

**21ST CENTURY LEADERSHIP STYLES OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AS
CORRELATES TO THE TEACHERS’ PERFORMANCE IN THE DIVISION
OF MARIKINA CITY: BASIS FOR PROPOSED CAPACITY
BUILDING PROGRAM**

**DR. ARLOU JHON P. FABULA¹, DR. RUEN P. LOMO²,
DR. ROMEO A. PILONGO³**

Nangka Elementary School Pamantasan ng
Lungsod ng Marikina Schools Division Office
– Marikina City
DOI:10.63305/742032

Article Info

Article history:
Received June 30, 2026
Revised July 7, 2026
Accepted July 13, 2026

Abstract

This study delves into the demographics and leadership perceptions of administrators and teachers in public elementary schools in Marikina City, aiming to comprehend their influence on educational outcomes. The study reveals that both administrators and teachers primarily belong to the 36 to 53-year age bracket, indicative a stable and experienced workforce. The study uncovers a gender disparity, with teaching roles predominantly occupied by females, while administrative positions show a more balanced gender representation, demonstrating progress toward gender equality in educational leadership.

A role distribution highlights that a significant portion of administrators serve as Grade Leaders, with fewer occupying higher-level positions such as Principal II-III/MT 2-3. This distribution suggests that higher positions are specialized and less prevalent. Most teachers focus on core teaching, underscoring a clear demarcation between instructional and leadership roles within the educational framework.

Leadership perceptions form a cornerstone of the study, revealing that both administrators and teachers recognize the efficacy of 21st-century leadership styles. Teachers rate the styles slightly higher, particularly in transformational, laissez-faire, and instructional leadership, pointing to a potential misalignment between administrators’ self-assessments and teachers’

perceptions. The study establishes a positive correlation between leadership styles and teacher performance.

The study recommends capacity-building programs to address identified gaps, promote effective leadership styles, and support teachers in achieving advanced educational qualifications. By leveraging the experience and expertise of seasoned educators, promoting gender equality, and emphasizing continuous improvement, Marikina City's public elementary schools can enhance leadership practices, align them with teachers' perceptions, to foster a more effective educational environment.

Keywords – *Democratic Leadership, Instructional Leadership, Laissez-Faire Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership*

INTRODUCTION

Leadership and management styles vary overtime. The emergence of 21st century leadership styles helps school administrators develop better leadership strategies for their respective stations.

A leader who is highly esteemed by some may be considered ineffective by others. Similarly, an innovative leader may be viewed as visionary by some, yet reckless by others (Smith & Johnson, 2022).

According to Yukl (2020), leadership is the process of envisioning a better future, creating a compelling vision, and empowering others to achieve it.

Maxwell (2017) argues that leadership is not about titles, positions, or flowcharts, but about one life influencing another. He further states that leadership is not dependent on formal positions or organizational structures, instead, it emphasizes the essence of leadership, which is the impact and influence one person can have on another. With the help of various

strategies school leaders were equipped and coped with the current trends in leadership which helped them to become effective and efficient school administrators.

According to Northouse (2020), leadership is the capacity to translate vision into reality through effective decision-making, communication, and ability to inspire action in others. Leaders should have the ability to maintain good interpersonal relationships with their followers and should motivate them to achieve organizational objectives.

Sims (2021) emphasized that leaders are intrinsically linked to their followers, and (Northouse, 2016) emphasizes that leadership is contingent upon the ability to influence group of individuals who share a common objective.

Moreover, a leader who is highly esteemed by some may be considered ineffective by others. Similarly, an innovative leader may be viewed as visionary by some, yet reckless by others (Smith & Johnson, 2022). They posited that

perceptions of leadership are inherently subjective, influenced by the individual's own interpretation and perspective.

The subjective interpretations make it challenging to arrive at a universally accepted definition.

In the field of education, the need for educational leaders who can effectively implement change in their schools has never been greater.

The Department of Education's policy “No Child Left Behind” (2010) demanded schools to meet new educational standards. Schools' new leaders who are not just willing, but who are able to face the challenges of the education sector.

It is crucial for school leaders to provide a clear direction that will lead to the achievement of its organizational objectives.

Based on the idea of lifelong learning, the Department of Education acknowledges the significance of professional standards in the improvement of educators and school

administrators. The DepEd upholds that quality student learning depends on quality teachers, who are supported by quality school leaders (DO 24, s. 2020).

Leadership styles affect the organization and employees' performance differently. Styles of leadership affect organizational culture, and consequently its efficacy.

The major driver for success in modern organizations is an excellent leader who has the intelligence, passion, and power to influence people, technical expertise, and knowledge of how to manage the organization's human capital. For organizations to succeed in the global arena, leaders must leverage on team performance. This is possible when a leader is knowledgeable of the proper mix of people to put in teams. If modern organizations must continue to persist in the global arena, leaders must be willing to explore and pay attention on how to build cohesive teams that can deliver positive

outcomes (Vivas, 2015).

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- Determine if there are significant differences between the assessments of administrators and teachers regarding these leadership styles.
- Identify if there are significant differences in how leadership styles are assessed based on the specific profiles of the respondents
- Determine the performance level of teachers based on their individual performance commitment and review form (IPCRF) for the 2022-2023 school year.
- Establish whether there is a significant relationship between the 21st-century leadership styles of school administrators and the performance of teachers
- Propose a specific capacity-building program based on the study's findings to enhance administrative effectiveness and teacher performance.

METHODOLOGY

Descriptive method of research was employed which determined the 21st century leadership styles of school administrators through quantifiable data, such as the connection between variables

elements obtained as in their natural conditions. Descriptive research is defined as a research method that describes the characteristics of the population or phenomenon being studied. This methodology focuses more on the “what” of the research subject than the “why” of the research subject. It also refers to research questions, design of the study, and data analysis conducted on that topic. The research has significant advantages. These are:

(1) A researcher can conduct descriptive research using specific methods like observational method, case study method, and survey method. Among these three, all primary data collection methods are covered, which provides a lot of information. This can be used for future research or even developing a hypothesis of research objects. (2) Since the data collected is qualitative and

quantitative, it gives a holistic understanding of a research topic. The information is varied, diverse, and thorough. (3) Descriptive research allows for the research to be conducted in the respondent’s natural environment, which ensures that high-quality and honest data is collected and (4) As the sample size is generally large, descriptive research, the data collection is quick to conduct and is inexpensive.

This research had a group of participants. The first group of participants are the School Administrators utilizing purposive sampling. Nine (9) administrators are considered per school. The second group of participants are teachers who are chosen utilizing systematic random sampling. A total of three hundred eight (308) out of one thousand three hundred thirty-eight (1338) teachers are considered as the second group.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Assessment of Two Groups of Respondents as Regards the 21st Century Leadership Styles of School Administrators from Public Elementary Schools in the Division of Marikina City in Terms of Transformational Leadership

A. Transformational Leadership	Administrators			Teachers		
	$\bar{x}$	SD	VI	$\bar{x}$	SD	VI
1. work with the planning team to develop and implement school plans that align with institutional goals and practices.	3.03	0.63	HE	3.28	0.63	VHE
2. work with school personnel to communicate DepEd's vision, mission and core values to the wider school community to strengthen shared understanding and alignment of school policies, programs, projects and activities.	3.27	0.64	VHE	3.25	0.69	HE
3. serve as a role model within the school and the school community in general, embodying the vision, mission and core values of DepEd.	3.22	0.73	HE	3.32	0.62	VHE
4. involve stakeholders in improving the implementation of revised policies to ensure school operations are consistent with national and local laws, regulations and publications.	3.02	0.67	HE	3.41	0.63	VHE
5. use relevant research findings from credible sources to facilitate data- and evidence-based innovation to improve school performance.	3.25	0.67	HE	3.19	0.60	HE
Over-all	3.16		HE	3.29		VHE
1.00-1.75 (VLE); 1.76-2.50 (LE); 2.51-3.25 (HE); 3.26-4.00 (VHE)						

The table provides an analysis of how administrators and teachers perceive the transformational leadership styles of school administrators in public elementary

schools in Marikina City for the School Year 2024-2025. Administrators rated their own effectiveness in aligning school plans with institutional goals with a mean score of 3.03 (SD = 0.63), categorizing it as "High Extent" (HE). In contrast, teachers rated this aspect slightly higher, with a mean score of 3.28 (SD = 0.63), interpreted as "Very High Extent" (VHE). This suggests that teachers perceive administrators as more effective in this area than administrators perceive themselves to be. When it comes to communicating the Department of Education's (DepEd) vision, mission, and core values, administrators gave themselves a mean score of 3.27 (SD = 0.64), which is a "Very High Extent" (VHE), while teachers rated this aspect at 3.25 (SD = 0.69), categorized as "High Extent" (HE).

Although the difference is small, it indicates that administrators believe they excel in communicating DepEd's core values more than teachers think they do. Both groups showed similar perceptions when it

came to using credible research for innovation, with administrators giving a mean score of 3.25 (SD = 0.67) and teachers

3.19 (SD = 0.60), both categorized as "High Extent" (HE). This alignment suggests agreement on the importance of research-driven practices yet also indicates room for improvement in this area. Overall, administrators' average mean score of 3.16, and teachers' average mean score of 3.29 reveal that, while administrators are generally seen as effective in areas like stakeholder engagement and the communication of institutional goals.

highly, especially

The result of the study is supported by the findings of Yacon, A et.al (2023) which suggests that there is a positive strong relationship existing between transformational and teachers' adaptive performance.

Table 2. Assessment of Two Groups of Respondents as Regards The 21st Century Leadership Styles of School Administrators from Public Elementary Schools in the Division of Marikina City in Terms of Transactional

“Advancing Education and Human Development Through Multidisciplinary Research”

Leadership

B. Transactional Leadership	Administrators			Teachers		
	$\bar{X}$	SD	VI	$\bar{X}$	SD	VI
1. promote a culture of inquiry that facilitates knowledge-based and evidence-based innovation to improve school outcomes and promote continuous improvement.	3.18	0.69	HE	3.27	0.62	VHE
2. prepare school personnel to manage school data and information using technology, including ICT, to ensure the efficient and effective running of the school.	3.23	0.65	HE	3.24	0.65	HE
3. enables school personnel to maintain effective HR management in accordance with laws, policies, manuals and guidelines based on school needs.	3.16	0.79	HE	3.26	0.67	VHE
4. manage emerging opportunities and challenges to promote equity and equality by responding to the needs of students, school personnel and other stakeholders.	3.09	0.80	HE	3.32	0.67	VHE
5. implement a school reward system that recognizes and encourages students, school personnel and other stakeholders for exemplary work and/or ongoing support.	3.24	0.73	HE	3.16	0.66	HE
Over-all	3.18		HE	3.25		HE

1.00-1.75 (VLE); 1.76-2.50 (LE); 2.51-3.25 (HE); 3.26-4.00 (VHE)

The assessment reveals some differences administrator as High Extent (HE), suggesting that administrators see themselves as more effective in this admistrator more reflective and committed than the administrator rate themselves. In effectiveness in utilizing stakeholder feedback to improve teaching as "Very High Extent" (VHE), while teachers rated this aspect but teachers believe that there is room for improvement. The

study of Sarwar, U et.al (2022) supports the findings of the study which states that when school administrators increase the use of a democratic leadershipstyle, teacher performance may improve as well.

Table 3. Assessment of Two Groups of Respondents as Regards The 21st Century Leadership Styles of School Administrators from Public Elementary Schools in the Division of Marikina City in Terms of Laissez-Faire Leadership

D. Laissez-Faire Leadership	Administrators			Teachers		
	$\bar{X}$	SD	VI	$\bar{X}$	SD	VI
1. Help teachers review, contextualize, and implement learning standards to make curriculum meaningful to students.	3.15	0.76	HE	3.22	0.61	HE
2. Provide opportunities for individuals and groups to manage leadership tasks and responsibilities.	3.15	0.74	HE	3.24	0.63	HE
3. demonstrate best practices in providing technical assistance to teachers to develop exemplary practices consistent with instructional standards and pedagogy in and across disciplines.	2.88	0.84	HE	3.29	0.64	VHE
4. engage the wider school community in the development of evidence-based interventions to maintain student achievement and achieve other outcomes.	2.80	0.75	HE	3.27	0.64	VHE
5. evaluate the achievements of school organizations such as student organizations, faculty clubs and parent associations to determine their impact on the achievement of institutional goals.	2.93	0.89	HE	3.21	0.68	HE
Over-all	2.98		HE	3.25		HE

1.00-1.75 (VLE); 1.76-2.50 (LE); 2.51-3.25 (HE); 3.26-4.00 (VHE)

“Advancing Education and Human Development Through Multidisciplinary Research”

Administrators rated their effectiveness in supporting curriculum development and delegating leadership tasks as "High Extent" (HE), while teachers rated these aspects slightly higher, suggesting a shared view of moderate effectiveness but a slightly more favourable perspective from the teachers. However, when it comes to providing technical assistance and engaging with the community, there is a significant discrepancy: teachers rated these areas as "Very High Extent" (VHE) whereas administrators rated themselves as "High Extent" (HE). This notable gap indicates that teachers perceive administrators as more effective in these areas than the administrators themselves do.

Both administrators and teachers have similar views regarding the evaluation of organizational achievements, reflecting a consistent perception of Effectiveness.

Overall, while administrators see their laissez-faire leadership

style as moderately effective, teachers have a more positive outlook, particularly regarding technical assistance and community engagement.

Teachers have similar views regarding the evaluation of organizational achievements, reflecting a consistent perception of effectiveness.

Table 4. Assessment of Two Groups of Respondents as Regards the 21st Century Leadership Styles of School Administrators From Public Elementary Schools in The Division of Marikina City in Terms of Instructional Leadership

E. Instructional Leadership	Administrators			Teachers		
	$\bar{x}$	SD	VI	$\bar{x}$	SD	VI
1. implements programs supporting student development in the school.	2.92	0.75	HE	3.24	0.68	HE
2. provide technical assistance to teachers in using assessment tools, strategies and outcomes in conjunction with curriculum requirements to ensure accountability for higher learning outcomes.	2.94	0.74	HE	3.20	0.64	HE
3. guide school personnel to communicate effectively through speaking, writing and positive use of communication platforms to facilitate information, collaboration and support.	3.01	0.97	HE	3.18	0.69	HE
4. incorporate laws, policies, guidelines and publications on the rights, privileges and benefits of school employees into school programs, projects and activities to ensure their overall well-being.	3.08	0.80	HE	3.20	0.70	HE
5. use learning outcomes to develop data driven interventions to maintain student achievement and achieve other outcome measures.	2.53	0.93	HE	3.22	0.66	HE
Over-all	2.90		HE	3.21		HE

1.00-1.75 (VLE); 1.76-2.50 (LE); 2.51-3.25 (HE); 3.26-4.00 (VHE)

Both groups agree that

instructional leadership practices are effective, rating them as "High Extent" (HE). However, teachers consistently rate these practices slightly higher than administrators, particularly in areas such as data-driven interventions and communication. For instance, administrators rated their effectiveness in supporting student development and providing technical assistance at 2.92 and 2.94, respectively, while teachers gave slightly higher scores for these areas. The most notable difference is in the use of data-driven interventions, where administrators scored 2.53, but teachers rated it much higher at 3.22. This significant gap suggests that teachers perceive these interventions as more impactful than administrators recognize.

Overall, while both administrators and teachers acknowledge the effectiveness of instructional leadership, teachers view it as more impactful. This discrepancy highlights the need for administrators to reassess their

self-perceptions and align them more closely with teachers' views to enhance the effectiveness of their instructional leadership and better support student achievement and development.

Table 5. Assessment of Two Groups of Respondents as regards the 21st Century Leadership Styles of School Administrators from Public Elementary Schools in the Division of Marikina City

21 st Century Leadership Styles	Administrators		Teachers	
	OX	VI	OX	VI
A. Transformational Leadership	3.16	HE	3.29	VHE
B. Transactional Leadership	3.18	HE	3.25	HE
C. Democratic Leadership	3.30	VHE	3.26	VHE
D. Laissez-Faire Leadership	2.98	HE	3.25	HE
E. Instructional Leadership	2.90	HE	3.21	HE
Over-all	3.10	HE	3.25	HE

1.00-1.75 (VLE); 1.76-2.50 (LE); 2.51-3.25 (HE); 3.26-4.00 (VHE)

Administrators rated their overall leadership effectiveness at 3.10, classified as "High Extent" (HE), while teachers rated it slightly higher at 3.25, also in the "High Extent" category. This suggests that teachers view the leadership styles as somewhat more effective than administrators do. Among specific styles, Transformational Leadership was rated 3.16 by administrators and 3.29 by teachers, indicating a

higher perceived impact from teachers. Both groups had similar ratings for Transactional Leadership, with administrators scoring it 3.18 and teachers 3.25. Democratic Leadership received favorable ratings from both, with administrators at 3.30 and teachers at 3.26, reflecting strong agreement on its effectiveness. However, Laissez-Faire Leadership was rated lower by administrators at 2.98 compared to 3.25 by teachers, suggesting that administrators value this style less. Instructional Leadership also showed a disparity, rated 2.90 by administrators and 3.21 by teachers, pointing to a greater perceived impact from the teachers' perspective.

Table 6. Significant Difference in the Assessment of Two Groups of Respondents as Regards 21st Century Leadership Styles of School Administrators from Public Elementary Schools in the Division of Marikina City in Terms of Transformational Leadership

Groups	#	$\bar{X}$	SD	Computed Z Value	Tabular Z Value (0.05)	Decision	Interpretation
Administrators	153	3.16	0.52	- 2.32	1.96	Reject H_0	Significant
Teachers	308	3.28	0.53				

Computed Z value $\geq$ Tabular Z value (Reject H_0) / Significant;
 Computed Z value $\leq$ Tabular Z value (Accept H_0) / Not Significant

There is a significant difference

in how administrators and teachers assess the 21st-century leadership styles, particularly transformational leadership, as evidenced by the computed Z value of ± 2.32 , which exceeds the tabular Z value of 1.96 at the 0.05 level of significance, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This finding is supported by Table 7, where administrators' overall mean score for transformational leadership was 3.16, interpreted as "High Extent," while teachers' mean score was 3.29, indicating "Very High Extent." This significant difference suggests that teachers perceive transformational leadership practices more favourably than administrators do. The disparity highlights that teachers may experience and value these leadership practices more positively, compared to the administrators' self-assessment.

Table 7. Significant Difference in the Assessment of Two Groups of Respondents Regarding 21st Century Leadership Styles of School Administrators from Public Elementary Schools in the

Division of Marikina City in terms of Transactional Leadership viewed consistently by both

Groups	#	$\bar{X}$	SD	Computed Z Value	Tabular Z Value (0.05)	Decision	Interpretation
Administrators	153	3.30	0.52	0.81	1.96	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Teachers	308	3.25	0.56				

Computed Z value $\geq$ Tabular Z value (Reject H_0) / Significant;
 Computed Z value $\leq$ Tabular Z value (Accept H_0) / Not Significant

There is no significant difference in how administrators and teachers assess transactional leadership styles, as indicated by the computed Z value of ± 1.08 , which is below the tabular Z value of 1.96 at the 0.05 level of significance, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This is supported by Table 8, where both administrators and teachers reported similar overall mean scores of 3.18 and 3.25, respectively, both interpreted as "High Extent." These results suggest that both groups perceive transactional leadership styles in a similar manner. Despite a slight numerical difference in their mean scores, the lack of statistical significance indicates that the effectiveness and value of transactional leadership are

administrators and teachers.

Table 8 Assessment of Two Groups of Respondents as Regards 21st Century Leadership Styles of School Administrators from Public Elementary Schools in the Division of Marikina City In Terms of Democratic Leadership

Groups	#	$\bar{X}$	SD	Computed Z Value	Tabular Z Value (0.05)	Decision	Interpretation
Administrators	153	3.18	0.60	- 1.08	1.96	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Teachers	308	3.24	0.55				

Computed Z value $\geq$ Tabular Z value (Reject H_0) / Significant;
 Computed Z value $\leq$ Tabular Z value (Accept H_0) / Not Significant

There is no significant difference in the assessment of two groups of respondents as regards the 21st Century leadership styles of administrators in terms of transactional leadership as seen in the computed Z value of 0.81 which is less than the tabular Z value of 1.96 that leads to the acceptance of null hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance. The claim was justified in Table 9 where the administrators and teachers obtained the same over-all means of 3.30 and 3.26 with verbal interpretation of very high extent.

This result indicates that both groups have similar perceptions of democratic leadership, with administrators reporting a mean score of 3.30 and teachers a mean score of 3.25. The similarity in these scores suggests that the effectiveness and impact of democratic leadership styles are perceived consistently by both administrators and teachers. Consequently, the null hypothesis is accepted, meaning there is no statistically significant difference in the evaluation of democratic leadership between the two groups.

Table 9. Significant Difference In the Assessment of Two Groups of Respondents as Regards 21st Century Leadership Styles of School Administrators from Public Elementary Schools in the Division of Marikina City in terms of Laissez-Faire Leadership

Groups	#	$\bar{X}$	SD	Computed Z Value	Tabular Z Value (0.05)	Decision	Interpretation
Administrators	153	2.98	0.62	- 4.47	1.96	Reject H_0	Significant
Teachers	308	3.24	0.54				

Computed Z value $\geq$ Tabular Z value (Reject H_0) / Significant;
 Computed Z value $\leq$ Tabular Z value (Accept H_0) / Not Significant

The assessment of laissez-faire leadership styles among school administrators reveals a significant

difference between the two groups of respondents, with a computed Z value of ± 4.47 exceeding the tabular Z value of 1.96, resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis at the 0.05 level of significance. This difference is supported by the data in Table 10, which shows that while administrators rated all five items related to transactional leadership as "High Extent," teachers rated only three out of five items similarly. This discrepancy indicates that teachers view transactional leadership as more effective than administrators perceive it to be. The significant variance suggests that administrators may need to reconsider their approach to transactional leadership to better align with the more favourable evaluations held by teachers.

Table 10. Significant Difference In The Assessment of Two Groups of Respondents as Regards 21st Century Leadership Styles of School Administrators from Public Elementary Schools in the Division of Marikina City in terms of Instructional Leadership

“Advancing Education and Human Development Through Multidisciplinary Research”

Groups	#	$\bar{X}$	SD	Computed Z Value	Tabular Z Value (0.05)	Decision	Interpretation
Administrators	153	2.90	0.62	- 5.17	1.96	Reject H_0	Significant
Teachers	308	3.20	0.56				

Computed Z value $\geq$ Tabular Z value (Reject H_0) / Significant;
 Computed Z value $\leq$ Tabular Z value (Accept H_0) / Not Significant

The computed Z value of -5.17 is greater than the tabular Z value of 1.96 at the 0.05 level of significance, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Administrators rated instructional leadership with a mean score of 2.90, while teachers gave it a higher mean score of 3.20. This significant discrepancy indicates that teachers view instructional leadership as more effective than administrators perceive it themselves.

Table 11. Significant Differences in the Assessment of Two Groups of Respondents as Regards 21st Century Leadership Styles of School Administrators from Public Elementary Schools in the Division of Marikina City

21 st Century Leadership Styles	Computed Z Value	Tabular Z Value (0.05)	Decision	Interpretation
A. Transformational Leadership	- 2.32	1.96	Reject H_0	Significant
B. Transactional Leadership	- 1.08	1.96	Accept H_0	Not Significant
C. Democratic Leadership	0.81	1.96	Accept H_0	Not Significant
D. Laissez-Faire Leadership	- 4.47	1.96	Reject H_0	Significant
E. Instructional Leadership	- 5.17	1.96	Reject H_0	Significant

Computed Z value $\geq$ Tabular Z value (Reject H_0) / Significant;
 Computed Z value $\leq$ Tabular Z value (Accept H_0) / Not Significant

The computed Z values indicate

significant differences for Transformational Leadership, Laissez-Faire Leadership, and Instructional Leadership, as all these values exceed the tabular Z value of 1.96. Specifically, the Transformational Leadership style had a computed Z value of -2.32, suggesting teachers view it more favorably than administrators do. The Laissez-Faire

Table 12. Significant Differences in the Assessment of Respondents When Grouped According To Their Profile as Regards 21st Century Leadership Styles of School Administrators from Public Elementary Schools in the Division of Marikina City In Terms of Number of Years In Present Designations

21 st Century Leadership Styles	Computed F Value	Tabular F Value (0.05)	Decision	Interpretation
A. Transformational Leadership	0.76	2.39	Accept H_0	Not Significant
B. Transactional Leadership	1.06	2.39	Accept H_0	Not Significant
C. Democratic Leadership	0.25	2.39	Accept H_0	Not Significant
D. Laissez-Faire Leadership	1.81	2.39	Accept H_0	Not Significant
E. Instructional Leadership	3.49	2.39	Reject H_0	Significant

Computed F value $\geq$ Tabular F value (Reject H_0) / Significant;
 Computed F value $\leq$ Tabular F value (Accept H_0) / Not Significant

The computed F values for Transformational, Transactional, Democratic, and Laissez-Faire

leadership styles are all below the tabular F value of 2.39, indicating no significant differences in how respondents with varying lengths of time in their current roles assess these leadership styles. However, the computed F value for Instructional Leadership is 3.49, which surpasses the tabular F value, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This significant result suggests that the number of years respondents have spent in their current designations does affect their evaluation of Instructional Leadership, implying that more experience in a role influences perceptions of this leadership style. Leadership style, with a computed Z value of -4.47, shows that teachers perceive it as more effective than administrators' self-assessment. Similarly, the Instructional Leadership style, with a computed Z value of -5.17, also reflects a more positive perception from teachers compared to administrators. Conversely, there are no significant differences in the

assessments of Transactional and Democratic Leadership styles, as their computed Z values are below the tabular Z value, indicating a consistent view between administrators and teachers regarding these styles. Overall, these findings highlight that while there is agreement on some leadership styles, notable differences exist in others, particularly in how administrators and teachers perceive the impact and effectiveness of leadership practices.

Table 13. Performance of Teachers From Public Elementary Schools in The Division of Marikina City

IPCR Rating	F	%
Outstanding (O)	2	0.65
Very Satisfactory (VS)	306	99.35
Satisfactory (S)	0	0.00
Unsatisfactory (U)	0	0.00
Poor (P)	0	0.00
Total	308	100.00

Below 1.499 (P); 1.500 – 2.499 (U); 2.500 – 3.499 (S); 3.500 – 4.499 (VS); 4.500 – 5.000 (O)

The data shows that 306 teachers, accounting for 99.35% of the total, were rated as Very Satisfactory (VS), while only 2 teachers, or 0.65%, received an Outstanding (O) rating. No

teachers were rated as Satisfactory (S), Unsatisfactory (U), or Poor (P). This distribution highlights that the majority of teachers performed at a very high level, with almost all evaluations falling within the Very Satisfactory category. The absence of lower performance ratings suggests a generally strong level of teacher performance within the schools assessed.

Table 14. Significant Relationship Between The 21st Century Leadership Styles Of School Administrators And Teachers' Performance

Variables	Computed r Value	DF	Computed t Value	Tabular t Value 0.05 (LOS)	Decision	Interpretation
Leadership Styles Teachers' Performance	0.30	306	5.60	1.97	Reject H_0	Significant

Computed t value $\geq$ Tabular t value (Reject H_0) / Significant;
 Computed t value $\leq$ Tabular t value (Accept H_0) / Not Significant

The computed correlation coefficient (r) is 0.30, with a computed t value of 5.60, which exceeds the tabular t value of 1.97 at the 0.05 level of significance. This result leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis, indicating a significant relationship between the leadership styles of administrators and teachers' performance.

The positive correlation suggests that variations in the leadership styles of administrators are associated with changes in teachers' performance, implying that effective leadership may positively impact teacher performance in the evaluated schools.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Administrative and Teaching Demographics:

Age Distribution:

Both administrators and teachers are predominantly in the 36 to 53-year age bracket, indicating a stable and experienced workforce. Administrators show a slightly higher percentage of younger individuals and fewer older individuals compared to teachers, suggesting a trend of newer entrants and possible career progression dynamics within administrative roles.

Gender Representation:

The gender disparity in teaching roles, with a significant majority being female, highlights the ongoing trend of female dominance

in elementary education. In contrast, administrative roles are more balanced in gender representation, reflecting progress towards gender equality in educational leadership.

Role Distribution and Career Progression:

Administrative Roles:

The high percentage of administrators serving as Grade Leaders indicates a focus on grade-level management. The scarcity of higher-level administrative roles such as Principal II/MT 2 and Principal III/MT 3 suggests that these positions are more specialized and less common.

Teaching Roles:

The predominance of core teaching roles among teachers reflects a clear distinction between instructional and leadership responsibilities. The lack of advanced leadership positions within the teaching staff underscores the well-defined hierarchical structure between administrative and teaching roles.

Educational Qualifications:

Administrators:

A significant portion of administrators hold advanced degrees, reflecting the importance of continued professional development and higher education in leadership roles.

Teachers:

While many teachers pursue graduate studies, the low percentage of those completing advanced degrees suggests challenges in further educational Attainment. This indicates a potential area for support and development to encourage the completion of advanced degree programs.

Length of Service Administrators:

A majority of administrators have been in their roles for 5 to 10 years, highlighting a stable and experienced administrative team. The presence of both recent and long-serving administrators suggests a balance of fresh perspectives and experienced leadership.

Teachers:

The varied length of service among teachers reflects a dynamic teaching environment with both experienced educators and newer recruits, contributing to a blend of seasoned expertise and fresh ideas.

Perceptions of 21st Century Leadership Styles:

Leadership Styles Ratings:

Both administrators and teachers view leadership styles as effective to a high extent, though teachers rate them slightly more positively. The higher ratings of Transformational, Democratic, and Instructional Leadership by teachers suggest a perception of these styles as more impactful.

Significant Differences:

Notable differences in the assessment of leadership styles, particularly for Transformational, Laissez-Faire, and Instructional Leadership, reveal that teachers generally perceive these styles more favorably than administrators. This discrepancy indicates a need for administrators to align their self-assessments with teachers' perceptions for improved

leadership effectiveness.

Impact of Leadership Styles on Teacher Performance:

The positive correlation between the leadership styles of administrators and teachers' performance underscores the significance of effective leadership in enhancing teacher performance. The strong relationship suggests that improvements in leadership practices could positively influence teaching outcomes.

Profile-Based Variations:

Age, Sex, Designation, and Educational

Attainment:

Variations in the assessment of leadership styles based on respondent profiles indicate that older respondents, females, higher-level administrators, and those with higher educational qualifications tend to rate leadership styles more favorably. This suggests that experience, educational background, and gender may influence perceptions of leadership effectiveness.

Years in Position:

Longer tenures in administrative roles are associated with higher ratings of leadership styles, particularly for Transformational and Democratic Leadership. This highlights the impact of experience on the perception of leadership effectiveness.

Program Recommendations:

The findings emphasize the need for targeted capacity building to address gaps and enhance leadership effectiveness, particularly in aligning administrative self-assessments with teachers' perceptions and supporting teachers in achieving advanced educational qualifications.

In summary, the study reveals a largely experienced and stable workforce within Marikina City's public elementary schools, with clear distinctions between administrative and teaching roles. The variations in perceptions of leadership styles and their impact on teacher performance highlight areas for targeted development and alignment to foster improved

educational outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Ahamed, S., et al. (2020). The leadership style of school principal and performance of teachers. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government*, 13(4).
- Al Malki, M., et al. (2018). Leadership styles and job performance: A literature review. *Journal of International Business Research and Marketing*, 3(3), 40–49. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18775/jibr.m.1849-8558.2015.33.3004>
- Alrowwad, A., Abualoush, S. H., & Masa'deh, R. (2020). Innovation and intellectual capital as intermediary variables among transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and organizational performance.

- Journal of Management education* [Master's thesis, University of Gävle].
Development, 39(2), 196–222.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-02-2019-0062>
- Aquino, C. J. C., Afalla, B. T., & Fabelico, F. L. (2021). Managing educational institutions: School heads' leadership practices and teachers' performance. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 10(4), 1325–1333.
<https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i4.21518>
- Batuigas, F., et al. (2022). Factors affecting teaching performance of junior high school teachers of Madridejos National High School. *Asia Research Network Journal of Education*, 2(1), 40–47.
- Beach, J. (2020). *Leadership for the 21st century: The case of school*
- Hartini, L., Effendi, R., & Saleh, M. (2022). Effect of professional attitude and welfare on job satisfaction and performance of early childhood education teachers in Paringin District, Balangan Regency. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 5(6), 2695–2700.
<https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v5-i6-105>
- Iqbal, Z. A., Abid, G., Arshad, M., Ashfaq, F., Athar, M. A., & Hassan, Q. (2021). Impact of authoritative and laissez-faire leadership on thriving at work: The moderating role of conscientiousness. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*, 11(3),

667–685.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe11>

030048

Kiplimo, J. J. C. (2023). Personal leadership philosophy for the 21st century: Integrating theory, experience, and perspectives.

Journal of Human Resource &

Leadership, 7(4), 30–49.

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018>

102t30107

Mullins, B. (2023). *Literature review: Transformational leadership*. OWL Leadership & Advisory Services.