon Junior High School, Marigondon Senior High School, Science Technology Education Center (STEC), and Subabasbas

Elementary School. The district served a large and diverse educational population, making it an ideal setting for examining school heads' leadership styles and teachers' job satisfaction. The respondents consisted of six (6) school heads and seventy-two (72) teachers from the elementary, junior high school, and senior high school levels, for a total of seventy-eight (78) participants during School Year 2025–2026. School heads were selected through total enumeration, while teachers were chosen using stratified random sampling to ensure proportional representation across school levels, providing reliable data for assessing leadership practices, teacher satisfaction, and administrative challenges within the district.

Research instrument

This study utilized an adapted and validated questionnaire based on the instruments of Cadimas et al. (2024) and Gingo and Dioso (2025) as its primary data-gathering tool. The instrument consisted of three parts: respondents' demographic profile, school heads' perceived leadership styles (authoritative, participative, delegative, servant, transformational, and transactional), and teachers' job satisfaction in terms of security, work engagement, job responsibilities, and community linkages, all measured using a five-point Likert scale. To complement the quantitative data, a semi-structured interview guide was used to explore school heads' experiences and administrative challenges in implementing various leadership styles. The instrument underwent face and content validation by five experts and was pilot-tested with 30 non-respondents, yielding Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.87 for the leadership styles scale and 0.84 for the job satisfaction scale, indicating high reliability and ensuring the credibility and dependability of the study's findings.

Data analyses procedure

The study followed a systematic data collection and analysis process that included obtaining official permissions, administering validated questionnaires to school heads and teachers, and conducting semi-structured interviews with selected school heads while ensuring voluntary participation, confidentiality, and compliance with ethical standards and the Data Privacy Act of 2012. Quantitative data were reviewed, encoded, and analyzed using frequency and percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient to describe respondents' profiles, determine leadership styles and job satisfaction levels, and assess the relationship between the variables. Qualitative interview data were transcribed and analyzed using Braun and Clarke's six-phase thematic analysis framework to identify key themes on leadership practices and administrative challenges. The integration of quantitative and qualitative findings provided a comprehensive basis for interpreting results, drawing conclusions, and developing an enhancement plan to strengthen leadership practices and teacher job satisfaction.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the data drawn from the survey responses of teacher respondents and the individual interviews conducted with school head participants, this Results and Discussion section presents a comprehensive and integrated analysis of the leadership styles perceived to be practiced by school heads, the corresponding levels of teacher job satisfaction, the statistical relationship between these two variables, and the administrative challenges encountered by school heads in implementing their leadership approaches. The study employed a mixed methods research design, combining a quantitative descriptive-correlational approach with a qualitative phenomenological component to capture both the measurable patterns in leadership

and satisfaction and the lived administrative experiences of school heads. Teacher respondents were selected through a sampling approach appropriate to the school setting under study, and data were gathered using a structured survey questionnaire measuring six leadership dimensions, namely authoritative, participative, delegative, servant, transformational, and transactional leadership, alongside four dimensions of teacher job satisfaction, namely security, work engagement, job responsibilities, and community linkages. Complementing this, semi-structured interviews were conducted with school head participants and analyzed using Braun and Clarke's (2006) reflexive thematic analysis approach. Descriptive statistics, specifically the mean and standard deviation, were used to determine the level of practice of each leadership style and the corresponding level of teacher job satisfaction, while Pearson r correlation was employed to test the significance of the relationship between school heads' leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction at the 0.05 level of significance. The discussion that follows is grounded strictly in the data gathered from these instruments and is interpreted in direct relation to the specific objectives of the study, namely to determine the perceived leadership styles of school heads, to assess the level of teacher job satisfaction, to test the significance of the relationship between these two variables, and to explore the administrative challenges school heads encounter in implementing their leadership styles.

With regard to the authoritative leadership style, the findings revealed that school heads generally exhibited this style at a moderate level, yielding an aggregate mean of 4.12 with a standard deviation of 0.98, interpreted as Agree. Among the specific indicators, the item stating that the school head "is determined to push projects forward and get results" obtained the highest rating with a mean of 4.67 and a standard deviation of 0.52, interpreted as Strongly Agree, while the item indicating that the school head "gives orders and clarifies procedures" likewise received a Strongly Agree interpretation with a mean of 4.33 and a standard deviation of 0.52. The belief that "employees must be given rewards or punishments to motivate them to achieve organizational objectives" obtained a mean of 4.50 and a standard deviation of 1.22, also interpreted as Strongly Agree, whereas the item concerning close supervision because subordinates "will likely fail to do their work" received a mean of 4.17 and a standard deviation of 0.98, interpreted as Agree. The item identifying the school head as "the chief judge of the achievements of employees" yielded a mean of 4.00 and a standard deviation of 1.26, interpreted as Agree, and the item on giving subordinates "complete freedom to solve problems on their own" obtained a mean of 3.83 and a standard deviation of 0.75, also interpreted as Agree. Notably, the lowest-rated indicator, the belief that "most employees in the general population are lazy," obtained a mean of only 3.33 with a standard deviation of 1.63, interpreted as Neutral, suggesting that while school heads exercised directive control and results-oriented supervision, they did not necessarily view teachers through a negative motivational lens. These results imply that authoritative leadership among school heads was characterized primarily by strong direction, structured supervision, goal orientation, and accountability rather than by a punitive or distrustful disposition toward subordinates. This is consistent with the assertions of Gürbüz and Saklan (2025), who emphasized that directive leadership requires supportive strategies to sustain teacher morale, Mincu (2022), who noted that authoritative leadership improves role clarity but may constrain autonomy and innovation, and Želvys et al. (2019), who concluded that the combination of authoritative and participative approaches enhances teacher satisfaction and overall school effectiveness. Taken together, these findings suggest that while authoritative leadership can enhance organizational efficiency and clarity of expectations, it should be balanced with more participative and transformational practices to sustain teacher motivation, job satisfaction, and a positive school climate.

In contrast, the participative leadership style was found to be strongly practiced by school heads, obtaining an aggregate mean of 4.57 and a standard deviation of 0.58, interpreted as Strongly Agree. The indicator with the highest rating, "encourages subordinates to use their creativity and ingenuity to solve organizational problems," obtained a mean of 4.83 and a standard deviation of 0.41, while the items "encourages subordinates to participate in decision making," "creates an environment where the employees take ownership of the project," and "believes teams work best when everyone is involved in making decisions" each obtained a mean of 4.67 and a standard deviation of 0.52. The item "solicits subordinates' suggestions before making a decision" yielded a mean of 4.50 and a standard deviation of 0.84, and "allows subordinates to set priorities with their guidance" obtained a mean of 4.50 with a standard deviation of 0.55, both interpreted as Strongly Agree. The item "is receptive to ideas and advice from others" recorded the comparatively lowest, though still favorable, mean of 4.17 with a standard deviation of 0.75, interpreted as Agree. These uniformly high ratings suggest that school heads fostered a democratic and inclusive school environment in which teachers were empowered to contribute to decision-making processes and encouraged to exercise creativity and initiative in addressing organizational problems. This finding aligns with Mbua (2023), who found that participative leadership increases teacher engagement and commitment through involvement in decision-making, Bălan and Jamaluddin (2024), who reported that shared leadership enhances staff creativity and problem-solving, and Gaspar (2021), who emphasized that participative leadership strengthens trust, collaboration, job satisfaction, and school effectiveness. The strong presence of participative leadership implies that sustaining such practices can further promote a positive school climate, strengthen collaboration, and improve overall school performance.

The delegative leadership style, by comparison, was practiced by school heads to a more moderate degree, obtaining an aggregate mean of 3.79 and a standard deviation of 1.13, interpreted as Agree. The highest-rated indicator, "ensures that information systems are timely and accurate and that information is fed directly to employees," obtained a mean of 4.50 and a standard deviation of 0.55, interpreted as Strongly Agree, while the item "let their subordinates think ahead and develop long-term plans for their areas" obtained a mean of 4.00 with a standard deviation of 0.63, and "emphasizes the importance of quality but allows subordinates to establish the control standards" likewise obtained a mean of 4.00 with a standard deviation of 1.10, both interpreted as Agree. The item "let their subordinates work their problems out in their way" obtained a mean of 3.83 and a standard deviation of 1.60, "allows their subordinates to appraise their work" obtained a mean of 3.67 and a standard deviation of 1.21, and "feels it's best to leave subordinates alone" obtained a mean of 3.50 and a standard deviation of 1.38, all interpreted as Agree. Notably, the item "stays out of the way as their subordinates do their work" obtained the lowest mean of 3.00 with a standard deviation of 1.41, interpreted as Neutral, indicating that school heads did not completely withdraw from supervising teachers' work even while allowing considerable autonomy. This pattern of results suggests that school heads maintained a balanced delegative approach, granting teachers sufficient freedom to manage tasks and exercise initiative while still preserving lines of accountability and guidance. This finding is consistent with Mirkhan et al. (2024), who found that teacher autonomy fosters innovation and ownership when accompanied by appropriate oversight, Ilter et al. (2023), who emphasized that a balanced laissez-faire approach enhances job satisfaction while maintaining performance, and Fréour (2021), who reported that delegative leadership supported by effective communication and feedback improves teacher engagement and professional confidence.

Servant leadership emerged as another strongly practiced style among school heads, with an aggregate mean of 4.57 and a standard deviation of 0.55, interpreted as Strongly Agree. The indicator "makes others' career development a priority" obtained the highest mean of 4.83 with a standard deviation of 0.41, followed closely by "emphasizes the importance of giving

back to the community," "cares more about others' success than his/her own," and "gives others the responsibility to make important decisions about their own jobs," each obtaining a mean of 4.67 and a standard deviation of 0.52. The item "holds high ethical standards" obtained a mean of 4.50 and a standard deviation of 0.84, while "can tell if something work-related is going wrong" and "takes time to talk to others on a personal level" each obtained a mean of 4.33 with a standard deviation of 0.52, all interpreted as Strongly Agree. These consistently high ratings indicate that school heads fostered a supportive, ethical, and people-centered school environment in which teachers felt valued, trusted, and encouraged to grow professionally. This is corroborated by Kainde and Mandagi (2023), who found that servant leadership promotes teacher commitment and professional development, Ahmad et al. (2022), who reported that servant leadership strengthens trust, collaboration, and job satisfaction, and Quinteros-Durand et al. (2023), who emphasized that ethical behavior, personal support, and community engagement contribute to a positive school climate and empower educators to perform effectively.

Similarly, transformational leadership was found to be strongly practiced, obtaining an aggregate mean of 4.55 and a standard deviation of 0.53, interpreted as Strongly Agree. The items "makes others feel good to be around him/her," "expresses in a few simple words what we could and should do," and "provides appealing images about what we can do" each obtained a mean of 4.67 with a standard deviation of 0.52, while "has complete faith with his/her subordinates," "is proud to be associated with his/her subordinates," and "gives personal attention to others who seem rejected" each obtained a mean of 4.50 with a standard deviation of 0.55. The item "enables others to think about old problems in new ways" obtained a comparatively lower, though still strongly favorable, mean of 4.33 with a standard deviation of 0.52. These results suggest that school heads effectively inspired teachers through a clear vision, positive encouragement, and motivating goals, fostering a collaborative and empowering school environment. This finding is consistent with Basar et al. (2021), who found that transformational leadership positively influences teacher motivation, engagement, and job satisfaction, Caharian and Cabanlit (2024), who reported that transformational leaders foster innovation, creativity, and strong professional relationships, and Sumampong and Arnado (2024), who emphasized that inspiring and intellectually stimulating leadership contributes to a collaborative, motivated, and high-performing school environment.

Transactional leadership likewise obtained a strongly favorable rating, with an aggregate mean of 4.31 and a standard deviation of 0.72, interpreted as Strongly Agree. The item "is very professional in dealing verbally with employees" obtained the highest mean of 4.67 with a standard deviation of 0.52, while "is always satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards" obtained a mean of 4.50 with a standard deviation of 0.55. The items "provides recognition/rewards when others reach their goals," "closely monitors the schedule to ensure a task or project will be completed in time," and "tells us the standards we have to know to carry out our work" each obtained a mean of 4.33 with a standard deviation of 0.82, interpreted as Strongly Agree, whereas "tells others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work" and "calls attention to what others can get for what they accomplish" each obtained a mean of 4.00, with standard deviations of 0.89 and 0.63 respectively, interpreted as Agree. These findings suggest that transactional leadership contributed to a structured and efficient school environment characterized by professionalism, clear communication, performance monitoring, and adherence to standards, wherein teachers understood expectations and were motivated through recognition of accomplishments. This supports the findings of Canatan et al. (2023), who reported that transactional leadership improves organizational efficiency through clear standards and contingent rewards, Nawaz et al. (2024), who found that monitoring and

feedback reinforce accountability and goal attainment, and Sarong (2024), who emphasized that transactional leadership combined with professionalism and recognition enhances teacher satisfaction and commitment to school objectives. Collectively, across all six dimensions, school heads strongly perceived themselves as practicing participative, servant, and transformational leadership, strongly agreed that they practiced transactional leadership, and practiced authoritative and delegative styles to a more moderate extent.

Turning to the level of teacher job satisfaction, results across all four measured dimensions consistently fell within the "Satisfied" range. With respect to security, the aggregate mean was 3.73 with a standard deviation of 0.77, interpreted as Satisfied. The item "the stability and security my job provides for my future" obtained the highest mean of 4.04 with a standard deviation of 0.70, while "how my pay compares with similar teaching positions in other schools/institutions" and "how my pay compares with my colleagues in this school" each obtained a mean of 3.81 with a standard deviation of 0.76. The items "the financial compensation (salary) I receive for my work" and "receiving fair and full credit for the work I perform" obtained means of 3.76 and 3.68 respectively, with standard deviations of 0.85 and 0.78, while "opportunities for professional advancement and promotion" obtained a mean of 3.68 with a standard deviation of 0.77. The item "the recognition and rewards I receive for my work and efforts" obtained a mean of 3.56 with a standard deviation of 0.75, and the lowest-rated item, concerning "the quality of benefits (e.g., health insurance, retirement plans) I receive compared to those offered by other organizations," obtained a mean of 3.47 with a standard deviation of 0.82, still interpreted as Satisfied. These results indicate that teachers derived a sense of stability and continuity from their employment, though comparatively lower satisfaction with benefits suggests an area warranting further institutional attention. This is supported by Anog et al. (2024), who found that financial stability and fair compensation are positively associated with teacher job satisfaction, Viernes et al. (2024), who reported that recognition and career advancement opportunities enhance teacher motivation and engagement, and Assaf and Antoun (2024), who emphasized that stable employment and equitable benefits increase teacher commitment and reduce turnover intentions.

With regard to work engagement, teachers reported an aggregate mean of 3.84 with a standard deviation of 0.72, interpreted as Satisfied, the second highest among the four dimensions. The item "my feeling of being completely immersed and focused when I am teaching" obtained the highest mean of 4.03 with a standard deviation of 0.67, closely followed by "the energy and enthusiasm I feel towards my teaching responsibilities" with a mean of 4.01 and a standard deviation of 0.70. The item "how easily I can build positive relationships with my co-workers" obtained a mean of 3.99 with a standard deviation of 0.66, and "the level of cooperation and teamwork among my colleagues" obtained a mean of 3.93 with a standard deviation of 0.59. The items "the sense of achievement and accomplishment I derive from my job" and "the overall positive atmosphere and morale within the school environment" each obtained a mean of 3.86, with standard deviations of 0.63 and 0.74 respectively, while "the quality of communication and understanding between myself and my immediate supervisor" obtained a mean of 3.85 with a standard deviation of 0.69. The item "the fairness and clarity of school policies and practices regarding employees" obtained a mean of 3.82 with a standard deviation of 0.76, and "the effectiveness of my immediate supervisor in supporting and guiding subordinates" obtained a mean of 3.74 with a standard deviation of 0.71. The item "how my immediate supervisor addresses employee complaints or grievances" obtained a mean of 3.72 with a standard deviation of 0.75, "the level of support and assistance provided by my immediate supervisor when faced with challenging problems" obtained a mean of 3.69 with a standard deviation of 0.70, and the lowest-rated item, "my working conditions, including lighting, ventilation, and safety," obtained a mean of 3.58 with a standard deviation of 1.04. These results indicate that teachers demonstrated strong intrinsic motivation and involvement

in their teaching responsibilities, supported by positive colleague relationships, although working conditions and certain aspects of supervisory support received comparatively lower ratings. This finding supports Bautista and Delariarte (2025), who found that supportive supervision and a positive school climate significantly improve teacher engagement and commitment, Uslukaya and Zincirli (2025), who reported that collaboration and teamwork increase teachers' energy, enthusiasm, and focus, and Holmström et al. (2023), who highlighted the critical role of work engagement in linking administrative support to teacher effectiveness and overall school success.

For job responsibilities, teachers reported the highest aggregate mean among all four dimensions at 3.93 with a standard deviation of 0.60, interpreted as Satisfied. The item "the ability to engage in activities that align with my moral values" obtained the highest mean of 4.08 with a standard deviation of 0.55, while "opportunities to perform work that is a great match for my skills, abilities, and competencies" obtained a mean of 4.03 with a standard deviation of 0.60. The items "opportunities to effectively utilize and apply my professional skills" obtained a mean of 3.99 with a standard deviation of 0.59, and "the opportunity to guide and mentor fellow colleagues on accomplishing tasks" obtained a mean of 3.97 with a standard deviation of 0.53. The items "the opportunity to innovate and devise improved methods for completing tasks," "the freedom to exercise my own judgment and decision-making in my work," and "the clarity of my job description and expectations" each obtained a mean of 3.93, with standard deviations of 0.56, 0.64, and 0.61 respectively. The item "the chance to explore new and innovative approaches within my role" obtained a mean of 3.86 with a standard deviation of 0.54, and the lowest-rated item, "the amount of administrative tasks and paperwork required in my job," obtained a mean of 3.67 with a standard deviation of 0.73. These results suggest that teachers found their responsibilities meaningful and professionally fulfilling, particularly in terms of alignment with personal values and skill utilization, although the burden of administrative paperwork remained a relatively lower-rated concern. This is consistent with Zahed-Babelan (2019), who reported that alignment between teachers' skills and job tasks promotes engagement and professional fulfillment, Xue et al. (2024), who found that opportunities for innovation and mentoring strengthen teacher motivation and commitment, and Ha et al. (2025), who emphasized that clear job expectations and autonomy in decision-making contribute to higher job satisfaction and improved performance in educational settings.

With respect to community linkages, the aggregate mean was 3.81 with a standard deviation of 0.64, interpreted as Satisfied, the lowest among the four dimensions alongside security. The item "the opportunity to engage in community outreach programs (e.g., cleaning initiatives, coastal clean-ups, tree planting)" obtained the highest mean of 3.94 with a standard deviation of 0.71, while "the social standing within the community associated with my job as a teacher" obtained a mean of 3.92 with a standard deviation of 0.58. The items "the school's connections and partnerships with the local community" and "the overall friendliness and positive atmosphere of the school community towards external stakeholders (e.g., parents, community members)" each obtained a mean of 3.88, with standard deviations of 0.65 and 0.63 respectively. The item "the chance to establish a significant presence for the school within the community" obtained a mean of 3.78 with a standard deviation of 0.56, while "the opportunity to hold a meaningful position within the community" and "the ability to provide valuable assistance to others in the community" each obtained a mean of 3.75, with standard deviations of 0.69 and 0.67 respectively. The item "the opportunity to promote stakeholder participation in all school-related activities" obtained a mean of 3.74 with a standard deviation of 0.67, "how effectively my immediate supervisor handles concerns raised by parents and the community" obtained a mean of 3.72 with a standard deviation of 0.61, and the lowest-rated item,

"opportunities to address and assist with community members' concerns," obtained a mean of 3.74 with a standard deviation of 0.65. These results indicate that teachers valued their engagement with the community and the social recognition associated with their profession, although areas concerning stakeholder participation and supervisory handling of community concerns registered comparatively lower, though still satisfactory, ratings. This finding is supported by Ertaş and Pekmezci (2023), who found that community participation enhances teachers' social responsibility and professional fulfillment, Oblina et al. (2021), who reported that strong school-community partnerships improve teacher engagement and stakeholder trust, and Admiraal and Røberg (2023), who emphasized that recognition of teachers' social contributions positively influences job satisfaction and motivation. Overall, among the four dimensions, job responsibilities obtained the highest satisfaction rating, followed by work engagement, while community linkages and security garnered comparatively lower, though still satisfactory, ratings.

To determine whether school heads' leadership styles were significantly related to teacher job satisfaction, Pearson r correlation analysis was conducted at the 0.05 level of significance, and the results are presented in relation to each leadership dimension. For authoritative leadership, the analysis yielded an r -value of 0.042 and a p -value of 0.724, resulting in a decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis, interpreted as not significant. For participative leadership, an r -value of 0.230 and a p -value of 0.050 were obtained, resulting in a decision to reject the null hypothesis, interpreted as significant, representing a borderline but statistically meaningful association. For delegative leadership, the r -value was 0.161 with a p -value of 0.173, leading to a decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis, interpreted as not significant. For servant leadership, an r -value of 0.233 and a p -value of 0.047 were obtained, resulting in a decision to reject the null hypothesis, interpreted as significant. For transformational leadership, the strongest relationship among all dimensions was found, with an r -value of 0.292 and a p -value of 0.013, resulting in a decision to reject the null hypothesis, interpreted as significant. For transactional leadership, the r -value was 0.216 with a p -value of 0.066, resulting in a decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis, interpreted as not significant. When leadership styles were considered collectively, the overall r -value was 0.126 with a p -value of 0.288, leading to a decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis, interpreted as not significant. These results reveal that transformational leadership, with an r -value of 0.292 and a p -value of 0.013, exhibited the strongest significant positive relationship with teacher job satisfaction, followed by servant leadership at an r -value of 0.233 and a p -value of 0.047, while participative leadership, at an r -value of 0.230 and a p -value of 0.050, demonstrated a modest, borderline-significant association. In contrast, authoritative, delegative, and transactional leadership styles were not significantly related to teacher job satisfaction, and the overall correlation between leadership styles and job satisfaction, at r equals 0.126 and p equals 0.288, was weak and non-significant. These findings imply that teachers responded more positively to leadership approaches emphasizing inspiration, support, personal growth, collaboration, and professional development rather than authority, monitoring, or reward-based management. This is corroborated by Andriadi and Sulistiyo (2024), who found that transformational leadership significantly improves teacher motivation and commitment, Baharuddin et al. (2023), who reported that supportive leadership practices positively influence teacher satisfaction and engagement, and Magnate (2023), who emphasized that participative decision-making enhances teacher involvement and morale, although its impact is generally less pronounced than transformational and supportive leadership styles. The findings therefore suggest that school heads should strengthen transformational, servant, and participative leadership practices to enhance teacher engagement, morale, satisfaction, and retention, which would in turn contribute to improved overall school performance.

Beyond the quantitative results, the qualitative phase of the study, guided by Braun and Clarke's (2006) reflexive thematic analysis approach, revealed four major themes describing the administrative challenges school heads encounter when implementing their leadership styles. The first theme, financial and resource constraints, emerged prominently across the interviews, with Participant 1 noting that "the MOOE fund is often not sufficient to cover all the school's needs, which can limit opportunities for learners," Participant 3 describing that "balancing the budget while ensuring quality education is a constant challenge," and Participant 5 stating that limited resources affect "the procurement of instructional materials, maintenance of facilities, and implementation of school programs." These accounts indicate that financial limitations are not merely operational concerns but deeply affect educational quality and equity, functioning as systemic barriers that compel school heads toward difficult prioritization, creative resource management, and stakeholder partnerships. This finding is consistent with Mncube et al. (2023), who emphasized that effective school leadership under resource constraints requires strategic resource management and advocacy for equitable funding, and Amaluddin et al. (2023), who noted that financial limitations directly impact a leader's ability to implement instructional and transformational initiatives, often forcing trade-offs that can affect teacher morale and student outcomes.

The second theme, adaptive and situational leadership, captured how school heads consistently adjusted their leadership approaches according to context. Participant 1 explained that "during urgent operational issues or emergencies, I may take a more directive approach... In contrast, for curriculum development... I emphasize collaboration," while Participant 3 observed that "in high-stakes moments, collaboration takes a back seat to decisive action," and Participant 5 affirmed that "school leadership is dynamic, and no single leadership style is effective in all circumstances." These statements indicate that leadership flexibility functions as a necessity rather than a mere preference, with school heads consciously shifting between transformational, participative, and directive styles depending on urgency, stakeholder involvement, and the nature of the challenge at hand. This aligns with the concept of "contextual intelligence" advanced by Hallinger (2018), who argued that successful school leadership is contingent on the ability to adapt styles to context, allowing leaders to navigate administrative challenges without sacrificing relational trust or operational efficiency.

The third theme, communication and stakeholder management, highlighted recurring administrative hurdles related to information flow within the school. Participant 1 shared that "if information is not clearly communicated, teachers and staff may be unclear about policies, schedules, or expectations," Participant 3 similarly noted that "miscommunication... can lead to confusion about policies, schedules, or expectations," and Participant 5 added that "communication problems can lead to misunderstandings, delayed implementation of programs, or inconsistent enforcement of policies." These findings underscore that effective communication is foundational to administrative success, influencing policy implementation, staff morale, and stakeholder trust, and that poor communication tends to exacerbate other challenges such as resource constraints and policy changes by creating ambiguity and resistance. This is supported by Spillane et al. (2019), who highlighted that distributed leadership relies heavily on clear communication channels, noting that when communication falters, even well-intentioned leadership styles can lead to administrative friction and reduced collective efficacy.

The fourth theme, policy compliance and external pressures, reflected the influence of external mandates and societal expectations on school heads' administrative work. Participant 1 mentioned that "policy reforms often require quick adaptation and alignment with DepEd guidelines, which can be challenging given limited time and resources," Participant 3 noted

that "frequent changes in education policy demand constant adaptation," and Participant 5 identified "socioeconomic and environmental factors" as adding unpredictability to planning. These accounts suggest that school heads operate within a high-stakes accountability environment where external mandates often conflict with local needs and capacities, with compliance pressures diverting attention from instructional leadership toward bureaucratic tasks and creating tension between policy adherence and contextual relevance. This is consistent with Cuban (2020), who described school leaders as "policy brokers" who must mediate between top-down mandates and grassroots realities, a brokering role requiring both diplomatic skill and strategic resistance to preserve school autonomy. Taken together, these four themes reveal that school heads navigate a complex interplay of internal constraints, such as financial and human resource limitations, and external pressures, such as policy reforms and societal expectations, through adaptive leadership and strategic communication, indicating that leadership in this context is not static but responsive, continuously shaped by the challenges encountered and the resources available.

In synthesis, the findings of this study establish that school heads strongly perceived themselves as practicing participative, servant, and transformational leadership styles, alongside a strongly agreed practice of transactional leadership, while authoritative and delegative styles were practiced to a more moderate extent. Teachers, for their part, reported an overall satisfied level of job satisfaction across all four measured dimensions, with job responsibilities yielding the highest satisfaction, followed by work engagement, while community linkages and security, though still within the satisfactory range, registered comparatively lower ratings. The correlational analysis further revealed those leadership styles emphasizing inspiration, support, and collaborative engagement, namely transformational leadership at r equals 0.292 and p equals 0.013, servant leadership at r equals 0.233 and p equals 0.047, and, to a borderline extent, participative leadership at r equals 0.230 and p equals 0.050, bore a statistically significant positive relationship with teacher job satisfaction, whereas authoritative, delegative, and transactional leadership styles, along with the overall composite relationship at r equals 0.126 and p equals 0.288, did not demonstrate statistically significant associations. Complementing these quantitative findings, the thematic analysis of school head interviews revealed that administrative practice is continuously shaped by financial and resource constraints, the demands of adaptive and situational leadership, communication and stakeholder management issues, and policy compliance amid external pressures, underscoring that effective school leadership requires constant negotiation between collaboration and decisiveness, compliance and creativity, and idealism and pragmatism. Collectively, these findings directly address the study's objectives by establishing which leadership styles are most strongly associated with positive teacher outcomes and by illuminating the administrative realities that condition the implementation of those styles, thereby contributing to the broader body of educational leadership literature by affirming the value of transformational, servant, and participative approaches while highlighting the structural and contextual constraints school heads must navigate in practice. These findings provide the empirical and thematic foundation upon which the succeeding chapter's summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations for policy, practice, and future research will be built.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that in District 5, Lapu-Lapu City Division, school heads predominantly employ participative, servant, and transformational leadership styles, which are significantly and positively related to higher levels of teacher job satisfaction. Teachers are generally satisfied with their jobs, particularly their responsibilities and work engagement, though security and community linkages remain areas for potential improvement. Leadership

effectiveness in fostering satisfaction depends on the style used, with inspirational and supportive approaches having the strongest positive impact. Furthermore, school heads navigate a complex administrative landscape marked by significant resource limitations, the need for adaptive leadership, communication hurdles, and external policy pressures, all of which influence the implementation and effectiveness of their leadership practices.

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, it is recommended that the proposed Enhancement Plan for School Leadership and Teacher Job Satisfaction in District 5, Lapu-Lapu City Division be adopted and implemented. This plan, detailed in Chapter 4, is designed to systematically address the identified areas of concern, leverage effective leadership styles, and mitigate administrative challenges to foster a more supportive, satisfying, and effective educational environment.

REFERENCES

- Admiraal, W., & Røberg, K.-I. K. (2023). Teachers' job demands, resources and their job satisfaction: Satisfaction with school, career choice and teaching profession of teachers in different career stages. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 125, 104063. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104063>
- Ahmad, S., Batool, A., & Abdullah, N. A. (2022). Perceived servant leadership style of principals correlates with job satisfaction of secondary school teachers in Pakistan. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.17583/ijelm.9169>
- Amaluddin, M. R., Ismail, N., & Munastiwi, E. (2023). Strategic financial management for enhanced educational infrastructure: A case study of State Elementary School 04 Samsam, Kandis Riau Indonesia. *MANAGERIA Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 8(2), 181. <https://doi.org/10.14421/manageria.2023.82-05>
- Andriadi, D., & Sulistiyo, U. (2024). The influence of transformational and instructional leadership styles of school's principals on teacher's performance, motivation, job satisfaction and student achievement in primary and secondary schools. *PPSDP International Journal of Education*, 3(2), 536. <https://doi.org/10.59175/pijed.v3i2.335>
- Anog, M. D. I., Vera, J. V. D., & Peteros, E. D. L. (2024). Examining teacher retention through the lens of job satisfaction and commitment in a Philippine private school. *International Journal of Learning Teaching and Educational Research*, 23(9), 242. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.9.13>
- Assaf, J., & Antoun, S. (2024). Impact of job satisfaction on teacher well-being and education quality. *Pedagogical Research*, 9(3). <https://doi.org/10.29333/pr/14437>
- Baharuddin, F. R., Amiruddin, A., & Idkhan, A. M. (2023). Integrated leadership effect on teacher satisfaction: Mediating effects of teacher collaboration and professional development. *International Journal of Learning Teaching and Educational Research*, 22(11), 321. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.11.17>
- Bălan, A., & Jamaluddin, R. (2024). Leadership practices and teacher satisfaction: The critical role of trust and professional development in mid-career stages. *International Journal of*

Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 14(9).
<https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v14-i9/22635>

Basar, Z. M., Mansor, A. N., & Hamid, A. H. A. (2021). The role of transformational leadership in addressing job satisfaction issues among secondary school teachers. *Creative Education*, 12(8), 1939. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2021.128148>

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2020). *Transformational leadership* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Bautista, A., & Delariarte, C. F. (2025). Exploring the moderating effects of age and career stage on the relationship between grit and work engagement among public school teachers. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 34(3), 249. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.340304>

Cadimas, M.-A., Cañedo, D. L. C., & Mercado, M. V. (2024). School heads' leadership styles in relation to teachers' performance. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability and Excellence (IMJRISE)*, 2(1), 874–883. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11665973>

Caharian, I. S., & Cabanlit, E. M. (2024). A systematic review on the influence of transformational leadership and teacher commitment to educational institutions. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 65. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.809006>

Canatan, V., Hatipoğlu, N., Kibar, H., Kizilkaya, H., & Aksay, M. E. (2023). School leadership and communication: A systematic review. *International Journal of Educational Spectrum*, 5(1), 19. <https://doi.org/10.47806/ijesacademic.1234260>

Canavesi, A. (2021). Servant leadership: A systematic literature review and synthesis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 1504108.

Cuban, L. (2020). *The enduring paradox of school leadership: Policy, practice, and the elusive search for balance*. Teachers College Press.

Department of Education. (2020). *Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH)*. DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024-.pdf

Department of Education. (2025). *Qualification standards for school administration and supervision*. DepEd Order No. 19, s. 2025.

Ertaş, B. D., & Pekmezci, F. B. (2024). Career motivation and job satisfaction in Türkiye: Mediating role of teacher innovativeness and instructional practice. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-024-00846-1>

Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *Leadership Quarterly*, 30(1), 111–132.

Fréour, L. (2021). *The study of work design in the industry 4.0: An agentic approach of individuals and the digital context interaction*. HAL. <https://theses.hal.science/tel-04350760>

Garcia, J. P., & Flores, M. L. (2025). Leadership readiness and teacher satisfaction: A Philippine perspective. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy*, 12(2), 56–67.

Gaspar, M. D. (2021). Influencing organizational culture: A distributed leadership approach to professional learning. *Journal of Leadership Accountability and Ethics*, 18(5). <https://doi.org/10.33423/jlae.v18i5.4742>

Gingo, H. G., & Dioso, E. D. (2025). Leadership styles of school heads and job satisfaction of teachers: A regression analysis. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)*, 7(4), 1–6.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Robert K. Greenleaf Publishing Center.

Gürbüz, A., & Saklan, E. (2025). Exploring of the relationship between school administrators' inclusive leadership behaviours and teachers' autonomy. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 58(2), 689. <https://doi.org/10.30964/auedfd.1634784>

Ha, C., Pressley, T., & Marshall, D. T. (2025). Teacher voices matter: The role of teacher autonomy in enhancing job satisfaction and mitigating burnout. *PLoS ONE*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0317471>

Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143216670652>

Han, H. (2025). Transformational leadership and project success. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, 1504108.

Holmström, A., Tuominen, H., Laasanen, M., & Veermans, M. (2023). Teachers' work engagement and burnout profiles: Associations with sense of efficacy and interprofessional collaboration in school. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 132, 104251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104251>

Ilter, Y., Barth-Farkas, F., & Ringeisen, T. (2023). Digital leadership communication and employees' organizational commitment during home office. *Gruppe Interaktion Organisation Zeitschrift Für Angewandte Organisationspsychologie (GIO)*, 54(2), 259. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11612-023-00676-7>

Kainde, S. J. R., & Mandagi, D. W. (2023). A systematic review of servant leadership outcomes in education context. *Edukasia*, 4(2), 2563. <https://doi.org/10.62775/edukasia.v4i2.627>

Lacson, R. (2022). The decentralization of education governance under RA 9155 and its impact on school leadership. *Philippine Journal of Educational Management*, 15(1), 34–48.

Lemoine, G. J., Hartnell, C. A., & Leroy, H. (2019). Taking stock of the moral perspective on leadership: An integrative review of ethical, authentic, and servant leadership. *Academy of Management Annals*, 13(1), 148–187.

- Magnate, F. (2023). Exploring the mediating role on distributive and instructional leadership of teacher organizational satisfaction to commitment: A structural equation model. *Journal for Educators Teachers and Trainers*, 14(5). <https://doi.org/10.47806/jett.2023.14.05.036>
- Mariano, F., & Oco, L. (2024). School heads' leadership approaches and teacher job satisfaction in Misamis Oriental. *IJRISS*.
- Mbua, E. M. (2023). Principal's participatory leadership approaches: An effective tool for teacher effectiveness in Fako Division, Cameroon. *Journal of Education and Teaching Methods*, 2(1), 63. <https://doi.org/10.58425/jetm.v2i1.133>
- Mendoza, A., dela Cruz, S., & Bautista, R. (2024). Enhancing school leadership through professional qualifications: Implications for teacher satisfaction. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education Reform*, 9(3), 22–37.
- Mincu, M. (2022). Why is school leadership key to transforming education? Structural and cultural assumptions for quality education in diverse contexts. *Prospects*, 52, 231. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-022-09625-6>
- Mirkhan, S. D., Omer, S. K., Ali, H. M., Hamza, M. Y., Rashid, T. A., & Nedunchezian, P. (2024). Effective delegation and leadership in software management. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2405.01612>
- Mncube, D. W., Ajani, O. A., Ngema, T., & Mkhasibe, R. G. (2023). Exploring the problems of limited school resources in rural schools and curriculum management. *UMT Education Review*, 6(2), 1. <https://doi.org/10.32350/uer.62.01>
- Mulyani, E., & Wiart, L. (2021). The impact of transformational leadership on teacher motivation and job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Administration and Leadership*, 35(2), 123–137.
- Nawaz, A., Ahsan, A., Haiwei, D., & Guang, R. T. (2024). Leadership on performance vs. mediating effect on job satisfaction: Evidence from higher educational institutions in Pakistan. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 24(3). <https://doi.org/10.33423/jhetp.v24i3.6830>
- Nguyen, T. H. (2025). Job satisfaction, work performance, and loyalty of employees. *Asian Journal of Business Research*.
- Notarnicola, I., et al. (2024). Transformational leadership and its impact on job satisfaction. *International Journal of Management Sciences*, 32(4), 456–470.
- Oblina, A. C., Linh, T. P., & Phuong, H. T. M. (2021). Job satisfaction of basic education teachers in Southeast Asia: Key issues and policy recommendations. *VNU Journal of Science Education Research*. <https://doi.org/10.25073/2588-1159/vnuer.4438>
- Quinteros-Durand, R., Almanza-Cabe, R. B., Morales-García, W. C., Mamani-Benito, Ó., Sairitupa-Sanchez, L. Z., Puño-Quispe, L., Saintila, J., Saavedra-Sandoval, R., Paredes, A. F., & Ramírez-Coronel, A. A. (2023). Influence of servant leadership on the life satisfaction of basic education teachers: The mediating role of satisfaction with job resources. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1167074>

- Rahman, A. (2023). Effects of authoritarian leadership on teacher morale and job satisfaction: An international review. *International Journal of School Leadership Research*, 28(1), 45–61.
- Rexha, U. (2024). Influence of school principals' leadership styles on public sector employee satisfaction. *Kosovo Journal of Public Administration*, 10(1), 67–80.
- Santos, E. G., Navarro, D., & Cabrera, F. (2023). Professional standards for school heads: Impacts on leadership and teacher motivation. *Philippine Education Review*, 20(1), 78–91.
- Sarong, J. S. (2024). Fostering collaboration and team effectiveness in educational leadership: Strategies for building high-performing teams and networks. *Randwick International of Education and Linguistics Science Journal*, 5(2), 727. <https://doi.org/10.47175/rielsj.v5i2.1005>
- Siddiquei, A. N. (2025). Fostering team resilience with servant leadership. *Journal of Management Behavior*, 40(2), 220–235.
- Soriano, V., & Manuel, R. (2024). Implementing the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads: Observations and recommendations. *Educational Leadership Journal*, 33(2), 44–59.
- Spillane, J. P., Healey, K., & Kim, C. M. (2019). Leading and managing instruction: Formal and informal aspects of the elementary school organization. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 55(4), 609–643. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X19862062>
- Sumampong, R. V., & Arnado, A. A. (2024). The influence of transformational leadership on teacher motivation and engagement: Proposed TELM framework.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (2022). Teacher job satisfaction: Promoting engagement and motivation. *Educational Leadership Quarterly*, 38(4), 271–289.
- Uslukaya, A., & Zincirli, M. (2025). Reciprocal relationships between job resources and work engagement in teachers: A longitudinal examination of cross-lagged and simultaneous effects. *Social Psychology of Education*, 28(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-025-10085-x>
- Valdez, C., & Reyes, A. (2023). Participative governance in Philippine schools: School leaders' role in teacher engagement. *Journal of Southeast Asian Educational Leadership*, 7(1), 15–29.
- Viernes, D. R., Pontillas, P. V., Ongcachuy, B. L., Corpuz, G. G., & Samson, V. B. (2024). Job commitment, satisfaction, and teachers' performance: Basis for retention program. *European Modern Studies Journal*, 8(3), 216. [https://doi.org/10.59573/emsj.8\(3\).2024.17](https://doi.org/10.59573/emsj.8(3).2024.17)

Xue, Z., Huang, H., & Yu, Q. (2024). The associations among gratitude, job crafting, teacher-student relationships, and teacher psychological well-being. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1329782>

Zahed-Babelan, A., Koulaei, G., Moeinikia, M., & Sharif, A. R. (2019). Instructional leadership effects on teachers' work engagement: Roles of school culture, empowerment, and job characteristics. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 9(3), 137. <https://doi.org/10.26803/cepsj.181>

Želvys, R., Dukynaitė, R., Vaitekaitis, J., & Jakaitienė, A. (2019). School leadership and educational effectiveness. *Management*, 24, 17. <https://doi.org/10.30924/mjcmi.24.si.2>