

The Significance of Leadership Styles and Performance of Public and Private School Heads in Urdaneta City

MARI JANE CAIREL ANDAYA

Institute of Graduate and Professional Studies, Lyceum Northwestern University

Abstract— *The objective of this study was to ascertain the performance standards and leadership philosophies of the principals of public and private secondary schools in Urdaneta City Division in the academic year 2023–2024. The descriptive research method was used by the researcher. The leadership styles of the school heads genuinely change significantly depending on how long they have been in that position, and a strong correlation was found between the leaders' leadership philosophies and how well they felt they were managing the curriculum. Looking at the findings, it was determined that the school heads' leadership styles varied significantly depending on how long they had been in that position; that there was a significant correlation between the school heads' leadership styles and their perceived performance along the curriculum management; that the school heads' performance in terms of the various identified management indicators was generally very satisfactory, with a few being exceptional; and that, of all the issues the school heads encountered, establishing connections received the highest rating, despite the fact that all of them were viewed as serious.*

Indexed Terms— *Leadership Styles, Performance, Principals, Serious, Significant*

I. INTRODUCTION

A school head needs to have a strong leadership style in order to inspire their staff to work together toward a common goal and to prioritize their own well-being. A school head must have a solid understanding of leadership styles in order to properly lead and manage their institutions and collaborate with teachers to continue improving while accepting change. According to Mutua, et al (2023), leadership philosophies are crucial in educational settings because they enable people to develop and apply their

own special talents to become capable leaders and to adopt different philosophies as their careers progress. A leader's style is influenced by a multitude of elements, such as their personality, values, abilities, and experiences, and it can greatly affect how well they lead. Nurturing learning environments that support children's growth and development is fostered by effective school leadership (Jilani, et al., 2024). School administrators must negotiate and foster cooperation among the frequently intricate web of stakeholders, which includes local communities, parents, teachers, students, and education authorities, to foster such an atmosphere. School heads are, as it were, the glue that keeps everyone together. On the other hand, duties ought to align with power and resources. Therefore, it is imperative that any meaningful attempt to enhance education—particularly in the public sector—reexamine the lessons discovered from school reform projects and take significant action to give school administrators more authority, which will enhance instruction at the school level. The effectiveness of principals and the effectiveness of schools are positively correlated. Farooq, et al (2022) underlined the necessity of identifying and training education managers capable of leading schools into the twenty-first century. In this regard, he lists the qualities that school administrators ought to have.

The most popular leadership theory of the past 20 years is transformational leadership, which is one of the strategies that has drawn the interest of numerous scholars. According to Bond (2015), transformational leadership occurs when one or more persons engage with others in a way that elevates one another's moral and motivational standards. As a result, Burns defined transformational leadership as a procedure as opposed to a particular action. According to what he said, transformational leaders inspire people to effect significant and long-lasting change by appealing to higher ideas and moral principles. Burns created the

transactional leadership style in 1978. When an individual establishes connections with others with the goal of exchanging valuable things—which could be of an economic, political, or psychological nature—transactional leadership takes place. Burns added that although there are goals shared by both sides, the partnership is limited to the sharing of worthwhile advantages. It's unlikely that the relationship will cause followers to act outside of their roles.

It is emphasized by Asiimwe, et al (2023) once more that transactional executives do not prioritize the personal growth of their staff members. Rather, leaders who are transaction-oriented prioritize achieving their objectives. Transactional leaders put a lot of effort into outlining responsibilities, rewarding good performance, and penalizing poor performance. The capacity to foresee, remain adaptable, and enable others to effect strategic change when called for characterizes a leader practicing strategic leadership. It has multiple uses and has to do with handling the difficulties presented by the current international business climate. In addition to handling complicated information processing, managing internal and external business settings is another skill that strategic leadership demands. The field of strategic leadership has changed significantly in the last 20 years as stated by Parveen, et al (2022). Effective leaders are able to recognize and get past real roadblocks. Three distinct elements—complexity, temporal horizons, and focus—define a leadership environment. It is necessary for leaders to be general, strategic, and direct (Parveen, et al., 2022). Outstanding leaders are assessed based on their legacy as much as their accomplishments during their term in office. An organization that is alive and well, intensely competitive, and driven to achieve success is undoubtedly one of a leader's greatest legacies.

Along with supporting and enhancing the organization's objectives, duties, and strategy and making the best possible use of its resources, constructive leaders uphold the organization's legitimate interests (Balochi, et al., 2023). They also help their subordinates feel better about themselves and their jobs by encouraging prolonged participation and incorporating them in decision-making. Constructive leadership contributes to lowering the incidence of bullying and should thus also preserve the

health and well-being of their subordinates, whereas destructive leadership should raise the risk of bullying and health issues. According to Kaleem (2021), three aspects of instructional leadership can be distinguished: establishing the mission of the school, overseeing the curriculum, and cultivating a supportive learning environment. By focusing staff members' attention on teaching and learning, instructional leadership practices encourage teachers to believe that every student can succeed, build their capacity and commitment to change, offer useful support in advancing faculty knowledge and instructional skills, and create an environment in the classroom that maximizes teachers' potential to meet the needs of every student. Additionally, it was discovered by Almonawer, et al (2023) that there are behaviors inside a school that may be altered to perhaps improve student learning and the school as a whole: instructional leadership, principal self-efficacy, and collective teacher efficacy. These associations were statistically significant

II. METHODOLOGY

When employing descriptive methods of research, the researcher's main tool for gathering the required data was a questionnaire. According to Belandres (2018), the objective of a descriptive approach is to precisely characterize a scenario in which variables are connected such that inferences about a particular group or population can be made. The leadership styles exhibited by 120 heads of both public and private secondary schools in Urdaneta City, Division, were transactional, constructivist, instructional, transformational, and strategic. They also gave examples of how well they performed in managing the curriculum, creating goals, evaluating teachers, and interacting with the community. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed using an open-source tool to determine the significant difference between the perceptions of the heads of public and private schools and the teachers across their profile factors. Using an open-source tool, the Pearson Product Correlation Coefficient was utilized to ascertain whether there was a significant correlation between the performance level of the school heads and their leadership styles. The following chart illustrates the application of an average weighted mean, a four-point Likert scale, and its descriptive equivalent to the

issues faced by the heads of public and private schools in carrying out their leadership roles.

philosophies and approaches to managing the curriculum.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Significant Relationship Between Leadership Styles Of School Heads And Their Perceived Level Of Performance

Variables Correlated	R	sig	Interpretation	Decision
Leadership Style*Goal Setting	.324	.272	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Leadership Style*Resources Allocation	.331	.373	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Leadership Style*Curriculum Management	.887	.000*	Significant	Accept Ho
Leadership Style*Evaluation of Teachers	.441	.482	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Leadership Style*Building Connection	.282	.338	Not Significant	Accept Ho

The significant value of.000, which is less than the predetermined level of significance of.05., indicates that there is a significant association between school heads' leadership styles and their perceived performance in curriculum management. Therefore, the null hypothesis—which contends that there isn't a meaningful connection between school heads' leadership philosophies and how well they think they're managing the curriculum—is disproved. It suggests that school heads have different leadership

Table 2. Problems Encountered by School Heads along Goal Setting

Goal Setting	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. Goals are not aligned with the organization's mission, vision, values, and strategic priorities.	4.01	Serious	3
2. Limited autonomy to adopt policies to the unique needs of the school community, particularly the policies are mandated at higher level of governance.	3.96	Serious	5
3. Leadership Tomorrow affecting continuity and consistency in planning and implementation effects.	3.88	Serious	7
4. Inadequate funding on budget allocations for conducting research, purchasing materials and having	4.03	Serious	2

	external consultants and researchers.				
5.	Difficulty in transitioning program ownership, Leadership or funding responsibilities to ensure continuity, sustainability and long-term input.	3.96	Serious	5	
6.	Lack of structured mechanism or net frame to provide feedback, suggestions or opinion on school policies, programs and activities.	3.96	Serious	5	
7.	Lack of strategized data collection protocols compromising the integration of evaluation findings.	4.11	Serious	1	

Overall Mean	Weighted Mean	3.98	Serious
--------------	---------------	------	---------

Legend:

Mean Score Range	Descriptive Equivalent	
4.50 – 5.00	Very Serious	- V
3.50 – 4.49	Serious	- S
2.50 – 3.49	Moderately Serious	- M
1.50 – 2.49	Slightly Serious	- S

1.00 – 1.49 Not Serious - N
S

With a mean score of 4.11, item no. 7, which pertains to the absence of well-planned data gathering techniques that may jeopardize the integration of evaluation findings, is classified as significant. The table also demonstrates how low funding allocations for research, material purchases, hiring outside consultants and researchers, and goal-setting are not in line with the organization's mission, vision, values, and strategic priorities. The mean ratings for these areas, which rank second and third, respectively, indicate how difficult it is for school heads to set goals. These findings may be explained by the necessity for personnel to receive training in data collection, integration of findings, evaluation, and goal alignment with the organization's mission, vision, values, and strategic priorities, as well as the distribution of funds for hiring consultants and conducting research. 3.98 is the weighted average overall, while serious is the descriptive equivalent.

Table 3. Leadership Styles of the Public and Private School Heads as Perceived by themselves and their teachers in terms of Transactional Leadership along Resources Allocation

	Resources Allocation	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1.	Insufficient technological infrastructure, tools and resources to effectively collect, manage, analyze and utilize school data.	4.04	Serious	1.5
2.	Challenges in allocating research budget resources on equitable and	4.03	Serious	3

efficiently across the program, department and student populations.					6.	Difficulty in keeping pace with rapid technological change and intersecting new tools and platforms into the educational environment.	3.98	Serious	5
3. Inadequate funding or budget allocations for facility maintenance repair upgrades and equipment purchases, constraining the ability to address infrastructure needs.	4.04	Serious	1.5						
4. Ineffective leadership or supervision practices including micromanagement, favoritism, or inconsistency in decision making undermining trust and morale.	3.88	Serious	6						
5. Limited focus in long-term resilience planning and recovery efforts to mitigate the impact of disaster, rebuild infrastructure, and restore the learning environment.	4.00	Serious	4						
				Overall Mean	Weighted	3.99	Serious		
Legend:									
				Mean Score Range	Descriptive Equivalent DE				
				4.50 – 5.00	Very Serious	-	V		
				3.50 – 4.49	Serious	-	S		
				2.50 – 3.49	Moderately Serious	-	M		
				1.50 – 2.49	Slightly Serious	-	S		
				1.00 – 1.49	Not Serious	-	N		

They are described as poor leadership or supervision techniques, such as micromanagement, partiality, or inconsistent decision-making, which weaken morale and trust. They also include challenges in adjusting to the quick changes in technology and integrating new platforms and tools into the classroom. The results demonstrate that, despite the seriousness of these things, school heads also possess the technological know-how and leadership styles required to effectively lead and govern their institutions. The total weighted mean of 3.99 is deemed troublesome due to the school heads' issues with resource distribution. Insufficient funds or budget allocations for facility maintenance, repairs, upgrades, and equipment acquisitions are attributed to Items Nos. 1 and 3, which restrict the ability to address infrastructure needs based on the same mean of 4.04, which is likewise categorized as serious. Additionally, it is said that they lack the technology infrastructure, instruments, and resources necessary to properly gather, organize, process, and make use of educational data. Interestingly, items 4 and 6 had the lowest mean ratings—3.88 and 3.98—despite being categorized as serious.

Table 4. Problems Encountered by School Heads along Curriculum Management

Curriculum Management	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. Rigidity in curriculum structures, formulas, or policy guides limiting opportunities for customization and adaptation to student needs.	3.96	Serious	4
2. Insufficient differentiation of instruction to meet the diverse needs, interests and learning style of student.	4.02	Serious	2
3. Absence of clear, transparent, and consistent criteria rubrics for evaluating teaching performance, leading to ambiguity and subjectivity in feedback.	3.94	Serious	5
4. Challenges in interpreting assessment data and using it effectively to inform instructional decision-making target interventions, and improve	4.03	Serious	1

Overall Mean	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
3.99	3.99	Serious

Legend:

Mean Score Range	Descriptive Equivalent
4.50 – 5.00	Very Serious - V
3.50 – 4.49	Serious - S
2.50 – 3.49	Moderately Serious - M
1.50 – 2.49	Slightly Serious - S
1.00 – 1.49	Not Serious - N

The next challenges are those related to allocating funding, staff, materials, and space to support a conducive learning environment. These challenges include the following: a rigidity in curriculum structures, formulas, or policy guides that limits opportunities for customization and adaptation to student needs (average weighted mean: 3.96); an absence of clear, transparent, and consistent criteria rubrics for evaluating teaching performance (average weighted mean: 3.94), which results in ambiguity and subjectivity in feedback. With a weighted average of 3.99 overall, this is regarded as serious. Every topic pertaining to curriculum management is thought to be a serious problem. Item 4—difficulties in interpreting assessment data and using it effectively to influence instructional decision-making, focus interventions,

and improve student learning outcomes—ranks as the most serious concern, with an average weighted mean of 4.03. However, item number 2, which discusses inadequate teaching differentiation to accommodate students' unique needs, interests, and learning styles, ranks second with an average weighted mean of 4.02.

Table 5. Problems Encountered by School Heads along Evaluation of Teachers

Evaluation of Teachers	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. Demonstrate shallow understanding or limited mastery of the subject matter resulting gaps in content knowledge.	4.02	Serious	1.5
2. Lack of opportunities for professional development and training in areas of cultural competence, diversity awareness and inclusive instructional practices.	4.02	Serious	1.5
3. Limited interdisciplinary connections and integration across subject areas resulting to fragmented and compartmentalized learning experiences.	3.94	Serious	4
4. Inconsistencies in grading practices	3.90	Serious	5

leading to variability in student grades and perceptions of unfairness.

5. Lack of standardized metrics or evaluation frameworks for assessing teachers “plus factor” leading to ambiguity in the evaluation process.

Overall Mean	Weighted Mean	3.91	Serious
--------------	---------------	------	---------

Legend:

Mean Range	Score	Descriptive Equivalent
4.50 – 5.00		Very Serious - V
3.50 – 4.49		Serious - S
2.50 – 3.49		Moderately Serious - M
1.50 – 2.49		Slightly Serious - S

The table above makes it clear that everything listed is a significant issue. Lack of opportunities for professional development and training in areas of cultural competence, diversity awareness, and inclusive instructional practices; limited interdisciplinary connections and integration across subject areas resulting in fragmented and compartmentalized learning experiences; inconsistent grading practices leading to variability in student grades and feelings of unfairness; and a weighted average of 4.02 for those who exhibit shallow understanding or limited mastery of the subject matter. with an average weighted mean of 3.90; and ambiguity in the evaluation process due to a lack of defined criteria or evaluation frameworks for evaluating instructors' "plus factor," with an average weighted mean of 3.98. Overall, 3.91 is the cumulative weighted mean, which is considered serious.

Table 6. Problems Encountered by School Heads along Building Connections/ Community Relations

Building Connections/Community Relations	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. Limited engagement and partnerships collaboration with community stakeholders on initiatives related to student learning, health and wellness, career readiness and community development.	3.98	Serious	3
2. Insensitivity to cultural norms, values, traditions resulting to feelings of exclusions and marginalization among stakeholders.	4.03	Serious	1
3. Limited opportunities for stakeholders to provide input, ask questions, or voice concerns in school communication channels resulting to disempowerment or lack of agency	3.97	Serious	4
4. Budgetary constraints limiting the scope of community outreach and engagement initiatives, restricting	4.00	Serious	2

opportunities for collaboration and partnership development.

Overall Weighted Mean	4.00	Serious
Legend:		
Mean Score Range	Descriptive Equivalent	
4.50 – 5.00	Very Serious	- V S
3.50 – 4.49	Serious	- S
2.50 – 3.49	Moderately Serious	- M S
1.50 – 2.49	Slightly Serious	- S S
1.00 – 1.49	Not Serious	N S

Table 6 makes it clear that every item was a significant issue. First, with an average weighted mean of 3.98, is the low level of engagement and partnership collaboration with community stakeholders on projects linked to student learning, health and wellness, career readiness, and community development. This is followed by an insensitivity to cultural norms, values, and traditions, which makes stakeholders feel excluded and marginalized. Having a weighted average of 4.03. The lack of agency or disempowerment that results from limited opportunities for stakeholders to voice concerns, ask questions, or provide input through school communication channels is the next issue. Finally, budgetary restrictions that limit the scope of community outreach and engagement initiatives also limit opportunities for partnership and collaboration development. has a weighted mean average of 4.00. With a weighted average of 4.00 overall, this situation is considered serious.

Table 7. Problems Encountered by School Heads

SUMMARY	Over all Weighted Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1. Goal Setting	3.98	Serious	4
2. Resources Allocation	3.99	Serious	2.5
3. Curriculum Management	3.99	Serious	2.5

4.	Evaluation of Teachers	3.91	Serious	5
5.	Building Connections	4.00	Serious	1
Grand Mean		3.97	Serious	

Legend:

Mean Score Range	Descriptive Equivalent		
4.50 – 5.00	Very Serious	-	V S
3.50 – 4.49	Serious	-	S
2.50 – 3.49	Moderately Serious	-	M S
1.50 – 2.49	Slightly Serious	-	S S
1.00 – 1.49	Not Serious	-	N S

The total weighted mean of 4.00, which is classified as serious, indicates that the school heads' top concern, as seen in the table, is establishing connections. Resource allocation and curriculum management come in second and third, respectively, with an overall weighted mean of 3.99 and 3.99. Goal-setting comes next, with a weighted overall mean of 3.98, followed by teacher assessment with a weighted overall mean of 3.91.

CONCLUSION

The leadership philosophies of the school heads vary greatly depending on how long they have been in that position. Additionally, there is a strong correlation between the school heads' perceived performance in curriculum management and their leadership styles. Also, there are significant issues with curriculum management, goal-setting, resource allocation, teacher assessment, and establishing connections. Creating relationships comes in first, followed by curriculum management and resource allocation. Then, setting goals is number four, and evaluating teachers is number five.

REFERENCES

[1] Almonawer, N., Althonayan, A., Alainati, S., Al-Hammad, F., Haque, R., & Senathirajah, A. R. B. S. (2023). Transformational Leadership Style

and School Transformation: The Case of Secondary Schools in Kuwait.

[2] Asiimwe, S., Mugenyi, E., Apiku, C., & Asiimwe, T. (2023). An assessment of the relationship between headmasters' leadership and teachers' performance in Makindye division, Kampala district, Uganda. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 18(2), 592-600.

[3] Baloch, N. A., Baloch, S., & Bhatti, T. N. (2023). Relationship between Leadership Styles of the Female Head Teacher and Academic Achievement of Students in Secondary Schools. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences*, 4(3), 296-305.

[4] Belandres, E. B. (2018). Research writing made easy.

[5] Bond, C. (2015). Leadership styles. In *Leadership in sport* (pp. 34-47). Routledge.

[6] Farooq, M. H., Hashmi, M. A., Jabbar, M. N., & Rehman, S. U. (2022). Heads' Leadership Style and Performance Appraisal Matter to Enhance the Job Satisfaction of Secondary School Teachers. *Journal of Education And Humanities Research (JEHR)*, University of Balochistan, Quetta, 13(1), 145-153.

[7] Jilani, S. A. A. S., Bukhari, S. S. H., Lashari, A. A., Rasool, A., Khoso, T. A., & Shah, S. A. A. (2024). The Role Of Heads' Leadership Styles In Public Sector Secondary School Teachers' Commitment In Sindh. *Migration Letters*, 21(S2), 1629-1642.

[8] Kaleem, S. (2021). Impact of principals' leadership style on schools' climate, teachers' performance and academic achievement of the students in Southern districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. *Ilkogretim online*, 20(6).

[9] Mutua, A. M., Cheloti, S. K., & Kamau, L. M. (2023). Headteachers' leadership styles as a critical factor towards learner's academic performance in public primary schools in Kenya.

[10] Parveen, K., Quang Bao Tran, P., Kumar, T., & Shah, A. H. (2022, May). Impact of principal leadership styles on teacher job performance: An empirical investigation. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 7, p. 814159). Frontiers Media SA.

- [11] Xu, Y., & Farris, K. (2024). The influence of leadership styles and supervisor communication on employee burnout. *Journal of General Management*, 49(3), 169-179.