



(RESEARCH ARTICLE)



## School head's leadership behavior and job performance of teacher leaders: A sequential explanatory mixed method

Maybelle G. Isidoro \* and Melanie N. Edig

*Institute of Advanced Studies, Davao del Norte State College, New Visayas, Pagabo City, Davao del Norte, Philippines.*

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2026, 30(02), 496-513

Publication history: Received on 15 April 2026; revised on 06 May 2026; accepted on 08 May 2026

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2026.30.2.1241>

### Abstract

This study examined the relationship between school heads' leadership behavior and the job performance of teacher leaders using a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design. The quantitative phase assessed the level of leadership behavior in terms of team approach to instructional leadership, compound leadership, and diverse leadership, as well as the job performance of teacher leaders based on the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS). Findings revealed that school heads' leadership behavior was rated extremely high, indicating consistent demonstration of collaborative, empowering, and transparent leadership practices. Teacher leaders' job performance, on the other hand, was rated very satisfactory, reflecting consistent and above-standard performance. Despite these high ratings, inferential analysis showed no statistically significant relationship between school heads' leadership behavior and teacher leaders' job performance. To explain this result, qualitative data were collected and analyzed, revealing key themes such as communication influence, leadership influence, instructional performance orientation, results accountability, and professional commitment. These findings suggest that teacher leaders' performance is largely sustained by intrinsic motivation, professional autonomy, and collaborative support systems rather than direct leadership influence. The study concludes that leadership behavior functions as an enabling and context-shaping factor rather than a direct predictor of performance. The findings support distributed leadership and self-determination perspectives, emphasizing shared leadership practices and intrinsic motivation as key drivers of performance. Implications for practice highlight the importance of fostering collaborative environments, empowering teacher leaders, and strengthening professional development systems. Policy recommendations include institutionalizing teacher leadership roles, enhancing performance evaluation systems, and promoting professional learning communities. Future research is recommended to explore additional factors influencing teacher performance and to examine these relationships across different contexts.

**Keywords:** Leadership Behavior; Teacher Leaders; Job Performance; Distributed Leadership; Intrinsic Motivation; Mixed-Methods Research

### 1. Introduction

Leadership in schools has become a popular topics for research studies to investigate the implications of leadership on successful schools [1]. With growing attention on education reform through the proliferation of professional learning communities and teacher leadership in public education, it is important to identify principals' leadership behaviors that best support the efforts of creating the conditions required to achieve the desired effects of effective leadership [2]. For the change in schools to be effective, factors such as leadership behavior and teachers' readiness to accept change need to be considered [3]. As school heads, it is important to significantly develop and support teachers [4]. Twenty-first century school heads require various behaviors different from before [5].

\* Corresponding author: Maybelle G. Isidoro

Pursuing its mission to support countries in achieving quality education for all, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has launched a comprehensive regional comparative review of policies and practices on school leadership, with a view to helping countries develop sound policies to support effective school leadership. Many countries have also emphasized the need to enhance school leadership as a key ingredient in reinforcing governance of the education system for increased performance and efficiency [6].

In the Philippines, teacher leadership is a meaningful concept in public schools even if the term teacher leadership has not been introduced formally. Teacher leadership consists of actions undertaken by teachers who respond positively to opportunities to improve teaching and learning. These teachers possess a strong sense of moral purpose and requisite pedagogic and leadership competencies. They help create conditions that support teaching and learning, often in challenging circumstances, in collaboration with colleagues and the school's leadership [7].

School heads, specifically in public schools who encounter teacher resistance, low teacher retention rates, or those who wish to increase student achievement, may need to reflect on their current leadership practices. It would be helpful to determine if these issues are the result of administrative behaviors or practices that do not support opportunities for teachers to become involved in significant decisions about the direction of educational policies and programs at their schools [8]. Developing teacher leadership and providing teachers with mastery experiences can have a positive impact on faculty, affirming the power of shared leadership, shared decision-making, and shared responsibility for school learning. This study provides a framework on which leaders can model their own behaviors and practices and informs educational leadership training programs on how to promote and support distributed leadership practices at school sites [9].

In the Department of Education, Tagum City Division, many teachers maintain leadership roles in their respective schools. Some lead curriculum implementation as master teachers, while others are designated by school heads to lead school programs or projects under governance and operations. While teachers have taken on informal leadership roles in schools and communities, it is increasingly important that teacher leadership is defined and encouraged. School heads' leadership behavior, such as empowering individuals and teams to consistently perform leadership roles and responsibilities in achieving school goals and shared governance and accountability, is emphasized by policy [37].

As revealed by previous research, leadership behaviors have a significant and positive impact on teachers' job performance [10]. Meyers et al. found that schools were less productive with principals who demonstrated more dominant leadership behaviors [11]. On the contrary, shared decision-making leadership behaviors (delegative behaviors) led to higher teacher job involvement [11]. In light of these findings, the researcher explores the leadership behavior of school heads and the job performance of teacher leaders.

### **1.1. Purpose of the Study**

This sequential explanatory mixed-methods study aimed to assess the extent of school heads leadership behavior and the level of job performance of teacher leaders, explore the teacher leader's perceptions within the context of public elementary and secondary schools in Tagum City, Davao del Norte, Philippines. By integrating qualitative results to explain the quantitative results, the study seeks to provide a detailed understanding of school head's leadership behavior and job performance of teacher leaders.

### **1.2. Research Questions**

This study aimed to assess the extent of school heads leadership behavior, level of job performance of teacher leaders, and explain qualitative and quantitative results of the study the extent of leadership behavior of school heads and the level of the job. The investigation is guided by the specific research questions below:

- What is the extent of the leadership behavior of school heads in terms of;
  - A team approach to instruction leadership
  - Compound leadership; and
  - Diverse leadership?
- What is the job performance of teacher leaders in terms of RPMS-IPCRF Rating?
- Is there a significant relationship between the leadership behavior of school heads and the job performance of teacher leaders?
- What are the perceptions of teacher leaders on the salient elements in the quantitative results?
- How do the qualitative results explain the quantitative results of the study?

### 1.3. Theoretical Lens

This study is anchored on the following theories: behavioral pattern, which argues that leadership behaviors affect subordinate behaviors and organizational performance [12]; behavior theory, which states that leadership behaviors affect subordinate performance [13]. A team approach to instructional leadership, compound leadership, and diverse leadership emphasized by Santoni and Rugar [14] were the indicators of school heads' leadership behavior. Principals' leadership behaviors are related to teachers' job performance and organizational commitment [15–18]. Cerit [17] also pointed out that teachers' job performance and organizational commitment are critical determining factors for a school's success or failure. Snyder [19] emphasized that school achievement evaluation and school effectiveness evaluation are important indicators of leadership behavior.

This study is also anchored on the concept of Distributed Leadership. Distributed leadership has become a popular "post-heroic" representation of leadership, which shifts focus from the attributes and behaviors of individual leaders to a more systemic perspective, where leadership is seen as a collective social process emerging through interactions of multiple actors [20]. From this perspective, distributed leadership is not something done by an individual to others but a group activity that works through relationships rather than individual action [21]. Teacher leadership, often referred to as distributed leadership, acknowledges the diverse knowledge and experience of teachers and promotes a more collaborative school environment [23].

Principals play a key role in establishing a culture of distributed leadership at their schools. Printy et al. [24] describe this as an intellectual school environment where teachers share responsibility for enhancing the intellectual atmosphere and model professional practice. Engaging in collaborative leadership provides opportunities for synergy, which can result in growing enthusiasm for ongoing collaboration [25]. Distributed leadership focuses on interactions rather than actions of those in formal and informal leadership roles [26]. Principals can help improve student outcomes by fostering a school culture where teachers are recognized as professional equals and experts in their field [8].

---

## 2. Methods

### 2.1. Research Design

This study employed a sequential explanatory mixed-method design. A sequential explanatory design collects and analyzes quantitative and qualitative data in two consecutive phases within a single study [27]. The design consists of two stages: first, quantitative data are collected and analyzed; then, qualitative data are gathered and analyzed based on the quantitative results. The qualitative findings are then used to explain and further interpret the quantitative results [28].

An explanatory sequential design was used to investigate how or why a phenomenon occurred. This research included both quantitative and qualitative methods, incorporating a survey. The process started with creating research survey questions and conducting the study. After data collection, data analysis and reporting of the results were performed. The gathered results led to qualitative research to explain the areas identified in the qualitative study.

This unit composes the research design, locale, sampling procedure, research instrument, data collection procedure, data analysis, and ethical considerations.

### 2.2. Locale and Sampling Procedure

The study was conducted in 35 public schools in the Tagum City, consisting of 26 elementary schools, 9 secondary schools, and 3 integrated schools under the Division of Tagum City. The study employed both stratified random sampling and purposive sampling. In the quantitative phase, 241 teacher leaders were randomly selected from a total population of 642 using the Rao soft calculator. Respondents included master teachers, grade level heads, subject coordinators, and program or project coordinators who had served in leadership roles for at least three years. Stratified random sampling ensured proportional representation from the different schools and leadership positions. In the qualitative phase, purposive sampling was utilized to select 11 teacher-researchers for in-depth interviews based on their relevant knowledge, experiences, and involvement in educational leadership and research activities.

### 2.3. Research Instruments

The study used a survey questionnaire and an interview guide as research instruments. In the quantitative phase, an adopted and standardized questionnaire based on Avolio et al. [39] was utilized to measure the leadership behavior of school heads. The instrument was validated by three experts and tested among 241 respondents, with reliability

analyzed using Cronbach's alpha. Teacher leaders' job performance was measured using the DepEd Results-Based Performance Management System through the RPMS-IPCRF ratings, which assessed effectiveness, efficiency, and timeliness using established performance scales and adjectival ratings. In the qualitative phase, a validated in-depth interview guide with open-ended and follow-up questions was used to gather deeper insights based on the quantitative findings. Responses were analyzed through coding and thematic classification to explain and support the statistical results.

#### 2.4. Data Analysis Procedure

The study followed a sequential mixed-method data collection and analysis procedure. In the quantitative phase, permission was secured from the Schools Division Superintendent and school principals before administering standardized online survey questionnaires to 241 teacher leaders through platforms such as Google Forms, email, and Messenger. In the qualitative phase, in-depth interviews were conducted with selected teacher leaders using validated open-ended interview questions, with responses recorded and transcribed upon consent. Quantitative data were analyzed using mean and Pearson  $r$  to determine leadership behavior, job performance, and their relationship, while qualitative data were coded, categorized, and analyzed thematically to identify emerging themes. The findings from both phases were then integrated through mixed-method analysis and joint displays to compare, connect, and interpret the quantitative and qualitative results for a deeper understanding of school heads' leadership behavior and teacher leaders' job performance.

#### 2.5. Ethical Consideration

The study strictly observed ethical principles based on the Belmont Report, particularly respect for persons, beneficence, and justice [38]. Participants were provided with informed consent, assured of voluntary participation, privacy, confidentiality, and protection under the Data Privacy Act, while the researcher ensured that the study minimized risks and maximized benefits for all respondents. To ensure trustworthiness, the study established credibility through prolonged engagement and iterative questioning during interviews; transferability through detailed descriptions of the research process; dependability through repetitive observations, code-recode procedures, inquiry audits, and proper documentation; and confirmability through audit trails, careful record-keeping, and the use of interviews and survey questionnaires as verifiable sources of data.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Extent of School Heads' Leadership behavior in Terms of A Team Approach to Instruction Leadership

**Table 1** Extent of school heads' Leadership behavior in terms of A Team approach to instruction leadership

Item No.	Statements	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
1	Establishment of Teaching Teams	6.63	0.63	Extremely High
2	Support for Teaching Teams in Managing Instructional Plans	6.65	0.58	Extremely High
3	Encouragement of Teaching Team Initiatives and Instructional Improvement	6.68	0.64	Extremely High
4	Authorization of Teachers for Instructional Leadership	6.58	0.68	Extremely High
5	Promotion of Teacher Collaboration and Sharing of Best Practices	6.72	0.57	Extremely High
6	Data-Driven Collaborative School Performance Analysis	6.60	0.65	Extremely High
7	Provision of Time for Teacher Collaboration	6.67	0.54	Extremely High
8	Recognition and Legitimization of Teacher Leadership Contributions	6.61	0.67	Extremely High
9	Systematic Planning and Functional Role Assignment	6.61	0.67	Extremely High
10	Prioritization of Leadership Functions and Action Planning	6.68	0.69	Extremely High
OVERALL		6.64	0.63	Extremely High

The extent of school heads leadership behavior in terms of A team approach to instruction leadership was interpreted based on the obtained computed mean ratings and standard deviations. As shown in table 1, the extent of leadership behavior of school head in terms of team approach to instruction leadership is extremely high as revealed in the overall mean of 6.64. This indicates that the school head's leadership behavior in promoting a team approach to instruction leadership is always perceived by the teacher leaders. It can be viewed from the table that among the indicators, our school head promotes teacher collaboration that encourages successful teaching methods to be shared has the highest mean score of 6.72 described as extremely high. This indicator highlights the role of school heads in fostering the culture of collaboration to encourage the teachers to share their expertise and best practices. The indicators, Our School Head analyzes data with teachers to improve the school performance indicators which has mean score of 6.60 described as extremely high perceived the school heads' commitment to data-driven decision making.

### 3.2. Extent of School Heads' Leadership behavior in Terms of Compound Leadership

The extent of school heads leadership behavior in terms of A team approach to instruction leadership was interpreted based on the obtained computed mean ratings and standard deviations. Presented in Table 2 is the Extent of the leadership behavior of school heads in terms of compound leadership as perceived by the respondents. The results reveal that the overall mean rating is 6.62 with a standard deviation (SD) of 0.63, which is interpreted as extremely high.

**Table 2** Extent of school heads' Leadership behavior in terms of Compound leadership

Item No.	Statements	Mean	SD	Description
1	Adaptive Leadership and Policy Flexibility	6.54	0.73	Extremely High
2	Delegation of Authority for Teacher Initiative	6.67	0.55	Extremely High
3	Clear Administrative Decision-Making Authority	6.63	0.66	Extremely High
4	Encouragement of Teacher Creativity and Autonomy	6.65	0.69	Extremely High
5	Authorization of Teachers Based on Expertise	6.67	0.61	Extremely High
6	Flexible Leadership in Addressing Challenges	6.60	0.61	Extremely High
7	Support for Mentoring and Teacher Development	6.63	0.61	Extremely High
8	Promotion of Evolving Teacher Creativity	6.57	0.66	Extremely High
9	Shared Decision-Making with Faculty	6.62	0.61	Extremely High
10	Teacher-Centered Instructional Leadership Expectation	6.66	0.60	Extremely High
OVERALL		6.62	0.63	Extremely High

This indicate that the school head consistently practice adaptive and delegative behavior. Among the indicators, "Our School Head delegates authority to the school's administrative department managers and teachers so that they can plan activities with greater devotion" got the highest mean of 6.67 that the school head strongly practice delegation and trust in the teacher leader's capability. Similarly, the indicator, "When organizing activities, our School Head authorizes teachers with relevant expertise to oversee the activities"

Also received the highest mean f 6.67. This indicate that leadership responsibilities are distributed according to the expertise of teacher leaders. Other indicators also received extremely high ratings, among these are Encouraging teachers to show creativity with a mean of 6.65, Maintaining openness to adjust behaviors when encountering resistance or obstacles which got a mean of 6.60 and supporting mentoring activities while monitoring teachers' progress with a mean of 6.63. These results suggest that school heads foster a supportive leadership environment that promotes professional growth and collaborative engagement among teachers. Moreover, the indicator "Our School Head shares decision-making responsibilities with the faculty" obtained a mean score of 6.62, highlighting participatory leadership practices within the school organization. The findings also show that the school head is teacher-centered and expects individual teachers to exercise instructional leadership with a mean score of 6.66, which reinforces the idea of empowering teachers as leaders within their classrooms and the broader school community.

### 3.3. Extent of School Heads' Leadership behavior in Terms of Diverse Leadership

The extent of school heads leadership behavior in terms of diverse leadership was interpreted based on the obtained computed mean ratings and standard deviations. Presented in table 3 that the overall rating for the extent of school heads leadership behavior in terms of diverse leadership was 6.62 with a standard deviation of 0.70, described as "Extremely High." This indicates that teacher leaders perceive their school heads as demonstrating an extremely high extent of diverse leadership behavior. The relatively low overall standard deviation suggests a strong consensus among respondents regarding their favorable assessment of their school heads' diverse leadership practices. This finding implies that school heads are generally effective in embracing diversity, fostering inclusivity, and employing varied leadership strategies to manage the complexities of the school environment. The highest mean rating among all indicators was recorded for Item 10, which states, "Our School Head upholds the school's important rituals to convey the school's vision for the future" (M = 6.69, SD = 0.62). This finding underscores that teacher leaders strongly recognize their school heads' commitment to preserving institutional traditions and using these as vehicles for communicating and reinforcing the school's future direction. Three items shared the second-highest mean rating of 6.68: Item 2, "Our School Head cultivates a harmonious atmosphere" (SD = 0.62), Item 7, "Our School Head extremely values the school's performance in all aspects" (SD = 0.71), and Item 9, "Our School Head values achieving the school's present goals" (SD = 0.62). These results reveal that school heads are perceived as highly effective in creating a positive and collegial school climate, maintaining high performance standards, and demonstrating a strong focus on goal attainment. The consistently low standard deviations for Items 2 and 9 (both at 0.62) indicate particularly uniform agreement among respondents on these leadership behaviors. Moderately High-Rated Items are the Item 3, "Our School Head cares about school teachers" (M = 6.63, SD = 0.69) and Item 8, "Our School Head values designing thorough administrative procedures for school affairs" (M = 6.63, SD = 0.72) both received identical mean ratings. These findings suggest that teacher leaders perceive their school heads as genuinely concerned about teacher welfare and committed to establishing systematic and well-organized administrative processes. The care shown toward teachers reflects a relational dimension of diverse leadership, while the attention to administrative procedures represents the structural and organizational dimension. Lowest-Rated Items, were observed for Item 1 "Our School Head takes teachers' diverse opinions" (M = 6.55, SD = 0.70) and Item 6, "In circumstances of a big event, and involved parties could not reach a consensus, our School Head and teachers could reach a compromise" (M = 6.55, SD = 0.75). Despite being the lowest-rated items, both still fall within the "Extremely High" descriptive range, indicating that even the least prominent aspects of diverse leadership are still practiced to a very commendable degree.

**Table 3** Extent of school heads Leadership behavior of in terms of Diverse leadership

Item No.	Statements	Mean	SD	Description
1	Consideration of Teachers' Diverse Opinions	6.55	0.70	Extremely High
2	Cultivation of a Harmonious School Climate	6.68	0.62	Extremely High
3	Care for Teachers' Welfare	6.63	0.69	Extremely High
4	Responsiveness to Teachers' Needs	6.58	0.78	Extremely High
5	Negotiation-Based Conflict Resolution	6.58	0.78	Extremely High
6	Consensus-Building and Compromise Facilitation	6.55	0.75	Extremely High
7	Emphasis on School Performance Excellence	6.68	0.71	Extremely High
8	Structured Administrative Procedures	6.63	0.72	Extremely High
9	Goal-Oriented School Leadership	6.68	0.62	Extremely High
10	Upholding School Rituals and Vision Communication	6.69	0.62	Extremely High
OVERALL		6.62	0.70	Extremely High

### 3.4. Extent of School Head's Leadership Behavior

The extent of school heads leadership behavior was interpreted based on the obtained computed mean ratings and standard deviations of its indicators, namely: A team Approach to Instruction Leadership, compound leadership and diverse leadership. Table 4 presents the extent of the school head's leadership behavior as perceived by the respondents. This is measured across three (3) indicators namely; A Team approach to instruction leadership,

compound leadership and diverse leadership. As shown in the table, all indicators of school head leadership behavior received an “extremely high” descriptive rating with mean scores that are remarkably close to one another, suggesting a consistently strong manifestation of leadership behavior across all dimensions. A Team approach to instruction leadership with a mean score of 6.64 (SD=0.63) described as extremely high indicates that school head demonstrate an outstanding capacity to foster collaborative and team oriented instructional leadership within their schools. The school head prioritizes collective effort in driving instructional improvement, recognizing that effective teaching and learning outcomes are best achieved through collaborative approaches rather than top-down directives. The indicator's diverse leadership obtained the second higher score mean of 6.62 (SD=0.70), also described as extremely high. This result reveals that school heads are perceived to exhibit a strong capacity to embrace and practice diverse leadership styles that are responsive to the varying needs, contexts, and situations within the school environment. The indicator compound leadership received a mean score of 6.62 (SD=0.63), likewise described as extremely high. These findings suggest that the school head effectively demonstrated compound leadership which specifically involves the integration of adaptive and delegative leadership behavior.

**Table 4** Extent of school heads leadership behavior

Item No.	Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1	A Team Approach to Instruction Leadership	6.64	0.63	Extremely High
2	Compound Leadership	6.62	0.63	Extremely High
3	Diverse Leadership	6.62	0.70	Extremely High
OVERALL		6.63	0.70	Extremely High

### 3.5. Level of Job Performance of Teacher Leaders in terms of RPMS-IPCRF

This section the job performance of the teacher leaders was measured through the obtained rating from the Results-Based Performance System (RPMS) through the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF). This performance appraisal tool systematically assesses and evaluates the performance of teachers. Table 5 reflects the level of job performance of teacher leaders in terms of RPMS-IPCRF rating. It yielded an overall mean of 4.36 with a standard deviation (SD) of 0.27, which correspond to the descriptive equivalent of very satisfactory. The result reflected in the table suggest that the teacher leaders were able to substantially meet the performance standard and expectation set for them in their respective schools. The performance of teacher leaders exceeded expectation, that is, all goals, objectives, and targets have been achieved above the established standards.

**Table 5** Level of Job Performance of Teacher Leaders in terms of RPMS-IPCRF Rating

Variable	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
Level of Job Performance of Teacher Leaders in terms of RPMS-IPCRF Rating	4.36	0.27	Very Satisfactory

### 3.6. Correlation Analysis of the Variables

The degree of relationship between School Head’s leadership behavior and job performance of teacher leaders was measured. It can be seen from the table that the correlation between School Head’s leadership behavior and the job performance of teacher leaders has an R-value of 0.019 with a p-value of 0.774, which is greater than 0.05 level of significance. This means that the school heads’ leadership behavior has no significant relationship with job performance of teacher leaders. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship between school heads’ leadership behavior and job performance of teacher leaders is not rejected.

**Table 6** Significance of the Relationship Between Leadership Behavior of School Heads and the Job Performance of Teacher Leaders

Variables Correlated	R	p-value	Decision on Ho	Decision on Relationship
Leadership Behaviour & Job Performance	0.019	0.774	Not Rejected	Not Significant

### 3.7. Perception of the Teacher Leaders on the Salient Points of the Quantitative Results on School Heads Leadership Behavior and Teacher Leaders Job Performance

The table presents teacher leaders' perceptions of the salient points of the quantitative findings on school heads' leadership behavior and teacher leaders' job performance. The extremely high leadership behavior was attributed to recognition-based motivation, transparent communication, collaborative collegial support, and empowered leadership practice. The very satisfactory job performance was linked to communication and leadership influence, instructional performance orientation, results accountability, and professional commitment. Although results showed no significant relationship between the two variables, teacher leaders explained this through professional commitment, integrity-based leadership modeling, teacher autonomy maturity, leadership performance impact, and collaborative professional support.

**Table 7** Perception of the Teacher Leaders on the Salient Points of the Quantitative Results on School Heads Leadership Behavior and Teacher Leaders' Job Performance

Quantitative Findings	Typical Reasons
School Heads' Leadership Behavior (M=6.63, SD=0.70, Extremely High)	Recognition-Based Leadership Motivation Transparent Communication in Leadership Practice Collaborative Collegial Support System Empowered Leadership Practice
Teacher Leaders' Job Performance (M=4.36, SD: 0.27, Very Satisfactory)	Communication Influence Leadership Influence Instructional Performance Orientation Results Accountability Professional Commitment
Significant Relationship Between School Heads' Leadership Behavior and Teacher Leaders' Job Performance (R-value=0.019, P-value=0.774, Not Significant)	Professional Commitment Integrity Leadership Modeling Influence Leadership Performance Impact Teacher Autonomy Maturity Collaborative Professional Support

### 3.8. Teacher Leaders' Perspectives on School Heads' Extremely High Leadership Behavior

The quantitative findings revealed that school heads' leadership behavior was rated extremely high (M = 6.63, SD = 0.70), indicating a very strong and consistently positive perception among teacher leaders. This result suggests that leadership practices in the schools are not only evident but are also strongly experienced and valued by teachers in their daily professional interactions.

Based on the qualitative exploration, this extremely high rating can be explained through four major thematic reasons that reflect the lived experiences of teacher leaders. Recognition-based leadership motivation emerged as a central explanation for the high leadership rating. Teacher leaders consistently emphasized that school heads actively recognize teachers' achievements, particularly during formal occasions such as flag ceremonies. This public acknowledgment serves as a powerful motivational mechanism that enhances teacher morale and reinforces professional performance. Conversely, the absence of recognition was also noted as a factor that could diminish motivation, highlighting the importance of appreciation as a leadership practice.

Teacher leaders emphasized that recognition of teachers' achievements is a consistent and visible practice among school heads. The teacher leader revealed:

*"Pag naa na syay achievement... dili jud na sya may fail na iya jud nang i recognize during sa flag ceremony."* (IDI-01)

*"When a teacher has an achievement, it is always recognized during the flag ceremony."*

This statement shows that school heads regularly provide public acknowledgment during formal school ceremonies, reinforcing teachers' sense of value and accomplishment.

The teacher leader further revealed that lack of recognition negatively affects teacher motivation and performance. The teacher leader stated:

*"Usa sa mga butang nga makaapekto sa performance kay kung dili ma-recognize ang effort sa teachers." (IDI-04)*  
*"One factor affecting performance is when teachers' efforts are not recognized."*

This indicates that recognition plays a crucial role in sustaining teacher motivation and improving performance.

Transparent communication in leadership practice was identified as a key factor supporting effective leadership behavior. Teacher leaders described school heads as communicative, empathetic, and considerate of teachers' situations when providing instructions. Clear and consistent communication was viewed as essential in preventing confusion, misinterpretation, and disorganization within the school environment. This suggests that transparency in communication strengthens clarity of direction and supports effective instructional leadership.

Teacher leaders emphasized that school heads demonstrate clear and empathic communication in guiding teachers. The teacher leader stated:

*"As a school leader you have to communicate clearly and with empathy.. imoha jud sabton ang sitwasyon sa imong maestra." (IDI-01)*  
*"As a leader, you must communicate clearly and with empathy and understand your teachers' situation."*

This reflects a leadership approach that is both directive and considerate of teachers' conditions.

The teacher leader also stated that unclear and inconsistent communication leads to confusion among teachers. The teacher leader revealed:

*"Kung dili klaro ang instructions ug inconsistent ang messages, dako kaayo ni og epekto kay makalibog sa mga teachers." (IDI-01)*  
*"If instructions are unclear and messages are inconsistent, it greatly causes confusion among teachers."*

In addition, the teacher leader revealed that poor communication within the school leads to disorganization. The teacher leader stated:

*"Kung poor ang communication sa sulod sa eskwelahan, labi na sa school head ug teachers, makalibog gyud na siya ug mahimong dili organisado ang trabaho." (IDI-03)*  
*"Poor communication between school heads and teachers leads to confusion and disorganized work."*

The collaborative collegial support system contributed significantly to the perception of extremely high leadership behavior. Teachers reported that strong collegial relationships and supportive peer interactions make their work more manageable and efficient. School heads also foster fellowship and positive relationships within the school community, creating an environment where collaboration is valued and practiced. This collegial culture enhances teamwork and reinforces a shared sense of responsibility.

Teacher leaders emphasized that collegial relationships are essential in ensuring effective school functioning. The teacher leader stated:

*"Dili pud ka ka function well kung wala pud kay mga kauban na teachers nga mahimong gaan og sayon ang buluhaton." (IDI-01)*  
*"You cannot function well without fellow teachers who make work easier."*

This highlights that collaboration among teachers helps ease workload and improves efficiency in accomplishing tasks.

Empowered leadership practice reflects the delegation and trust given by school heads to teacher leaders. Participants noted that when teachers are empowered to perform their tasks independently, they are able to “shine” in their respective roles, while school heads primarily focus on monitoring and follow-up. This distributed leadership approach promotes professional autonomy, confidence, and accountability among teachers.

Teacher leaders emphasized that school heads practice empowerment by allowing teachers to work independently. The teacher leader revealed:

*“When we empower individual, mu shine sya ana... ang trabaho nalang jud sa school head is mu follow up.” (IDI-03)*

*“When individuals are empowered, they shine, and the school head mainly follows up.”*

This indicates that school heads trust teachers’ capabilities and focus more on monitoring rather than direct control.

The integration of these four qualitative themes provides a clear explanation for the extremely high quantitative rating of school heads’ leadership behavior. It suggests that leadership effectiveness in these schools is driven by a combination of recognition, transparent communication, collegial support, and empowerment—indicating a strong, positive, and enabling leadership environment.

### **3.9. Teacher Leaders’ Perspectives on them Very Satisfactory Job Performance**

The quantitative findings revealed that teacher leaders’ job performance was rated very satisfactory ( $M = 4.36$ ,  $SD = 0.27$ ), indicating a consistently positive level of performance across key professional responsibilities. This result suggests that teacher leaders are able to effectively carry out their roles in instruction, collaboration, and leadership functions within the school. The narrow standard deviation further implies that performance ratings were relatively uniform, reflecting stable and dependable performance among teacher leaders.

Based on the qualitative exploration, this very satisfactory level of job performance can be explained through five major thematic reasons derived from the lived experiences of teacher leaders.

Communication influence emerged as an important factor contributing to teacher leaders’ performance. Teacher leaders emphasized that effective communication strengthens relationships, clarifies expectations, and promotes collaboration among colleagues. When communication is clear and respectful, teacher leaders are able to coordinate tasks efficiently and support instructional improvement within their departments.

Teacher leaders highlighted the importance of communication in guiding their colleagues. The teacher leader revealed:

*“Effective communication skills. Tarungon jud nimo sila sa imong pagdala sa imong pag communicate sa ilaha.” (IDI-01)*

*“Effective communication skills. You really need to handle them effectively in how you speak with them.”*

This statement indicates that communication competence helps teacher leaders manage professional interactions effectively and maintain smooth workflow. Teacher leaders further emphasized that good communication fosters positive relationships. The teacher leader stated:

*“Nindot man gud syag communication, nindot pud syag relation sa teacher.” (IDI-05)*

*“The communication is good, and the relationship with the teacher is also good.”*

This reflects those strong interpersonal relationships that enhance collaboration and support job performance.

Leadership influence also contributed to the very satisfactory performance of teacher leaders. Participants noted that leadership attitude, empowerment, and shared governance practices shape their motivation and ability to perform effectively. Leadership that promotes distributed roles and trust encourages teacher leaders to take initiative and responsibility.

Teacher leaders emphasized the impact of leadership attitude on performance. The teacher leader revealed:

*"Ang attitude naka influence pud sa ilang performance gyud." (IDI-01)*  
"Attitude influences their performance"

### 3.10. Attitude influences their performance.

This suggests that leadership behavior shapes teachers' motivation and work engagement.

Teacher leaders further emphasized empowerment through shared governance. The teacher leader stated:

*"Distributive leadership system ang style, gi distribute ninyo ang shared governance." (IDI-04)*  
"The style is a distributive leadership system; you dispersed shared governance."

This indicates that shared leadership encourages participation and enhances performance.

Instructional performance orientation was identified as another explanation for teacher leaders' very satisfactory performance. Participants emphasized student achievement, instructional supervision, and monitoring as key indicators of their effectiveness. Teacher leaders focus on improving teaching practices and ensuring quality learning outcomes. Teacher leaders highlighted the importance of student achievement. The teacher leader revealed:

*"One is student achievement, meaning assessing the impact of teacher leaders and student learning outcomes." (IDI-02)*  
"One is student achievement, meaning assessing the impact of teacher leaders and student learning outcomes."

This demonstrates that teacher leaders anchor their performance on improving student learning. Teacher leaders also emphasized instructional competence. The teacher leader stated:

*"Instructional competence sa teacher. Kung unsa ang output nimo, mag speak gyud na kung unsa ka nga klase na maestra." (IDI-05)*  
The instructional competence of the teacher—your output speaks of what kind of teacher you are.

This reflects that instructional quality is central to teacher leaders' job performance.

Results accountability further explains the very satisfactory performance rating. Teacher leaders stressed that performance is evaluated based on outcomes, task completion, and the impact of their responsibilities. This results-oriented mindset promotes accountability and productivity. Teacher leaders emphasized results-based performance. The teacher leader revealed:

*"Result based jud ta. Kanang impact gani sa iyang performance." (IDI-04)*  
"We are truly results-based. The impact of one's performance is what we look at."

This indicates that teacher leaders focus on measurable outcomes to guide their work. Teacher leaders also highlighted shared accountability. The teacher leader stated:

*"Failure sa isa, failure pud baya sa organization kung dili maging successful ang isa ka event." (IDI-05)*  
The failure of one is also the failure of the organization if an event is not successful.

This shows that teacher leaders view performance as a collective responsibility.

Professional commitment emerged as a sustaining factor for very satisfactory job performance. Participants emphasized dedication, resilience under pressure, and adherence to professional responsibilities. Teacher leaders maintain performance through strong work ethic and commitment to student success. Teacher leaders emphasized commitment as key to success. The teacher leader revealed:

*"Commitment jud, kanang makahatag jud nah siya ug success as a teacher leader." (IDI-05)*

"It is really commitment that gives success as a teacher leader."

This highlights that professional dedication sustains consistent performance. Teacher leaders also described resilience under challenging conditions. The teacher leader stated:

*"Can work under pressure... kung ma pressure ang isa ka tao, diha mogawas iyang tinaguan." (IDI-03)*

When a person is pressured, their true capability comes out.

This indicates that resilience strengthens performance even in demanding situations.

The integration of these five qualitative themes provides a clear explanation for the very satisfactory quantitative rating of teacher leaders' job performance. It suggests that performance is driven by effective communication, leadership influence, instructional orientation, results accountability, and professional commitment. Together, these factors create a stable and productive professional environment that supports consistent and high-quality performance among teacher leaders.

### **3.11. Teacher Leaders Reflection on No Significant Relationships between School Heads Leadership Behavior and Teacher Leaders Job Performance**

The quantitative findings revealed that there was no significant relationship between school heads' leadership behavior and teacher leaders' job performance ( $R = 0.019$ ,  $p = 0.774$ ). This result indicates that variations in leadership behavior did not significantly influence the level of job performance among teacher leaders. Despite differences in leadership practices, teacher leaders consistently maintained their performance, suggesting that other factors contribute to sustaining their professional responsibilities.

Based on the qualitative exploration, this non-significant relationship can be explained through five major thematic reasons derived from the lived experiences of teacher leaders.

Professional commitment integrity emerged as a primary explanation for the stable job performance of teacher leaders regardless of leadership behavior. Participants emphasized that their dedication to their work, integrity, and sense of responsibility motivate them to perform effectively even in less favorable leadership conditions. This suggests that teacher leaders rely heavily on intrinsic motivation to sustain their performance.

Teacher leaders highlighted that commitment drives them to continue performing despite leadership variations. The teacher leader revealed:

*"Even with negative principal behavior, if you have commitment, you still perform." (IDI-01)*

"Even with negative principal behavior, if you have commitment, you still perform."

Even with negative principal behavior, teachers continue to perform if they have commitment. This indicates that professional integrity and commitment serve as internal anchors for consistent job performance.

Leadership modeling influence also explains the non-significant relationship. While leadership behavior may not directly affect performance levels, teacher leaders still observe and emulate positive leadership practices. This modeling fosters professional growth and aspiration rather than immediate performance changes.

Teacher leaders emphasized that effective school heads serve as professional role models. The teacher leader stated:

*"Kung makita ni teacher leader effective iyang school head, gusto pud siya mahimong ingon-ana." (IDI-02)*

If a teacher leader sees that the school head is effective, they also want to become like that.

This suggests that leadership influences professional development indirectly rather than determining performance outcomes.

Leadership performance impact reflects that teacher leaders perceive leadership as shaping work conditions but not necessarily dictating performance. Leadership may affect direction, climate, and expectations; however, teacher leaders maintain performance through personal and professional accountability.

Teacher leaders stressed that leadership quality influences performance context. The teacher leader revealed:

“Good leadership leads to higher performance; bad leadership lowers performance.”  
(IDI-03)

This shows that leadership has contextual influence, yet performance stability remains due to other sustaining factors. Teacher autonomy maturity further explains why leadership behavior does not significantly affect performance. Teacher leaders described themselves as self-directed professionals capable of managing their responsibilities independently. Their autonomy reduces reliance on direct supervision.

Teacher leaders emphasized their independence in performing tasks. The teacher leader stated:

“*Leader naman gud ni, they are mature enough, self-directed, dili na nimo sila ingnon.*”  
(IDI-04)  
Teacher leaders are mature enough and self-directed; they do not need to be told what to do.

This highlights that professional maturity allows teachers to sustain performance despite leadership variations. Collaborative professional support also contributed to stable job performance. Teacher leaders emphasized the importance of collegial relationships and peer assistance in accomplishing tasks. When direct leadership guidance is limited, teachers rely on collaboration to maintain effectiveness.

Teacher leaders pointed out the role of peer support. The teacher leader revealed:

“Support from colleagues is a factor when school heads cannot coach directly.” (IDI-04)

Support from colleagues is a factor when school heads cannot coach directly.

This indicates that collaboration among teachers compensates for differences in leadership behavior. The integration of these five qualitative themes provides a clear explanation for the non-significant quantitative result. It suggests that teacher leaders' job performance is sustained by professional commitment, leadership modeling, contextual leadership influence, autonomy, and collaborative support. These factors collectively ensure that performance remains stable regardless of variations in school heads' leadership behavior.

### 3.12. Joint Display of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings

The joint display of quantitative and qualitative findings was used to integrate the results of the study, following the explanatory mixed-methods approach described by John W. Creswell and J. David Creswell (2023). In this approach, integration occurs by connecting the phases of data collection and merging the quantitative and qualitative results during interpretation. This process allows qualitative themes to explain, expand, and provide deeper meaning to statistical outcomes, thereby producing meta-inferences that reflect both numerical trends and participants lived experiences.

**Table 8** Joint Display of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings

Quantitative Findings	Typical Reasons	Nature of Integration
School Heads' Leadership Behavior (M=6.63, SD=0.70, Extremely High)	Recognition-Based Leadership Motivation Transparent Communication in Leadership Practice Collaborative Collegial Support System Empowered Leadership Practice	Connecting, merging

Teacher Leaders' Job Performance (M=4.36, SD: 0.2, Very Satisfactory)	Communication Influence Leadership Influence Instructional Performance Orientation Results Accountability Professional Commitment	Connecting, merging
Significant Relationship Between School Heads' Leadership Behavior and Teacher Leaders' Job Performance (R-value=0.019, P-value=0.774, Not Significant)	Professional Commitment Integrity Leadership Modeling Influence Leadership Performance Impact Teacher Autonomy Maturity Collaborative Professional Support	Connecting, merging

For school heads' leadership behavior, the quantitative results indicated an extremely high rating ( $M = 6.63$ ,  $SD = 0.70$ ), suggesting that teacher leaders strongly perceive their school heads as demonstrating effective leadership practices. Through the connecting strategy, the qualitative phase was designed to explore reasons behind this high rating. The merging of results revealed four explanatory themes: recognition-based leadership motivation, transparent communication in leadership practice, collaborative collegial support system, and empowered leadership practice. These qualitative insights clarify that leadership effectiveness is grounded in recognition of achievements, clear communication, supportive collaboration, and empowerment of teachers. The integration of these strands demonstrates how qualitative findings explain the statistical strength of leadership behavior, consistent with Creswell and Creswell's emphasis on using qualitative data to elaborate quantitative results.

Similarly, teacher leaders' job performance was quantitatively rated very satisfactory ( $M = 4.36$ ,  $SD = 0.27$ ), indicating consistent and dependable performance. Using the connecting process, qualitative data were collected to identify underlying reasons for this level of performance. The merging of both data sets produced five themes: communication influence, leadership influence, instructional performance orientation, results accountability, and professional commitment. These themes explain that teacher leaders' performance is shaped by effective communication, leadership support, focus on instruction, accountability for outcomes, and dedication to professional responsibilities. The integration strengthens the interpretation that performance is not only measurable but also influenced by relational and professional factors experienced by teacher leaders.

Regarding the relationship between school heads' leadership behavior and teacher leaders' job performance, the quantitative findings showed no significant relationship ( $r = 0.019$ ,  $p = 0.774$ ). Through connecting, qualitative exploration sought to understand why leadership behavior did not statistically predict job performance. The merging of findings revealed five explanatory themes: professional commitment integrity, leadership modeling influence, leadership performance impact, teacher autonomy maturity, and collaborative professional support. These themes suggest that teacher leaders maintain performance regardless of leadership variations due to strong internal commitment, professional maturity, and collaborative support systems. Thus, performance may be sustained by intrinsic and collegial factors rather than being directly dependent on leadership behavior.

The joint display demonstrates the integration of quantitative and qualitative strands through connecting and merging, as recommended by Creswell and Creswell (2023). This integration provides a comprehensive interpretation by showing that leadership behavior is strongly perceived, job performance remains consistently satisfactory, and the absence of a significant statistical relationship is explained by independent professional and collaborative factors. The combined analysis produces a coherent meta-inference, highlighting that leadership and performance coexist within a complex professional environment shaped by recognition, communication, commitment, and collegial support.

#### 4. Discussion

The study integrated the quantitative and qualitative findings using the explanatory mixed-methods approach [36]. The results revealed that school heads' leadership behavior was rated extremely high, indicating that teacher leaders strongly perceive their school heads as effective leaders. Qualitative findings explained this through recognition-based leadership motivation, transparent communication, collaborative collegial support, and empowered leadership practice. These findings suggest that leadership becomes more effective when school heads recognize teachers' efforts, communicate clearly, encourage collaboration, and empower teachers to lead. The findings support studies showing that transformational, distributed, and collaborative leadership practices strengthen organizational climate and teacher performance [29][30]. The results also align with transformational leadership and distributed leadership theories, which emphasize motivation, empowerment, and shared responsibility in improving school effectiveness.

Teacher leaders' job performance was rated very satisfactory, showing that they consistently performed their professional responsibilities effectively. The qualitative findings revealed that communication influence, leadership influence, instructional performance orientation, results accountability, and professional commitment contributed to this performance. These findings indicate that teacher leaders perform better in environments that promote collaboration, accountability, and professional support. Similar findings were reported by Voelkel et al. [31], who emphasized that trust-building and collaborative leadership improve teacher performance and highlighted the importance of professional learning communities in strengthening instructional practices. The findings further support distributed leadership theory, which explains that leadership is shared through daily professional interactions rather than centered only on the school head [26].

The study also found no significant relationship between school heads' leadership behavior and teacher leaders' job performance, suggesting that teacher leaders maintain performance regardless of leadership variations. Qualitative findings showed that professional commitment, teacher autonomy, leadership modeling, and collaborative support helped sustain performance. This supports the findings of Zhao [32] and Timperley [33], who explained that intrinsic motivation, professional responsibility, and self-regulated practice allow teachers to remain effective even with varying leadership support. The findings also support self-determination theory of Ryan and Deci [34] and distributed leadership theory of Spillane [35], which emphasize intrinsic motivation, autonomy, and shared professional responsibility. These findings imply that school leadership functions more as a supportive and enabling force rather than a direct determinant of teacher performance. Therefore, schools should strengthen professional learning communities, mentoring systems, teacher empowerment, and collaborative cultures to sustain teacher leaders' effectiveness and professional growth.

---

## 5. Conclusion

Based on the findings, it is concluded that school heads demonstrate highly effective leadership behaviors that foster a positive and collaborative school climate. These leadership practices play a crucial role in creating an environment that supports teacher growth and professional engagement. Teacher leaders, on the other hand, exhibit consistently high job performance, which is largely sustained by internal factors such as commitment to the profession, accountability for results, and dedication to instructional improvement.

The absence of a significant relationship between leadership behavior and job performance suggests that teacher leaders are capable of maintaining performance independently of leadership variations. This implies that leadership functions more as an enabling and facilitating force rather than a direct determinant of performance outcomes. Teacher leaders operate within a system where shared responsibility, professional autonomy, and collegial collaboration are central to sustaining high performance.

### *Implications*

**Implications to Theory.** The findings of the study provide important theoretical insights into the nature of educational leadership and performance. The results challenge traditional leadership models that assume a direct causal link between leadership behavior and employee performance. Instead, the findings support the principles of distributed leadership, which conceptualize leadership as a shared and collective process embedded within organizational interactions. Leadership influence is diffused across individuals and practices rather than concentrated in a single authority figure.

Moreover, the findings align with self-determination theory, which emphasizes the role of intrinsic motivation, autonomy, and competence in driving performance. Teacher leaders' ability to sustain high performance despite the absence of a direct leadership effect suggests that internal motivational factors and professional identity play a more significant role than external leadership behaviors. This underscores the importance of viewing leadership as a contextual and enabling mechanism that nurtures professional capacity rather than as a controlling force.

**Implications to Practice.** From a practical perspective, the findings highlight the need for school heads to focus on creating enabling conditions that support teacher leaders rather than relying solely on directive leadership approaches. Effective leadership should emphasize collaboration, empowerment, and open communication to strengthen professional relationships and foster a positive organizational climate. School heads should also prioritize recognition and support systems that reinforce teacher motivation and engagement.

For teacher leaders, the findings emphasize the importance of sustaining professional commitment, accountability, and instructional focus. Schools should provide continuous opportunities for professional development, leadership training,

and collaborative learning to further enhance teacher leaders' capabilities. The cultivation of a strong professional culture that values teamwork, shared responsibility, and continuous improvement is essential for maintaining high levels of performance.

**Implications for Policy.** The study has significant implications for educational policy, particularly in the areas of leadership development and performance management. There is a need to institutionalize structures that promote shared leadership, such as professional learning communities, mentoring programs, and collaborative decision-making processes. These structures can help sustain teacher performance by strengthening professional support systems within schools.

Additionally, performance evaluation systems should be revisited to incorporate not only quantitative measures but also qualitative indicators such as collaboration, communication, and professional engagement. Policies should also emphasize the recognition of teacher contributions and the promotion of teacher leadership roles in school governance. By doing so, educational systems can better support the development of self-sustaining and high-performing teacher leaders.

### *Recommendations*

In light of the findings, several recommendations are proposed. For future research, it is recommended to explore other factors that may influence teacher leaders' job performance, such as organizational culture, work environment, and motivation. Conducting similar studies in different contexts or regions may also help validate and extend the findings. Longitudinal research designs are encouraged to examine the long-term effects of leadership behavior on performance and to provide a more comprehensive understanding of these dynamics.

For practice, school heads are encouraged to strengthen leadership practices that focus on empowerment, communication, and recognition. Teacher leaders should be supported through continuous professional development programs that enhance their instructional and leadership competencies. Schools should also foster collaborative environments that encourage shared learning and mutual support among teachers.

For policy, it is recommended that educational authorities institutionalize teacher leadership roles and provide clear guidelines for their integration into school governance. Policies should support the establishment of professional learning communities and mentoring systems, as well as the continuous development of both school heads and teacher leaders. Furthermore, performance management systems should be enhanced to reflect a more holistic approach that captures both measurable outcomes and professional practices

---

## **Compliance with ethical standards**

### *Acknowledgments*

The author sincerely acknowledges Dr. Marilou D. Junsay, Program Chair of the PhD-EM Program, for her guidance and support throughout this research.

### *Disclosure of conflict of interest*

We, Maybelle G. Isidoro and Melanie N. Edig, declare that we have no conflicts of interest or competing interests to disclose regarding the publication of this manuscript or any institution, product, or entity mentioned herein. Furthermore, we have no affiliations with, or financial interests in, any products or organizations that could influence the study outcomes presented or compete with those discussed in the manuscript.

### *Statement of ethical approval*

Ethical approval adhered to Belmont Report principles, ensuring informed consent, confidentiality, voluntary participation, minimized risks, participant protection, and trustworthy procedures throughout the study for all respondents.

### *Statement of informed consent*

Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

## References

- [1] Sergiovanni T. Building community in schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers; 1994.
- [2] Rowe KJ. The imperative of evidence-based instructional leadership: Building capacity within professional learning communities via a focus on effective teaching practice [Internet]. 2008. Available from: [https://research.acer.edu.au/learning\\_processes/2](https://research.acer.edu.au/learning_processes/2)
- [3] Vega T, Travis B. An investigation of the effectiveness of reform mathematics curricula analyzed by ethnicity, socio-economic status, and limited English proficiency. *Math Comput Educ.* 2011;45(1):10–16.
- [4] Olson L. Leadership by teachers gains notice. *Education Week.* 2007;26(36):1–14.
- [5] Murphy J. The standards are reshaping the principalship. *Principal.* 2002;82(1):22–26.
- [6] UNESCO. Addressing exclusion in education: A guide to developing inclusive education systems [Internet]. 2012. Available from: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000222124>
- [7] Oracion CC. Teacher leadership in public schools in the Philippines [dissertation]. London: UCL Institute of Education; 2014. Available from: <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10021652/>
- [8] Hamilton JK. The relationship between principal leadership behaviors and teacher leadership: A mixed methods study [dissertation]. California State University, Fullerton; 2019. Available from: <https://www.proquest.com/openview/3b3e95ae37d39521ba711e52db20e9b4/>
- [9] Angelle P, Teague M. Leadership and collective efficacy: Teacher perceptions in three U.S. school districts. *J Educ Adm.* 2014;52(6):738–753. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-06-2013-0070>
- [10] Chen Y, Cheng J. Leadership behavior and job performance of teachers in public and private kindergartens. *Sch Eff Sch Improv.* 2001;23(1):1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2011.632422>
- [11] Meyers B, Meyers J, Gelzheiser L. Observing leadership roles in shared decision making. *J Educ Psychol Consult.* 2001;12(4):277–312. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532768XJEP1204\\_01](https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532768XJEP1204_01)
- [12] Schöner G, Kelso JS. A dynamic pattern theory of behavioral change. *J Theor Biol.* 1998;135(4):501–524. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5193\(88\)80273-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5193(88)80273-X)
- [13] Khan ZA, Nawaz A, Khan I. Leadership theories and styles: A literature review. *J Res Dev Manag.* 2016; 16:1–7.
- [14] Sentocnik S, Rupar B. School leadership of the future. *Eur Educ.* 2009;41(3):7–22. <https://doi.org/10.2753/EUE1056-4934410301>
- [15] Avey JB, Palanski ME, Walumbwa FO. Ethical leadership and follower behavior. *J Bus Ethics.* 2011; 98:573–582. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0610-2>.
- [16] Biswas S. Organizational culture and transformational leadership. *Indian J Ind Relat.* 2009;44(4):611–627. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27768234>
- [17] Cerit Y. Servant leadership and teachers' organizational commitment. *Int J Leadersh Educ.* 2010;13(3):301–317. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2010.496933>
- [18] Vecchio RP, Justin JE, Pearce C. Leadership and performance. *J Occup Organ Psychol.* 2008; 81:71–82. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317907X202482>
- [19] Snyder KJ. Instructional leadership for productive schools. *Educ Leadersh.* 1993;40(5):32–37. Available from: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ276375>
- [20] Badaracco JL. We don't need another hero. *Harv Bus Rev.* 2001;79(8):120–126.
- [21] Uhl-Bien M. Relational leadership theory. *Leadersh Q.* 2006; 17:654–676. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.007>
- [22] Bennett N, Wise C, Woods PA, Harvey J. Distributed leadership. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership; 2003.
- [23] Rutherford C. Teacher leadership and organizational structure. *J Educ Change.* 2006;7(1):59–76. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-006-0013-4>
- [24] Printy S, Marks H, Bowers AJ. Integrated leadership. *J Sch Leadersh.* 2009; 19:504–532. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105268460901900501>

- [25] Gronn P. Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *Leadersh Q.* 2002;13(4):423–451. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(02\)00120-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00120-0)
- [26] Harris A, Spillane J. Distributed leadership through the looking glass. *Manag Educ.* 2008;22(1):31–34. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jea.2008.07446baa.001>
- [27] Ivankova NV, Creswell JW, Stick SL. Mixed-methods sequential explanatory design. *Field Methods.* 2006;18(1):3–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05282260>
- [28] Creswell JW, Creswell JD. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach.* Sage; 2017. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/research-design/book255675>
- [29] Sheokand U. Rethinking school leadership. *IJSAT.* 2025;16(4). Available from: <https://www.ijSAT.org/research-paper.php?id=9804>
- [30] Tiongson GP. Transformational leadership skills of school heads. *Int J Multidiscip Educ Res Innov.* 2025;3(3):631314. Available from: <https://www.neliti.com/publications/631314/>
- [31] Voelkel JG, et al. Megastudy testing 25 treatments. *Science.* 2024;386(6719): eadh4764. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adh4764>
- [32] Zhao Y. COVID-19 as a catalyst for educational change. *Prospects.* 2020;49(1):29–33. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-020-09477-y>
- [33] Timperley C. Embodied pedagogies. In: *Subversive pedagogies.* Routledge; 2021.
- [34] Ryan RM, Deci EL. Self-determination theory. *Contemp Educ Psychol.* 2020; 61:101860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>
- [35] Spillane JP. Accountability systems cross-nationally. *Educ Assess Eval Account.* 2021;33(3):581–585. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-021-09370-y>
- [36] Creswell JW, Creswell JD. Mixed methods research: Developments, debates, and dilemmas. In: *Research in organizations: Foundations and methods of inquiry.* 2005. p. 315–326.
- [37] Department of Education (DepEd). *Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS).* 2020.
- [38] National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. *The Belmont Report.* 1978. Available from: <https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/>
- [39] Avolio BJ, Walumbwa FO, Weber TJ. Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annu Rev Psychol.* 2009;60(1):421–449. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621>