



**LEADERSHIP STYLES OF SCHOOL HEADS  
AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO  
SCHOOL PERFORMANCE**

**Richard M. Oco, PhD**

Full-time Alubijid National Comprehensive High School Teacher

Part-time The New El Salvador Colleges Instructor

Part-time Southern Philippines College Graduate School Instructor

**ABSTRACT**

This study aimed to figure the Leadership Styles of the school heads and its relationship to school performance. Descriptive design were use in this study with instruments on lifelike leadership style incidents as means to determine the responses of the 161 teacher respondents and 5 school heads respondents on leadership styles.

Specifically, it sought to offer data on; (1) respondents' profile: gender, civil status, present position and length of service; (2) leadership styles: Autocratic, Delegative, Democratic, Servant and Transformational; (3) School performance: SBM Level of Practice, Dropout Rate, Cohort Survival Rate and Academic performance. Statistical tools like mean, percentage, z-test, f-test, t-test and Spearman rank correlation coefficients were used to check the statistical significance of the data.

The study revealed that the majority of the teachers were women, married, 0-7 years teaching service and present position of Teacher I-III. The majority of the school heads were male, married, 8-15 years in service with the present position of Head Teacher IV.

Overall top 3 leadership styles for school heads were Delegative, Democratic and Transformational. School Heads' present position and civil status showed significant difference on Autocratic, Democratic and Transformational leadership styles. Gender showed no significant difference significant difference on Delegative and Servant leadership styles. Length of service showed very high adherence on all leadership styles.

Overall top 3 leadership styles for teachers were Autocratic, Democratic and Servant leadership styles. Teachers' gender showed no significance in all five leadership styles. Civil Status, Present Position and Length of Service showed significant difference on Autocratic, Democratic and Transformational leadership styles. Significant correlations were registered between leadership styles and school performance.

In the final analysis, it was concluded that since democratic leadership style is the dominant style in managing teachers and students in school, continuous development trainings and programs must be

implemented since both teachers and school heads are still at their novice level in terms of experience to ensure that performance of school meets if not exceeds the standards set by the government. Finally, handling school requires mastery on various leadership styles so that various school scenario and problems will be addressed properly.

**KEYWORDS: Autocratic, Delegative, Democratic, Servant, Transformational, Performance Indicators**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The leadership styles of school heads play a pivotal role that can affect the school performance in this study. The leadership of school heads deals with the administrator's way of supervising his/her subordinates. A good school head promotes good relationships towards the teachers working with him/her. Teachers' awareness over their school heads' positive doing on duties and responsibilities clearly inspires them to do it to their own work as well. While a school head who is a deficiency and an advocate on promoting chaos, confusions, and factions towards his subordinates definitely losses the teachers' trusts and confidence.

School heads are the recognized leaders in schools; they are entrusted with authorities, responsibilities, and accountabilities in the success or failure of the institution. Their position is significant to the educational development and academic growth and performance of the learners because the school heads are usually the major source and the driving force that uphold the welfare of the organization.

As leaders in the field of education, the school heads have been entrusted with the responsibility of ensuring that the school runs efficiently and students are provided with the best and quality education that at the end become the indispensable workforce of the community and the country (Hardman, 2011).

School heads, which form the core of a school's leadership team, are increasingly touted as important determinants of school effectiveness. Thus, school heads play a key role as the primary leaders of schools and will greatly influence all aspects of the functions of the schools with their behaviors, personal characteristics and also biases. This view has garnered them added scrutiny in recent educational policy debates over how to improve schools (Sabado, 2014).

The best thing about leadership is that we all bring something different from each other. There are no individuals who can express leadership in the same way. Each of us can be a unique leader, and that is why trying to put leadership into a box always fails. If one has to read articles on good leadership qualities, one would usually see factors like integrity, effective communication, and influence.

Most of the time, people tend to believe that the study on leadership is not that necessary. But leadership has always been important. Leadership is desperately important. That is why leadership is the most abused theme in research studies.

This study is a response to the need to have a basis of inference on the importance of leadership styles of public school heads to the school performance and to the teachers as well. The results of this study might show how various leadership styles affect school performance and how they are used in different scenarios at school. The results of this study might also show how school heads and their teachers fare in making democracy functional in the management of their schools.

This study aimed to determine the leadership styles as perceived by the public school heads and teachers from the selected Junior High Schools in Misamis Oriental and its relation to school performance.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the school heads and teachers from the selected Junior High Schools in Misamis Oriental in terms of gender, civil status, present position and length of service?
2. What are the respondents' comparative responses on implementing leadership styles at their respective schools?
3. What is the significant difference in the responses of School heads and Teachers on leadership styles when grouped according to gender, civil status, present position and length of service?
4. What is the performance of the school in terms of the following indicators, Academic Performance, Cohort Survival Rate, Drop-Out Rate and SBM Level of Practice?
5. What is the significant relationship between the leadership styles of school heads and teachers and the school performance?

## **THEORITICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

This study was anchored on the premise that the quality of leadership makes a significant difference in school and student outcomes (Juntahan, 2012). Important theoretical contributions to the understanding of Leadership is Taylor's theory of Scientific Management.

Scientific Management is a philosophy that dealt with the relationship between people and work. Finding "one best way" for the job, finding the proper person for the job with maximum output using minimum effort was the main goal of the theory.

Taylor believed that if both labor and management embrace this philosophy, they would become teammates rather than adversaries, disregarding their traditional relationship and shaping in greater profits than before (Sabado, 2014).

Leadership involves the ability of an individual to influence others to pursue defined goals and objectives, establishing relationships with

individuals affiliated with the organization sufficient to gain their commitment and acquiring knowledge of individuals and situations (Hardman, 2011).

The study considered the Input-Process-Output model. For the input, the profile of the school heads and teachers on gender, civil status, present position and length of service were determined. In the process, the perception of the respondents on Leadership Styles namely: Autocratic, Delegative, Democratic, Servant and Transformational were checked. The school performance on the dropout rate, cohort survival rate, academic performance and SBM Level of Practice were also checked.

In the Autocratic Leadership Style, the leader makes decisions without consulting with others. Autocratic leadership style is very effective when decision making does not need inputs and it does not affect people in carrying out their subsequent actions whether they were or were not involved in the decision-making (Napire, 2014).

Democratic Leadership Style means the leader involves the people in the decision-making, although the process for the final decision may vary from the leader having the final say to them facilitating consensus in the group. Democratic decision-making is usually appreciated by the people, especially if they have been used to the autocratic decisions with which they disagreed. Democratic style can be problematic when there is a wide range of opinions and there is no clear way of reaching an equitable final decision (Cuciac, 2016).

Delegative Leadership Style minimizes the leader's involvement in decision-making. Delegative works best when: people are capable and motivated in making their own decisions, and where there is no requirement for central coordination.

In Transformational Leadership Style, the leader examines and searches for the needs and motives of others while seeking a higher agenda of needs (Cuciac, 2016).

In Servant Leadership Style, leaders often lead by example, although it is usually admired in politics, employees prefer a servant leader. They have high integrity and lead with generosity. Servant Leadership style creates a positive culture and high morale among team members. Advocates of the servant leadership model suggest that it is a good way to move ahead and can achieve power because of their values, ideals, and ethics. This style also takes time to apply correctly. It is ill-suited to situations where one has to make quick decisions or meet tight deadlines (Del Valle, 2016).

## **METHODOLOGY**

The study utilized the descriptive design which is appropriate for its objective to determine the subjects' perceptions on the leadership styles of

their school heads under conditions that naturally occurred in their school environment. The data collected by the study provided bases of inference on the said styles in the normal daily management of their schools at the time when the research was conducted.

The design involved description, recording, analyses, and interpretations of a prevailing conditions as illustrated in the conceptual framework. Furthermore, the unstructured interview was also conducted to confirm the consolidated data and for the respondents' opportunity to express their reasons and sentiments on perceived prevailing leadership styles.

The actual population of 161 teachers and 5 school heads were the respondents of this study, no sampling procedure was employed; hence the whole universe is the total number of respondents.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Profile of the teacher respondents**

Data show that the majority of the respondents are female with 121 out of 161 or 75%, while 40 out of 161 or 25% of the respondents are male. These data imply that the teaching profession is still dominated by females. These data affirm the report of Civil Service Commission (CSC) as quoted by Congressional Commission on Education (CCE) reported in 1991, eighty-four point two (84.2) percent of the teachers' population was occupied by females.

Data also re-affirm the Congressional Commission on Education study in 1993, concluding that female teachers covered 80.9 percent population, resulting in a 1:4 male to female ratio. Even the Department of Education record showed that 86% of its employees were women (Esplanada, 2010). Moreover, the studies of Juntahan (2012) found out that most of the teachers were female and Agawin (2014) revealed that female populace dominated the teaching world.

Married teachers also dominated the populace with 83 out of 161 or 51% while the singles were 77 out of 161 or 48%. These data implied that the majority of the teacher respondents were married. Teaching in public schools with a permanent tenure is considered by married respondents as a secured profession for life's sustainability of their family.

In the aspect of the length of service, 86 out of 161 teachers or 54% were at 0-7 years of teaching. This was followed closely by 16- 23 years and 8-15 years of teaching with 29 out of 161 or 18% and 28 out of 161 or 17% respectively. Teachers with 24 years and above teaching service came last with a tally of 18 out of 161 or 11%. These data implied that in terms of the teaching experience the majority of the respondents were still at their novice level, which means that they are still young in the teaching service in the Department of Education. Teachers at novice level need to

participate in various training and seminars to get acquainted with the environment, rule, and regulations of the department that they are serving.

Moreover, in terms of present position 136 out of 161 or 85% of the respondents were holding Teacher I-III positions, while 15 out of 161 or 9% of the respondents have Master Teacher positions and 10 out of 161 or 6% was handling Head teacher positions. These data implied that the teacher respondents are still at the entry level in the Department of Education which is on a teacher I to teacher III position wherein they can decide on whether to remain as a teacher or become one of the school heads in the future.

### **Profile of the school heads respondents**

Data revealed that male respondents were 4 out of 5 or 80%, while 1 out of 5 or 20% of the respondents were female. These data implied that the majority of the school heads managing the schools were male. These findings differ from the study of Magtabog (2016) which revealed that there are more female school heads than males, which means that further study on this variable must be conducted for confirmation of the findings.

Married School Heads dominated the populace with 4 out 5 or 80%, while the widow was 1 out of 5 or 20%. Which means that more married school heads are willing to handle schools for these positions has higher salary and that their maturity level in terms of decision making are already high.

In the aspect of the length of service, 5 out of 5 or 100% of the school heads were at 8-15 years of serving as school heads. These data implied that the school heads were still very eager in performing their duties and responsibilities as school heads since they are still new to the position and that they are still learning and adjusting to it.

These findings support the study of Magtabog (2016) who revealed that more school heads are still at the novice level in their experience as school heads. Moreover, in terms of present position 3 out of 5 or 60% of the respondents were holding Head Teacher IV positions, while 2 out of 5 or 40% of the respondents have principal II positions. These findings contradict the study of Magtabog (2016) who revealed that there are more school heads with principal positions than with head teacher positions.

These data implied that school heads do not have the same positions due to factors like their managerial experience is still not enough, lack of accredited training and seminars and lack of item positions and needs to undergo training on School Head Development Program (SHDP).

## Comparative Responses on Leadership Style

Table 1 presents the comparative responses of school heads and teachers on leadership style. Data revealed that school heads top 3 most used leadership styles were Democratic, Transformational and Delegative Leadership Styles. This implies that the school heads value the importance of freedom, shared duties and responsibilities and in making a difference for the school and the learners as well. School heads are unselfish in sharing their managerial knowledge and skills.

Table 1  
Comparative Responses of School Heads and Teachers  
on Leadership Style

Leadership Style	School Heads		Teachers	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Autocratic	3.58	5	3.78	1
Delegative	3.70	3	3.69	4
Democratic	3.82	1	3.73	2
Servant	3.68	4	3.72	3
Transformational	3.72	2	3.62	5

Furthermore, the data also revealed that the top 3 perceived leadership styles of school heads as observed by the teachers were Autocratic, Democratic and Servant Leadership Styles. These data implied that teachers perceived their school heads to be autocratic on things that needs to be implemented even if there are objections into it. Teachers also realized that they were given the opportunity to explore and put their leadership skills into practice in serving the learners and the community where the school is situated as well.

Overall, all the 5 leadership styles generated mean with the description of “Always” and with the interpretation of “Very High Adherence” both by the school heads and teachers. Only Democratic Leadership Style was consistent among the top 3 choices of both respondents. This data implies that sense of freedom is being emphasize in the school and learning environment. These findings affirmed the study of Bago (2010) which revealed that seventy-five percent (75%) of the administrators assessed themselves to be supporting and twenty-five percent ( 25%) considered themselves as coaching (more of democratic way). The teachers regarded their administrators otherwise: their principals were perceived more of the coaching type of instructional leaders.

However school heads must be clear on the leadership style that they are implementing to the school and the teachers because this situation may lead to misunderstanding and confusions. School heads

must let their teachers learn the difference of each leadership styles that they employ at work to have better understanding and interpretations.

### Test Significance on School Heads' Responses on Leadership Style

Table 2  
Overall Distribution of School Heads' Perception on Leadership Style

Leadership Styles	Variables			
	Gender	Civil Status	Present Position	Length of Service
Autocratic	NS	NS	S	VHA
Delegative	S	S	NS	VHA
Democratic	NS	NS	S	VHA
Servant	S	S	NS	VHA
Transformational	NS	NS	S	VHA

NS=Not Significant S=Significant VHA=Very High Adherence

Table 2 shows the overall distribution of the School Heads' responses on leadership styles. Data showed that in terms of Gender the respondents have the same view on Autocratic, Democratic and Transformational Leadership Styles. Gender showed significant difference in responses for Delegative and Servant Leadership Styles with male school heads giving much emphasis in delegating tasks to others as well as in participating in community activities.

These findings contradict with the studies of Sawati et al (2013) who found out that gender is not significant to leadership styles, Napire (2014) who revealed that gender has no relation to leadership style and Ndiku et al (2015) who revealed that gender was a non factor on school heads' leadership practices while it contradicts the study of Anbazhagan et al (2010) who yielded opposite results.

Civil Status revealed no significant difference on Autocratic, Democratic and Transformational Leadership Styles. Significant difference was also generated for Delegative and Servant Leadership Styles with married school heads giving much emphasis in delegating tasks to others as well as in participating in community activities. These findings contradict with the study of Napire (2014) who revealed that civil status has no significant relationship with school heads' leadership practices.

Present position reveals that School heads respondents have the same responses on Autocratic, Democratic and Transformational Leadership Styles and differs in their perception on Delegative and Servant Leadership Styles with school heads with head teacher position giving much emphasis in delegating tasks to others as well as in participating in community activities.

These findings aligns with the study of Ndiku et al (2015) who showed there is a significant difference in the perception of school heads' leadership practices while it contradicts with the study of Napire (2014)



who revealed that the position has no significant relationship on school heads' leadership practices.

In terms of length of service, Data revealed that all the school heads have very high adherence in all 5 leadership styles. They recognize the importance and uniqueness of each of the leadership style. These findings support the studies of Balbon (2016) leadership styles were observable at school and Del Valle (2016) who revealed the leadership styles among school heads were highly observed and manifested. Moreover, the study of Napire (2014) revealed that length of service has no significant relationship on school heads' leadership styles while the study of Quin et al (2015) revealed that school heads that employ all leadership styles have the biggest impact on student achievement.

### Data on School Performance

Table 3  
Data on Schools' Academic Performance

School	Average of Increase	Rating	Interpretation
A	70.23	2	Average
B	58.52	2	Average
C	68.15	2	Average
D	50.94	1	Marginal
E	44.61	1	Marginal

Secondary – Baseline 48%

Option 2

1 – Marginal: At least 7% Inc.

1 – Marginal: 26-50% increase

2 – Average: At least 8% Inc.

2 – Average: 51-75% increase

3 – High: With 10% Inc. or 75% increase

3 – High: 76-100% increase

Table 3 presents the schools' academic performance. Data revealed that 3 out of 5 or 60% of the schools under this research got the average increase of academic performance between 51% - 75% with the rating of 2 and with the interpretation "average". The other two schools got the average increase on the academic performance of between 26% - 50% with the ratings of 1 and with the interpretation "marginal".

These data imply that the majority of the schools got an increase in their National Achievement Test Scores that qualifies to the standards of School Based Management assessment tools and majority of the schools had a high rate of students who have average academic performance although it did not meet the passing mark of 75%. Thus, innovations and interventions like remedial classes, review classes, enrichment classes and even tutorials were still implemented to achieve much higher results.

These findings confirmed the report of Post (2016) wherein the average NAT rate of secondary schools in the Philippines from 2008 to 2012 of the subjects under this test are: Mathematics (41.51%), Science (41.45%), English (49.52%), AP (54.70%) and Filipino (48.82%). Quite low to the national passing rate requirement of 75%.

Table 4  
Schools' data on Cohort Survival Rate

School	Average of increase	Rating	Interpretation
A	21.30	3	High
B	7.95	2	Average
C	18.40	3	High
D	14.34	3	High
E	5.90	1	Marginal

Baseline: 75%

1 – Marginal: At least 5% Inc.

2 – Average: At least 7% Inc.

3 – High: At least 10% Inc.

Table 4 presents the schools' cohort survival rate. Data revealed that 3 out of 5 or 60% of the schools under this research got the average increase of cohort survival rate more than 10% with the rating of 3 and with the interpretation "high".

The other two schools got the average increase of the cohort survival rate of more than 5% but less than 10% with the ratings of 2 and 1 with the interpretation "average" and "marginal" respectively. These data imply that the majority of the schools had a high rate of students who starts from grade 7 level and ends at grade 10 level for the past 3 years based on the standards set by the Department of education and School Based Management assessment tools. Thus, holding power of schools towards their students were imminent.

These findings aligned with the report of Post (2016) which stated that the average cohort survival rate of students in public schools in the Philippines from 2008 to 2012 was at 78.93%. Causes were lack of financial support due to poverty and the sometimes unexpected transfer of residences that led the student to stop from studying at school.

Table 5  
Schools' data on Dropout Rate

School	Average of Decrease	Rating	Interpretation
A	0.54	3	High
B	0.00	3	High
C	0.41	3	High
D	1.16	3	High
E	0.00	3	High

Baseline: 7.06

1 – Marginal: At least 4% Inc.

2 – Average: At least 2% Inc.

3 – High: 0 DR or less than 2%

Table 5 presents the schools' data on the dropout rate. Data revealed that all the 5 schools under this research got the average decrease on dropout rate less than 2% with the rating of 3 and with the interpretation "high".

These data imply that all the schools had a very low case of students who drop out for the past 3 years based on the standards set by the Department of education and School Based Management assessment tools. Per interview, the majority of the school heads and teachers agreed that several activities were conducted like remedial classes, home visitations and even counseling to ensure that students continue their studies.

These findings contradict the report of the Post (2016) which stated that the dropout rate from 2008 to 2012 is at 7.75% in the Philippine secondary schools. As well as on the data from the 2016 Annual Poverty Indicators Survey of the Philippine Statistics Authority as reported by Golez (2018) which showed that 3.8 million or one in 10 Filipinos aged 6 to 24 years old are not in school. Most of them or almost 3.3 million are aged 16 to 24 years old who was supposed to be in senior high school or college level already.

Furthermore, Findings from the study of Brown (2015) indicated that multiple styles of leadership are recommended as critical in complex environments like the reduction of dropout cases on the at-risk youth. It also indicated that students appreciated the role of management and the need for increased engagement in school.

Table 6  
Schools' data on SBM Level of Practice

School	SBM Rating	Description	Level	Interpretation
A	2.47	Better	II	Maturing
B	1.20	Good	I	Developing
C	2.35	Better	II	Maturing
D	2.20	Better	II	Maturing
E	1.27	Good	I	Developing

Table 6 presents the schools' data on School Based Management (SBM) Level of Practices. Data revealed that 3 out of 5 or 60% of the schools under this research got the ratings under the description better, equivalent to level II and with the interpretation "maturing" as evaluated by the division level and regional level SBM evaluating teams.

The other two schools got the ratings under the description good, equivalent to level I and with the interpretation "developing" as evaluated by the division level evaluating teams. These data imply that majority of the schools had a maturing rate of based on the standards set by the Department of education and School Based Management assessment tools. The majority of the schools were able to adjust in implementing the vision, mission, goals and objectives of the Department of education without much supervision and monitoring of the central office ever since the implementation of "decentralization" rule.

### **Test Significance on School Performance and Leadership Styles**

Table 7 presents test significance on school performance and responses on leadership style of school heads. Data revealed that Academic Performance with computed t - value of 11.174, Cohort Survival Rate with computed t - value of 3.348, Dropout Rate with computed t - value of 15.084 and School Based Management Level of Practice rating with computed t - value of 15.247 were all higher than the t - critical value of 2.306 at 0.05 level of significance. These data means that there is a significant relationship on the school heads' responses towards the leadership styles and school performance. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 7  
Test Significance on School Performance and  
Leadership Style Responses of School Heads

School Performance	r - value	Correlation Level	t - value	Interpretation	Decision
Academic Performance	-0.300	Weak Correlation	11.174	Significant	Reject Ho
Cohort Survival Rate	-0.400	Moderate Correlation	3.348	Significant	Reject Ho
Dropout Rate	-0.564	Moderate Correlation	15.084	Significant	Reject Ho
SBM rating	-0.300	Weak Correlation	15.247	Significant	Reject Ho

Legend: Critical t - value at 0.05 level of significance =2.306

These data imply that leadership styles have significant effects on the school performance. Cohort Survival rate and Dropout rate registered moderate negative correlation with leadership styles while Academic Performance and School Based Management Level of Practice rating registered weak negative correlation. This means that if the school heads will not perform their managerial duties properly, it will result to negative effects on the school performance. Thus, leadership styles play important role in the outcomes of school performance.

These findings aligns with the studies of Wang and Guan (2018) with results indicating that the school Authoritarian leadership had moderate but significant indirect effects on student achievement, Morgan (2015) with study results indicating significant positive relationships between perceived leadership practices of school heads to academic performance and Calibara (2016) who revealed that school heads' perceptions on leadership practices has a significant relationship on school performance.

However, the study of Mphale (2014) found out that the increase in students dropping out of school have no effects on some of the roles played by the school leadership to retain students and recommended that parents, community and teachers should work together to enhance student retention.

## REFERENCES

- Agawin, C. G. (2014). Exploring school leaders' leadership styles that satisfy secondary school teachers (Research project, Capitol University, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines)
- Anbazhagan, S., et al. (2010). The influence of age and gender on the leadership styles (Thesis, Bharathidasan University, Trichy, TN, India). Retrieved: November 23, 2018. <http://iosrjournals.org/iosr-jbm/papers/Vol16-issue5/Version-3/O0165397103.pdf>
- Bago, A. (2010). Supervision of instruction: The philippine perspective. Manila, Philippines: Rex Book Store Incorporated
- Balbon, S. (2016). School heads administrative skills affecting teachers' participation in the implementation of k-12 curriculum: Basis for district human resource development plan. Retrieved December 7, 2016, from the journal of the Philippine conference on basic education researchers 2016, PICC, Pasay City, Philippines, 2016
- Brown, K. E. (2018). The link between leadership and reduced high school dropout rates. Retrieved January 05, 2019. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu>
- Calibara, L. O. (2016). Effects of school heads with the performance of teachers in teaching and learning process. Retrieved December 7, 2016, from the journal of the Philippine conference on basic education researchers 2016, PICC, Pasay City, Philippines, 2016
- Cuciac, L. S. (2016). The influence of teachers' perceived leadership styles and students' learning approaches on academic achievement. Retrieved May 20, 2017, from <http://www.usv.ro/edrp/index.php/EDRP/article/view/22>
- Del Valle, J. (2016). Leadership style and related variables: Inputs to school head's good governance. Retrieved December 7, 2016, from the journal of the Philippine conference on basic education researchers 2016, PICC, Pasay City, Philippines, 2016
- Esplanada, J. E. (2010). Male teachers in the Philippines. Retrieved May 20, 2017, from [http://www.menteach.org/news/male\\_teachers\\_in\\_the\\_phillipines](http://www.menteach.org/news/male_teachers_in_the_phillipines)

- Golez, P. (2018). K to 12 blamed for the high dropout rate in schools. Retrieved January 05, 2019 from <https://www.panaynews.net/k-12-blamed-for-high-dropout-rate-in-schools/>
- Hardman, B. K. (2011). Teacher's perception of their principal's leadership style and the effects on student achievement in improving and non-improving schools (Dissertation, University of South Florida, U.S.A.). Retrieved: November 23, 2018. <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com.ph/&httpsredir=1&article=4921&context=etd>
- Juntahan, G. G. (2012). Leadership practices of school heads as perceived by the public elementary school teachers in jasaan district, s.y. 2011-2012 (Masteral Thesis, Southern Philippines College, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines)
- Magtabog, T. A. (2016). Leadership and management practices of school heads: Basis for continuous improvement program (Dissertation, Capitol University, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines).
- Morgan, W. (2015). The influence of school leadership practices on classroom management, school environment and academic underperformance. (Walden University, U.S.A., 2015) Retrieved May 20, 2017, from <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1451&context=dissertations>
- Mphale, L. (2014). Prevalent dropout: A challenge on the roles of school management teams to enhance students' retention in botswana junior high schools (University of Botswana Gaborone) Retrieved: November 05, 2017. [https://ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol\\_5\\_No\\_11\\_1\\_October\\_2014/19.pdf](https://ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol_5_No_11_1_October_2014/19.pdf)
- Napire, J. N. (2014). Adversity quotient and leadership style in relation to the demographic profile of the elementary school principals in the second congressional district of camarines sur (Dissertation, University of Northeastern Philippines, Camarines Sur, Philippines). Retrieved: November 22, 2018. [http://www.peaklearning.com/documents/PEAK\\_GRI\\_Bautista\\_Pascua\\_Tiu\\_Vela.pdf](http://www.peaklearning.com/documents/PEAK_GRI_Bautista_Pascua_Tiu_Vela.pdf)
- Ndiku, M. L. et al. (2015). The correlates of leadership amongst selected secondary school stakeholders in musoma municipality. (University

- of Eastern Africa, Kenya, 2015) Retrieved May 20, 2017, from <http://www.sciepub.com/reference/148486>
- Post, G. (2016). Basic education statistics in the Philippines. Retrieved January 05, 2019. <<https://www.teacherph.com/basic-education-statistics-philippines/>>
- Sabado, N. P. (2014). The influence of leadership behavior of school heads with the performance of public and private high school teachers in kidapawan city division (Dissertation, University of Southern Mindanao, Philippines). Retrieved: November 22, 2018.[http://www.academia.edu/8219636/The\\_Influence\\_of\\_Leadership\\_Behavior\\_to\\_the\\_Teachers\\_Performance](http://www.academia.edu/8219636/The_Influence_of_Leadership_Behavior_to_the_Teachers_Performance)
- Sawati, M. J. et al. (2013). Do qualifications, experience and age matter for principals leadership styles? (Hazara University, Mansehra, Pakistan, 2013) Retrieved May 20, 2017, from [http://hrmars.com/hrmars\\_papers/Do\\_Qualification,\\_Experience\\_and\\_Age\\_Matter\\_for\\_Principals\\_Leadership\\_Styles.pdf](http://hrmars.com/hrmars_papers/Do_Qualification,_Experience_and_Age_Matter_for_Principals_Leadership_Styles.pdf)
- Quin, J., et al. (2015). Comparison of leadership practices: Implications for school districts and principal preparation programs. (University of Southern Mississippi, U.S.A., 2015) Retrieved May 20, 2017, from Journal of Leadership Education, <http://www.journalofleadershiped.org>
- Wang, H., & Guan, B. (2018). The positive effect of authoritarian leadership on employee performance: The moderating role of power distance. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 357. Retrieved February 16, 2016. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00357