



# ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF SCHOOL LEADERS ON FOSTERING TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

<sup>1</sup>Gallemit, Rochelle Alvarez

<sup>1</sup>Teacher III

<sup>1</sup>Department of Education

<sup>1</sup>Department of Education, Laguna, Philippines

**Abstract:** This study aims to assess the impact of school leaders on fostering teacher professional development. The study involved 60 randomly selected secondary teachers within the District of Santa Maria, Laguna for the school year 2023-2024. Survey questionnaires were distributed among the target respondents to gather data using a 5-point Likert scale. In addition, mean, verbal interpretation and rank statistical treatment were utilized for the descriptive analysis, while the Mann-Whitney and Kruskal Wallis tests were used to determine the significant difference in the respondents' perceptions of the leadership styles of school leaders and their influence in developing teachers' professionalism. Based on the result, there is no significant difference in the respondents' perceived leadership styles of school leaders and their influence on the development of teachers' professionalism when grouped according to profile. This means that school leaders work towards enhancing the influence of leadership on teacher professionalism and ensure that all teachers benefit from effective leadership practices, irrespective of their profiles.

**IndexTerms – Professional development, teacher, fostering**

## INTRODUCTION

The role of school leaders in promoting teacher professional development has been increasingly identified within the Philippines' educational environment. The school leader acts as a catalyst in which teachers can successfully challenge themselves, ask for failure, and steadily advance teaching techniques. This realization conforms to the constantly changing requirements facing educators, it calls for an active approach in striving to aid their growth and effectiveness. According to Kilag and Sasan (2023), effective school leaders play a key role in promoting teacher participation, providing continuing professional development opportunities, and willful student learning objectives.

Although a range of measures have been taken to promote and maintain the professional development of teachers, it is particularly unclear how school leaders specifically help with this aspect within a Philippine context. This state of affairs underscores the need for research on the impact of school leaders in promoting teacher professional development so that the results can inform policy and practice. As Choi (2023) argues, effective school leaders help teachers take part in their schools' development processes, thus improving the teachers' effectiveness teaching students from various backgrounds.

Current research gaps highlight the necessity for investigating the interplay between school leadership practices and teacher professional development outcomes in the Philippines. Understanding this relationship is crucial to identifying successful strategies and interventions which can be customized to handle the specific challenges and opportunities facing Philippine schools. Göçen (2021) believes that such understanding can help optimize initiatives for teacher professional development and increase overall educational quality.

School leaders' participation and teachers' professional development, when looked at in the Philippine context, are subject to each other. Influences include such contextual factors as the frameworks for curriculum, distribution of resources, staff technical perfection and organizational culture. By studying these influences in relation to school leaders' roles, insights are provided which facilitate optimizing teachers' vocational training programs as well as improving total educational quality (Abbaspour, 2024; Ho et al., 2020; Louws et al., 2020).

## NEED OF THE STUDY.

This paper aims to research the influence of school leaders on the promotion of teacher professional development in the Philippine setting. Through an examination of their practices, strategies, and difficulties in promoting teachers' growth in this manner, it hopes

to provide further understanding of how effective management can bring positive change to students' results. Ultimately, the results of this research are expected to lead to policy pronouncements and practical advice on helping Philippine schools improve the professional development of teachers.

### 3.1 Population and Sample

The respondents of this study were 60 secondary teachers within the District of Santa Maria, Laguna for the school year 2023-2024. The respondents of the study were chosen using a simple random sampling technique. In this sampling method, each member of the population has an exactly equal chance of being selected. This sampling method allows researchers to statistically measure a subset of individuals selected from a larger group or population to approximate a response from the entire group.

### 3.2 Data and Sources of Data

Data were gathered using a researcher-made survey questionnaire comprising the profile of the respondents and statements on teachers' perception of the leadership styles of the school leaders and the influence of the school leaders in the development of teachers' professionalism. It was administered through various mediums such as paper and pencil and online forms. Using a 5-point Likert Scale the respondents were tasked to rate their perceptions as shown below:

Extent of Linguistic Diversity Exposure

Scale	Range	Interpretation
5	4.21 – 5.00	Strong Agree
4	3.21 – 4.20	Agree
3	2.61 – 3.20	Neutral
2	1.81 – 2.60	Disagree
1	1.00 – 1.80	Strongly Disagree

### 3.3 Theoretical framework

The study was framed from three relevant theories frame the study.

Firstly, the Theory of Transformation, which was explicitly advanced by James MacGregor Burns and propagated by Bernard M. Bass, which governs the inspiration and motivation of followers for performance and enhancement for personal growth. This theory was chosen to guide the transformation of the school leaders' leadership style in terms of their influence on the growth of the teacher and appraisals since it theoretically explicates how the leader's model's inspiration causes follow's growth and performance.

Secondly, the Theory Situational Leadership, which was presented by Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard; this theory was chosen to offer possible changes in leadership emphasizing the adaptability of school leaders to the various levels of readiness and places of the teachers that influence their growth and performance and hence impacts the theory of change.

Thirdly, the Path-Goal Theory presented by Robert House; this theory was chosen to fill the research gap through explicating how the school leader's perception and awareness of goal and path towards teacher's appraisal and performance influence their experience and perception of the same in Santa Maria district.

The integration of the three theories enriches the study by providing the theory to view and understand school leaders' influence on teacher growth.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research utilized descriptive research design, which is a methodological approach that seeks to depict the characteristics of a phenomenon or subject under investigation. It is a means of observing and measuring without manipulating the variables. Using descriptive research, the researcher can identify patterns in the characteristics of a group to essentially establish everything the researcher needs to understand apart from why something has happened.

### 3.1 Population and Sample

The respondents of this study were 60 secondary teachers within the District of Santa Maria, Laguna for the school year 2023-2024. The respondents of the study were chosen using a simple random sampling technique. In this sampling method, each member of the population has an exactly equal chance of being selected. This sampling method allows researchers to statistically measure a subset of individuals selected from a larger group or population to approximate a response from the entire group.

### 3.2 Data and Sources of Data

Data were gathered using a researcher-made survey questionnaire comprising the profile of the respondents and statements on teachers' perception of the leadership styles of the school leaders and the influence of the school leaders in the development of teachers' professionalism. It was administered through various mediums such as paper and pencil and online forms.

### 3.3 Data Gathering Methods

Survey questionnaires were distributed to the respondents to assess the teachers' perception of the leadership styles of the school leaders and the influence of the school leaders in the development of teachers' professionalism. Moreover, a normality test was utilized to test the normal distribution of the variables. The results were gathered and interpreted using Frequency, Percentage, and Rank for the profile of the respondents while Mean, Verbal Interpretation, and Rank were used for the descriptive analysis. On the other hand, to determine the significance difference, the Mann-Whitney and Kruskal Wallis Test were utilized.

### 3.4 Data Analysis

The results of this study were analyzed by the following statistical treatments:

<i>Problems</i>	<i>Data Analysis</i>
1. Demographic profile of the respondents in terms of: 1.1 sex; 1.2. age; 1.3. position; 1.4. subject handling; 1.5. highest educational attainment; 1.6 years in service; and 1.7 years in teaching in the current school	Frequency, Percentage, Rank
2. Teachers' perception on the leadership styles of the school leaders in terms of: 2.1. directive; 2.2. participative; 2.3. supportive; or 2.4. achievement-oriented.	Mean, Verbal Interpretation, Rank
3. Difference in the perceived leadership styles of the school leaders among the profiles of the respondents.	Mann-Whitney, Kruskal Wallis Test
4. Teachers' perception on the influence of the school leaders in the development of their professionalism in terms of: 4.1. teaching planning; 4.2. classroom organization; 4.3. monitoring and evaluation; and 4.4. teacher leadership?	Mean, Verbal Interpretation, Rank
5. Difference in the influence of the school leaders in the development of professionalism among the profile of the respondents.	Mann-Whitney, Kruskal Wallis Test

### 3.4. Ethical Considerations

Respondents of the study were informed about the study's objectives and that all data gathered will be used for the research alone and any information the participants gave will be treated with the utmost confidentiality. In addition, voluntary participation was also considered, and all research respondents were free to participate without pressure or coercion.

## IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Results of Descriptive Statics of Study Variables

Table 4.1 Table shows the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of sex, age, position, subject handled, highest educational attainment, years in service, and years in teaching in the current school. Based on the results, out of 60 respondents, 46 are female and 14 are male. This implies that there are more female than male teachers. The 2017 census reported that women predominate in the teaching profession in the Philippines. In public primary and secondary schools, there are more female teachers than male teachers (Regalado, 2017). Additionally, as cited by Bongco and Abenes (2019), the Philippine Commission on Women reveals that about 89.58% of the teachers in public elementary and 77.06% in public secondary schools are female. In terms of age, most of the respondents ranged from 31-40 years old, which is 41.67 percent of the total respondents. On the other hand, only 10 percent of the total respondents were 51-60 years old. This signifies that most of the teacher-respondents are in early adulthood and early middle age. Most teachers in the Philippines are ages 31 to 40 (Espinar, 2021; Dignos, 2021; Abdurahman & Omar, 2021).

Further, 36.67 percent of the respondents were Teacher I, and 35 percent were Teacher II. It implies that the teaching workforce in public schools has a larger base of entry-level positions. Moreover, 17 out of 60 respondents were handling Mathematics, while 11 of them were handling Science subject. On the contrary, Philosophy ranked last with only one (1) respondent teaching the subject. Concerning the respondents' highest educational attainment, 43 teachers' highest educational attainment was a bachelor's degree, 15 obtained a master's degree and only two (2) got a doctorate degree. Since most of the respondents were Teacher I and Teacher II, this could signify that many of the respondents found it difficult to pursue further education since they were facing modest salaries. According to Plaza and Jamito (2021), teachers' monthly salaries could not suffice for their monthly expenses for varied reasons. In addition, the cost of professional development and family responsibilities were the most cited reasons that prevented teachers from participating in professional development (Butt & Nadeem, 2021).

Additionally, 31.67 percent of the total respondents were 0-5 years in service with a frequency of 19 which ranked first, followed by 6-10 years in service with a frequency of 18 and a percentage of 30.00. Furthermore, in terms of years of teaching in their current school, 46.67 percent are within the 0-5 years and 23.33 percent are within the 6-10 years bracket. This implies that a large proportion of teacher-respondents are in their early years of service. Hence, schools may need to implement stronger retention strategies, such as professional development opportunities and supportive work environments to encourage teachers to remain in the profession. As mentioned by Reitman and Karge (2019), when teachers receive structured support and professional development in key areas of need, there is a greater tendency to remain in the profession.

Table 4.1 Profile of the Respondents

<b>Profile</b>			
<b>Sex</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Rank</b>
Male	14	23.33	2
Female	46	76.67	1
Total	60	100.00	
<b>Age</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Rank</b>
21-30	19	31.67	2
31-40	25	41.67	1
41-50	10	16.67	3
51-60	6	10.00	4
Total	60	100.00	
<b>Position</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Rank</b>
Teacher I	22	36.67	1
Teacher II	21	35.00	2
Teacher III	14	23.33	3
Master Teacher I	1	1.67	5
Master Teacher II	2	3.33	4
Total	60	100.00	
<b>Subject Handled</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Rank</b>
Filipino	5	8.33	5.5
English	9	15.00	3
Mathematics	17	28.33	1
Science	11	18.33	2
AP	6	10.00	4
MAPEH	4	6.67	7
TLE	5	8.33	5.5
ESP	2	3.33	8
Philosophy	1	1.67	9
Total	60	100.00	
<b>Highest Educational Attainment</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Rank</b>
Bachelor's Degree	43	71.67	1
Master's Degree	15	25.00	2
Doctorate Degree	2	3.33	3
Total	60	100.00	
<b>Years in Service</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Rank</b>
0-5 Years	19	31.67	2
6-10 Years	18	30.00	1
11-15 Years	13	21.67	3
16-20 Years	4	6.67	4.5
21-25 Years	2	3.33	6
26 and above	4	6.67	4.5
Total	60	100.00	
<b>Years of Teaching in the Current School</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Rank</b>
0-5	28	46.67	1
6-10	14	23.33	2
11-15	11	18.33	3
16-20	1	1.67	6
21-25	2	3.33	5
26 and above	4	6.67	4
Total	60	100	

It can be gleaned from Table 4.2 the teachers' perception of the leadership styles of the school leaders. Based on the results, all the indicators for directive, participative, supportive, and achievement-oriented leadership styles were interpreted as strongly agree. In terms of directive leadership, the statement "The school leaders clearly outline expectations and goals for the teachers" ranked first with a mean of 4.55. This indicates a proactive approach to leadership, where school leaders communicate effectively to ensure that teachers understand their roles, responsibilities, and objectives within the school environment. On the other hand, the statement "The school leaders prefer a top-down approach to leadership, with little decentralization of authority" ranked last with a weighted mean of 4.22, interpreted as strongly agree.

This implies that school leaders provide clear direction and expectations to teachers, emphasizing structure, efficiency, and adherence to rules. However, it also suggests a slight preference for centralized decision-making, as indicated by the lower rank for statements related to decentralization of authority. With an average weighted mean of 4.42, the teacher-respondents perceived their school leaders as directive leaders. According to Lonati (2020), directive leaders emerged as a solution to coordinate the joint efforts of a multitude of followers and to resolve their frequent conflicts. Hence, by implementing directive leadership behaviors like issuing clear instructions and meeting deadlines, leaders can pay more attention to the speed of teamwork (Li et al., 2018).

The table also shows that in terms of participative leadership, the statement "Teachers are given opportunities to lead initiatives and projects within the school" ranked first with a weighted mean of 4.63. On the contrary, the statement "The school leader values the input and perspectives of teachers in problem-solving" ranked last. The high weighted mean scores and strong agreement across most statements suggest that school leaders actively engage teachers in decision-making processes, goal-setting, and problem-solving. This implies a collaborative and inclusive approach to leadership where teachers feel valued and respected for their input. As mentioned by Wang et al., (2022), to make good organizational decisions and work together to solve challenges at work, participative leaders promote and assist staff members' participation in the decision-making process through a variety of strategies.

Another leadership style presented in the table is the supportive leadership style. The respondents perceived their school leaders as leaders who recognize the efforts of teachers and staff as it ranked first with a weighted mean of 4.62. The higher weighted means indicate a strong agreement that focuses on the support, recognition, and empathy demonstrated by school leaders towards teachers, as well as their commitment to teachers' professional development and well-being. Based on the study of Popli and Rizvi (2016), supportive leadership impacts employee engagement in the sense of increasing their involvement, satisfaction, and enthusiasm for work.

Further, the respondents as shown in the table, also perceived their school leaders as achievement oriented. Most of the respondents perceived their leaders as leaders who actively engage with stakeholders to develop strategies for continuous improvement of the school with a weighted mean of 4.67. The average weighted mean score of 4.58 reflects a strong agreement with statements related to setting clear goals, inspiring improvement, celebrating successes, and providing resources for effective teaching. This means that school leaders promote academic excellence, continuous improvement, innovation, and collaboration among teachers to enhance student learning outcomes. According to Saleem (2020), achievement-oriented leadership helps school leaders set such objectives and goals, which makes teachers active, energetic, and motivated.

Table 4.2. Teachers' Perception of the Leadership Styles of the School Leaders

STATEMENTS	WEIGHTED MEAN	VERBAL INTERPRETATION	RANK
<b>DIRECTIVE</b>			
1. The school leaders clearly outline expectations and goals for the teachers.	4.55	Strongly Agree	1
2. The school leaders provide specific instructions on how tasks should be completed.	4.52	Strongly Agree	2
3. The school leaders take charge of decision-making processes without much input from the teachers.	4.35	Strongly Agree	9
4. The school leader closely monitors and controls the work of the teachers.	4.40	Strongly Agree	7.5
5. The school leaders emphasize following established procedures and protocols.	4.50	Strongly Agree	3
6. The school leaders prefer a structured and organized approach to tasks and projects.	4.43	Strongly Agree	5
7. The school leaders emphasize efficiency and productivity in the school environment.	4.42	Strongly Agree	6
8. The school leaders expect adherence to rules and policies without much flexibility.	4.40	Strongly Agree	7.5
9. The school leaders provide clear guidance on how to handle challenges or issues that arise.	4.45	Strongly Agree	4
10. The school leaders prefer a top-down approach to leadership, with little decentralization of authority.	4.22	Strongly Agree	10
<b>AVERAGE WEIGHTED MEAN</b>	<b>4.42</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	
<b>PARTICIPATIVE</b>			
1. The school leaders actively solicit feedback and suggestions from teachers on important decisions.	4.53	Strongly Agree	3

2. Teachers are involved in setting goals and priorities for our school.	4.53	Strongly Agree	3
3. The school leader values the input and perspectives of teachers in problem-solving.	4.42	Strongly Agree	10
4. Teachers feel empowered to share their ideas and opinions without fear of retribution.	4.50	Strongly Agree	7
5. Collaboration among teachers and school leaders is encouraged and supported.	4.53	Strongly Agree	3
6. Teachers are given opportunities to lead initiatives and projects within the school.	4.63	Strongly Agree	1
7. Feedback from teachers is regularly sought and utilized to improve school processes.	4.47	Strongly Agree	8
8. The school leaders actively listen to concerns and ideas raised by teachers.	4.52	Strongly Agree	5.5
9. Teachers feel a sense of ownership and investment in the direction our school is headed.	4.43	Strongly Agree	9
10. The school leaders encourage open communication and discussion among teachers.	4.52	Strongly Agree	5.5
<b>AVERAGE WEIGHTED MEAN</b>	<b>4.51</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	
<b>SUPPORTIVE</b>	<b>WEIGHTED MEAN</b>	<b>VERBAL INTERPRETATION</b>	<b>RANK</b>
1. The school leaders provide constructive feedback and guidance when needed.	4.55	Strongly Agree	3
2. The school leaders foster a positive and inclusive school culture.	4.52	Strongly Agree	6.5
3. The school leaders are approachable and available to support teachers with their professional development.	4.55	Strongly Agree	3
4. The school leaders recognize the efforts of teachers and staff.	4.62	Strongly Agree	1
5. The school leaders demonstrate empathy towards teachers' challenges.	4.47	Strongly Agree	10
6. The school leaders advocate for resources and support to enhance teaching practices.	4.52	Strongly Agree	5
7. The school leaders promote collaboration and teamwork among teachers.	4.50	Strongly Agree	8.5
8. The school leaders demonstrate a commitment to the well-being of teachers.	4.55	Strongly Agree	3
9. The school leaders actively seek to remove obstacles hindering teachers' success.	4.52	Strongly Agree	6.5
10. The school leaders empower teachers to take on leadership roles and initiatives.	4.50	Strongly Agree	8.5
<b>AVERAGE WEIGHTED MEAN</b>	<b>4.53</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	
<b>ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTED</b>	<b>WEIGHTED MEAN</b>	<b>VERBAL INTERPRETATION</b>	<b>RANK</b>
1. The school leaders set clear goals and expectations for academic excellence.	4.55	Strongly Agree	8
2. The school leaders inspire teachers to strive for continuous improvement.	4.65	Strongly Agree	2
3. The school leaders celebrate successes and achievements that contribute to the school.	4.57	Strongly Agree	5
4. The school leaders empower teachers to set ambitious targets for student learning and growth.	4.55	Strongly Agree	8

5. The school leaders provide resources to help teachers implement effective instructional strategies.	4.52	Strongly Agree	10
6. The school leaders challenge teachers to push beyond their comfort zones to reach new levels of achievement.	4.55	Strongly Agree	8
7. The school leaders recognize and reward innovation and creativity in teaching practices.	4.57	Strongly Agree	5
8. The school leaders actively engage with stakeholders to develop strategies for continuous improvement of the school.	4.67	Strongly Agree	1
9. The school leaders collaborate with teachers to identify areas for improvement.	4.57	Strongly Agree	5
10. The school leaders provide opportunities for the professional development of teachers.	4.63	Strongly Agree	3
<b>AVERAGE WEIGHTED MEAN</b>	<b>4.58</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	

Table 4.3 presents the difference in the perceived leadership styles in terms of respondents' sex. It can be gleaned from the results that the p-values of the leadership styles (Directive, Participative, Supportive, and Achievement Oriented), considering the respondents' sex, are greater than the 0.05 alpha level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, there is no significant difference in the perception of leadership styles of the school leaders in terms of respondents' sex. This implies that the leadership styles of the school leaders are perceived consistently by both male and female teacher-respondents. It suggests that the leaders are effective in their roles across different genders, maintaining an inclusive and equitable approach in their interactions and decision-making processes.

Table 4.3 Difference in the Perceived Leadership Styles in terms of Respondents' Sex

Variable	Sex	N	Mean Rank	Computed Value	P-Value	Decision	Interpretation
Directive	Male	14	33.75	-0.80	0.42	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	46	29.5108696				
	Total	60					
Participative	Male	14	29.8928571	-0.15	0.88	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	46	30.6847826				
	Total	60					
Supportive	Male	14	30.6428571	-0.04	0.97	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	46	30.4565217				
	Total	60					
Achievement Oriented	Male	14	30.5	0.00	1.00	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	46	30.5				
	Total	60					

Based on the result presented in Table 4.4, it can be gleaned that in terms of directive and achievement oriented leadership styles, having p-values greater than the 0.05 alpha level of significance, there is no significant difference in the respondents' perceived leadership styles in terms of their age. It suggests that these leadership approaches are consistently recognized and valued across different age groups. This implies that the clarity in goal setting, expectations, and the emphasis on academic excellence are uniformly understood and appreciated by both younger and older respondents.

On the other hand, in terms of participative and supportive leadership, with p-values 0.04 and 0.05 respectively, it is found that there is a significant difference in the respondents' perceived leadership styles of the school leaders. The significant differences in perceived participative and supportive leadership styles suggest that respondents' age influences how they experience and evaluate these aspects of leadership. Younger and older respondents might have different expectations or experiences with how leaders solicit input, encourage collaboration, and provide support. It was suggested in the study of Brezicha et al. (2015) to conceptualize leadership that specifically addresses how leaders can provide teachers with differentiated support, supply teachers with the necessary tools to implement the new idea, and facilitate teachers' voice and participation in the process.

Table 4.4 Difference in the Perceived Leadership Styles in terms of Respondents' Age

Variable	Age	N	Mean Rank	Computed Value	P-Value	Decision	Interpretation
Directive	21-30	19	31	3.15	0.37	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	31-40	25	33.28				
	41-50	10	29.2				
	51-60	6	19.5				

	Total	60					
Participative	21-30	19	26.95	8.59	0.04	Reject Ho	Significant
	31-40	25	37.26				
	41-50	10	28.5				
	51-60	6	16.92				
	Total	60					
Supportive	21-30	19	26.29	7.75	0.05	Reject Ho	Significant
	31-40	25	35.8				
	41-50	10	33.5				
	51-60	6	16.75				
	Total	60					
Achievement Oriented	21-30	19	28.37	5.98	0.11	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	31-40	25	34.3				
	41-50	10	33.55				
	51-60	6	16.33				
	Total	60					

Table 4.5 presents the results on the difference in the perceived leadership styles in terms of respondents' positions. With p-values greater than 0.05 alpha level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected. In terms of the respondents' positions, there is no significant difference in the perceived leadership styles of the respondents. It suggests that the leadership practices and behaviors of school leaders are perceived consistently by all teachers, regardless of their roles. Consistent perceptions across positions imply that the school leaders are likely implementing policies and practices that are inclusive and fair. As suggested by Kuknor and Bhattacharya (2022), individuals with varying levels must be treated fairly, valued for their contributions, and included in decision-making.

Table 4.5 Difference on the Perceived Leadership Styles in terms of Respondents' Position

Variable	Position	N	Mean Rank	Computed Value	P-Value	Decision	Interpretation
Directive	Teacher I	22	33.77	2.83	0.59	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	21	30.38				
	Teacher III	14	26.25				
	Master Teacher I	1	12.5				
	Master Teacher II	2	34.5				
	Total	60					
Participative	Teacher I	22	34.91	3.51	0.48	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	21	29.17				
	Teacher III	14	27.39				
	Master Teacher I	1	10				
	Master Teacher II	2	28				
	Total	60					
Supportive	Teacher I	22	33.57	2.75	0.60	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	21	27.69				
	Teacher III	14	31.25				
	Master Teacher I	1	10				
	Master Teacher II	2	31.25				
	Total	60					
Achievement Oriented	Teacher I	22	33.68	2.98	0.56	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	21	27.88				
	Teacher III	14	31.32				
	Master Teacher I	1	8.5				

	Master Teacher II	2	28.25				
	Total	60					

Table 4.6 shows the difference in the perceived leadership styles in terms of the respondents' subject handled. All the leadership styles obtained p-values greater than 0.05 alpha level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. It can be concluded that there is no significant difference in the perceived leadership styles in terms of the respondents' subject handled. It suggests that school leaders apply their leadership practices consistently across various departments. Additionally, it indicates that teachers, regardless of the subject they teach, experience leadership similarly. This result implies that all teachers, whether they handle Mathematics, Science, English, or other subjects, feel equally valued and supported by the school leaders. One of the leadership principles discussed in the study of Amanchukwu et al. (2015) is to not focus on just one department, section, or employees, but envision the whole organization as an entity that must learn and succeed together.

Table 4.6 Difference in the Perceived Leadership Styles in terms of Respondents' Subject Handled

Variable	Subject Handled	N	Mean Rank	Computed Value	P-Value	Decision	Interpretation
Directive	Filipino	5	30.4	10.43	0.24	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	English	9	26.11				
	Mathematics	17	35.38				
	Science	11	30.05				
	AP	6	18				
	MAPEH	4	44				
	TLE	5	26.3				
	ESP	2	20.5				
	Philosophy	1	54.5				
	Total	60					
Participative	Filipino	5	30.1	4.83	0.78	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	English	9	27				
	Mathematics	17	33.44				
	Science	11	29.91				
	AP	6	22.67				
	MAPEH	4	37.38				
	TLE	5	31.7				
	ESP	2	21.75				
	Philosophy	1	51.5				
	Total	60					
Supportive	Filipino	5	31.9	6.38	0.60	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	English	9	25.89				
	Mathematics	17	34.29				
	Science	11	31.32				
	AP	6	19.92				
	MAPEH	4	36.75				
	TLE	5	30.2				
	ESP	2	21				
	Philosophy	1	50.5				
	Total	60					
Achievement Oriented	Filipino	5	32	5.21	0.74	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	English	9	25.33				
	Mathematics	17	32.79				
	Science	11	32.77				
	AP	6	21.25				
	MAPEH	4	35.88				
	TLE	5	31				
	ESP	2	23.75				
	Philosophy	1	50.5				

	Total	60					
--	-------	----	--	--	--	--	--

Regarding respondents' highest educational attainment, the perceived leadership styles gained p-values greater than the 0.05 alpha level of significance, thus the null hypothesis was again rejected. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the perceived leadership styles in terms of the respondents' highest educational attainment. The finding, which states that there is no significant difference in perceived leadership styles among respondents with varying levels of educational attainment, enunciates that school leaders are applying their leadership practices consistently across teachers with different educational backgrounds. This indicates that leadership communication and expectations are clear and effective regardless of the educational qualifications of the teachers. Effective professional development can result in teacher learning and changes in attitudes and beliefs, subsequently changing teacher practices (Whitworth & Chiu, 2015). It is suggested to reduce teacher attrition and is also intended to encourage leaders to look more closely at their programs and their own styles of leadership and support (Hughes et al., 2015).

Table 4.7 Difference in the Perceived Leadership Styles in terms of Respondents' Highest Educational Attainment

Variable	Highest Educational Attainment	N	Mean Rank	Computed Value	P-Value	Decision	Interpretation
Directive	Bachelor's Degree	43	30.29	0.45	0.80	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Master's Degree	15	32.03				
	Doctorate Degree	2	23.5				
	Total	60					
Participative	Bachelor's Degree	43	29.84	0.65	0.72	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Master's Degree	15	33.17				
	Doctorate Degree	2	24.75				
	Total	60					
Supportive	Bachelor's Degree	43	28.77	1.93	0.38	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Master's Degree	15	35.8				
	Doctorate Degree	2	28				
	Total	60					
Achievement Oriented	Bachelor's Degree	43	29.12	1.56	0.46	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Master's Degree	15	35.13				
	Doctorate Degree	2	25.5				
	Total	60					

Table 4.8 shows that regarding the perceived leadership styles as directive, participative, supportive, and achievement oriented, there is no significant difference when the respondents' number of years in service is considered since the p-values are greater than the 0.05 alpha level of significance. It is argued that the appropriate leadership style would depend on the school's context and the maturity of the staff and, in practical terms, will require the school leader to adopt several leadership styles or change their style when the situation demands (Hoque & Raya, 2023). However, the study found that teachers consistently recognize and value these leadership approaches, regardless of tenure. It signifies that the school leaders effectively apply these leadership styles uniformly across teachers with varying lengths of service.

Table 4.8. Difference on the Perceived Leadership Styles in terms of Respondents' Years in Service

Variable	Years in Service	N	Mean Rank	Computed Value	P-Value	Decision	Interpretation
Directive	0-5	19	35.530	3.851	0.571	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10	18	29.310				
	11-15	13	27.650				
	16-20	4	22.380				

	21-25	2	20.250				
	26 and above	4	34.500				
	Total	60					
Participative	0-5	19	36.450	5.454	0.363	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10	18	27.280				
	11-15	13	23.650				
	16-20	4	32.380				
	21-25	2	33.500				
	26 and above	4	35.620				
	Total	60					
Supportive	0-5	19	35.130	3.411	0.637	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10	18	27.220				
	11-15	13	26.730				
	16-20	4	34.500				
	21-25	2	24.250				
	26 AND ABOVE	4	34.620				
	Total	60					
Achievement Oriented	0-5	19	37.030	4.632	0.462	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10	18	26.810				
	11-15	13	26.150				
	16-20	4	31.000				
	21-25	2	34.000				
	26 AND ABOVE	4	28.000				
	Total	60					

Table 4.9 presents the results on the difference in the perceived leadership styles in terms of the respondents' years in teaching in the current school. With p-values greater than the 0.05 alpha level of significance, it was found that there is no significant difference in the perceived leadership styles of school leaders. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. It suggests that school leaders apply their leadership practices consistently, regardless of how long staff members have been at the school. This result implies that all teachers, whether they are relatively new to the school or have been there for many years, feel equally valued and supported by the school leaders. Teachers are more likely to work together and support each other when they feel equally valued and recognized by the leadership (Fairman & Mackenzie, 2015).

Table 4.9. Difference in the Perceived Leadership Styles in terms of Respondents' Years in Teaching in The Current School

Variable	Years in Teaching in the Current School	N	Mean Rank	Computed Value	P-Value	Decision	Interpretation
Directive	0-5	28	26.980	5.149	0.398	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10	14	32.500				
	11-15	11	39.000				
	16-20	1	12.500				
	21-25	2	27.750				
	26 and above	4	30.620				
	Total	60					
Participative	0-5	28	28.000	3.537	0.618	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10	14	30.500				
	11-15	11	34.230				
	16-20	1	19.500				
	21-25	2	26.750				
	26 and above	4	42.380				
	Total	60					
Supportive	0-5	28	27.380	4.862	0.433		

	6-10	14	30.860			Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant	
	11-15	11	35.590					
	16-20	1	16.000					
	21-25	2	26.250					
	26 and above	4	42.880					
	Total	60						
Achievement Oriented	0-5	28	27.520		2.402	0.791	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10	14	32.110					
	11-15	11	35.950					
	16-20	1	28.500					
	21-25	2	25.750					
	26 and above	4	33.620					
	Total	60						

Table 5 presents the respondents' perceived influence of school leaders in the development of teachers' professionalism. Based on the results, the respondents strongly agreed that school leaders influence teachers in terms of teaching and planning with an average weighted mean of 4.49. The statement "School leaders provide opportunities to enhance teachers' teaching skills and planning capabilities" ranked first with a weighted mean of 4.57. This implies that school leaders are providing significant opportunities to enhance teaching skills and planning capabilities, as indicated by the highest score. This suggests a strong emphasis on professional development programs that likely lead to better-prepared and more effective teachers.

On the other hand, the statement "School leaders reduce the administrative burden of the teachers." ranked last with a weighted mean of 4.42. Despite the relatively high score, this indicator ranking last suggests that teachers still perceive an administrative burden. School leaders might need to address this issue more effectively to free up teachers' time for instructional activities and professional development. According to Van Droogenbroeck et al. (2014), administrative burdens are considered an important stressor and a main cause of job dissatisfaction among teachers.

Moreover, in terms of classroom organization, the statement "School leaders create an environment where teachers feel valued and motivated, leading to improved classroom management and organization" ranked first with a weighted mean of 4.60. This implies that teachers who feel valued and motivated are likely to invest more effort in organizing their classrooms efficiently. However, clear communication from school leaders regarding policies and procedures to help teachers maintain consistency in classroom management approaches ranked last with a weighted mean of 4.43. Additionally, with an average weighted mean of 4.53, the teacher-respondents perceived the school leaders as contributors to better classroom management. As mentioned in the study by Morgan (2015), school leadership must provide an environment that motivates teachers to improve how they deliver instruction and manage the class.

Further, it was perceived that school leaders influence teachers' professionalism through monitoring and evaluation with an average weighted mean of 4.52. Ranking first, with a weighted mean of 4.60, they perceived that school leaders create a safe and non-threatening environment for teachers to receive feedback, facilitating open communication and reflection. This signifies that when teachers feel safe to receive feedback, they are more likely to engage in continuous professional development that can help teachers identify areas for improvement, set professional goals, and pursue relevant training opportunities. School leaders must take charge in seeking and implementing professional development for successful relationship-building (Lasater, 2016).

In addition, they also perceived that school leaders influence the teachers' professional development in terms of teacher leadership with an average weighted mean of 4.57. The statements "School leaders who provide mentorship and support to emerging teacher leaders help cultivate a pipeline of future educational leaders within the school community" and "Leadership that encourages teacher leaders to engage in research enhances their capacity to drive innovation in education" ranked first with a weighted mean of 4.62. This implies that effective school leadership, characterized by mentorship and encouragement of research, is crucial for cultivating teacher leadership and driving innovation in education. This underscores the importance of school leaders in shaping a dynamic and forward-thinking educational environment. According to Gist et al. (2019), a provision of mentoring support is essential for the teacher development continuum.

Overall, the teacher-respondents perceived that school leaders have influenced the teachers' professional development, as reflected in the high mean scores of the indicators.

Table 5. Influence of the School Leaders in the Development of Teachers' Professionalism

STATEMENTS	WEIGHTED MEAN	VERBAL INTERPRETATION	RANK
<b>TEACHING PLANNING</b>			
1. School leaders provide support and allocate resources to assist teachers in their planning process.	4.50	Strongly Agree	5.5
2. School leaders create a climate of trust where teachers feel empowered to take risks and innovate in their planning.	4.50	Strongly Agree	5.5
3. School leaders motivate teachers to continue investing time and effort in developing high-quality teaching plans.	4.52	Strongly Agree	3

4. School leaders reduce the administrative burden of the teachers.	4.42	Strongly Agree	10
5. The school leaders encourage teachers to reflect on their practice and seek feedback to implement effective teaching plans.	4.52	Strongly Agree	3
6. Teachers pursue professional growth opportunities to refine their planning skills through the guidance of the school leaders.	4.47	Strongly Agree	8
7. School leaders provide opportunities to enhance teachers' teaching skills and planning capabilities.	4.57	Strongly Agree	1
8. They boost teachers' morale and motivation, leading to increased engagement in teaching and planning activities.	4.47	Strongly Agree	8
9. School leaders foster an environment where teachers feel empowered to innovate and experiment with new teaching strategies.	4.47	Strongly Agree	8
10. School leaders establish expectations for teaching planning to ensure quality education.	4.52	Strongly Agree	3
<b>AVERAGE WEIGHTED MEAN</b>	<b>4.49</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	
<b>CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>WEIGHTED MEAN</b>	<b>VERBAL INTERPRETATION</b>	<b>RANK</b>
1. School leaders set the tone for classroom management by establishing clear expectations and providing support and resources to teachers.	4.53	Strongly Agree	5.5
2. School leaders foster a positive school culture that emphasizes discipline and order, which can positively influence teachers' classroom management strategies.	4.53	Strongly Agree	5.5
3. School leaders encourage collaboration among teachers, allowing them to share best practices for effective classroom organization and management.	4.57	Strongly Agree	2.5
4. School leaders prioritize professional development opportunities to enhance teachers' classroom management skills.	4.57	Strongly Agree	2.5
5. School leaders create an environment where teachers feel valued and motivated, leading to improved classroom management and organization.	4.60	Strongly Agree	1
6. Clear communication from school leaders regarding policies and procedures helps teachers maintain consistency in classroom management approaches.	4.43	Strongly Agree	10
7. School leaders recognize teachers' successes in classroom management efforts to provide positive reinforcement and encouragement.	4.55	Strongly Agree	4
8. School leaders involve teachers in decision-making processes related to classroom management policies for greater implementation success.	4.48	Strongly Agree	9
9. They equip teachers with the necessary skills to handle diverse student needs effectively through training in classroom management techniques.	4.52	Strongly Agree	7.5
10. Transparent communication from school leaders regarding disciplinary procedures and consequences helps teachers enforce classroom rules consistently and fairly.	4.52	Strongly Agree	7.5
<b>AVERAGE WEIGHTED MEAN</b>	<b>4.53</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	
<b>MONITORING AND EVALUATION</b>	<b>WEIGHTED MEAN</b>	<b>VERBAL INTERPRETATION</b>	<b>RANK</b>
1. School leaders provide regular feedback and constructive criticism to teachers, fostering continuous growth and improvement.	4.55	Strongly Agree	3.5
2. School leaders establish clear standards for teacher performance, guiding the monitoring and evaluation process effectively.	4.50	Strongly Agree	7.5
3. School leaders prioritize professional development opportunities tailored to individual teacher needs to enhance their effectiveness in monitoring and evaluation.	4.57	Strongly Agree	2
4. School leaders create a safe and non-threatening environment for teachers to receive feedback, facilitating open communication and reflection.	4.60	Strongly Agree	1

5. School leaders model best practices in monitoring and evaluation, serving as mentors and role models for teachers.	4.55	Strongly Agree	3.5
6. School leaders who value innovation and experimentation enhance the monitoring and evaluation processes.	4.47	Strongly Agree	9.5
7. School leaders who allocate resources for training on assessment tools and techniques equip teachers with the skills to conduct thorough and meaningful evaluations.	4.50	Strongly Agree	7.5
8. School leaders provide opportunities for teachers to learn from each other and improve their monitoring and evaluation skills collectively.	4.53	Strongly Agree	5.5
9. School leaders who lead monitoring and evaluation efforts motivate teachers for continued growth and development.	4.47	Strongly Agree	9.5
10. School leaders who value teacher autonomy and creativity in the evaluation process allow for personalized approaches to monitoring and assessment, catering to individual teacher strengths and preferences.	4.53	Strongly Agree	5.5
<b>AVERAGE WEIGHTED MEAN</b>	<b>4.53</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	
<b>TEACHER LEADERSHIP</b>	<b>WEIGHTED MEAN</b>	<b>VERBAL INTERPRETATION</b>	<b>RANK</b>
1. School leaders who empower teachers to take on leadership roles create opportunities for them to develop their skills and expertise.	4.56	Strongly Agree	7.5
2. School leaders who provide mentorship and support to emerging teacher leaders help cultivate a pipeline of future educational leaders within the school community.	4.62	Strongly Agree	1.5
3. Leadership that values and recognizes teacher leadership contributions encourages teachers to take initiative and innovate in their practice.	4.49	Strongly Agree	10
4. School leaders who allocate resources for professional development and training on leadership skills equip teachers with the tools they need to succeed in leadership roles.	4.58	Strongly Agree	5
5. School leaders who promote distributed leadership models allow teachers to play a significant role in shaping the direction and vision of the school.	4.55	Strongly Agree	9
6. School leaders who provide opportunities for teacher leaders to collaborate with external stakeholders, such as parents, community members, and educational organizations, expand their leadership impact beyond the school walls.	4.58	Strongly Agree	5
7. School leaders who support teacher leaders in advocating for policies and practices that benefit students and the teaching profession strengthen the voice and influence of educators in educational decision-making processes.	4.58	Strongly Agree	5
8. Leadership that encourages teacher leaders to engage in research enhances their capacity to drive innovation in education.	4.62	Strongly Agree	1.5
9. School leaders who prioritize diversity and inclusion in leadership development initiatives ensure that opportunities for teacher leadership are accessible and equitable to all educators.	4.60	Strongly Agree	3
10. School leaders who provide recognition and appreciation for teacher leadership efforts motivate teachers to continue their leadership development and engagement.	4.56	Strongly Agree	7.5
<b>AVERAGE WEIGHTED MEAN</b>	<b>4.57</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	

The implication drawn from the results presented in Table 5.1, where p-values exceed the significance level of 0.05, indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in the perceived influence of school leaders on the development of teachers' professionalism based on respondents' sex. This suggests that regardless of whether respondents identified as male or female, they generally held similar perceptions regarding the impact of school leaders on teacher professionalism. In practical terms, this implies that gender does not appear to be a significant factor in shaping how individuals perceive the influence of school leaders on teacher development. As cited by Avgeri (2015), career development policies should be more 'gender-neutral' and foster equal opportunities for both genders. It suggests that perceptions of school leadership in fostering teacher professionalism are consistent across genders among the respondents in the study.

Table 5.1. Difference on the Perceived Influence of the School Leaders in the Development of Teachers' Professionalism in terms of Respondents' Sex

Variable	Sex	N	Mean Rank	Computed Value	P-Value	Decision	Interpretation
Teaching Planning	Male	14	31.39	-0.22	0.82	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	46	30.23				
	Total	60					
Classroom Organization	Male	14	32.64	-0.54	0.59	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	46	29.85				
	Total	60					
Monitoring and Evaluation	Male	14	32.89	-0.60	0.55	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	46	29.77				
	Total	60					
Teacher Leadership	Male	14	29.75	-0.49	0.62	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Female	41	27.40				
	Total	55					

The results presented in Table 5.2 indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in the perceived influence of school leadership on the development of teachers' professionalism across various aspects such as teaching and planning, classroom organization, and monitoring and evaluation, based on respondents' age. With p-values exceeding the significance level of 0.05 for these aspects, it suggests that regardless of respondents' age, they generally held similar perceptions regarding the influence of school leaders on these dimensions of teacher professionalism.

However, a notable exception is found in the aspect of teacher leadership, where a p-value of 0.03 indicates a significant difference in perceived influence based on respondents' age. This suggests that respondents' age may play a role in how they perceive the influence of school leadership, specifically in fostering teacher leadership. Taking the responsibility of instructional leadership, school leaders can bolster teachers to transcend their habitual teaching methods and attempt innovative approaches or alternative practices (Atasoy & Yalçın, 2023).

Table 5.2. Difference on the Perceived Influence of the School Leaders in the Development of Teachers' Professionalism in terms of Respondents' Age

Variable	Age	N	Mean Rank	Computed Value	P-Value	Decision	Interpretation
Teaching Planning	21-30	19	27.53	5.86	0.12	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	31-40	25	35.62				
	41-50	10	30.70				
	51-60	6	18.25				
	Total	60					
Classroom Organization	21-30	19	26.84	7.37	0.06	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	31-40	25	36.22				
	41-50	10	31.15				
	51-60	6	17.17				
	Total	60					
Monitoring and Evaluation	21-30	19	28.18	7.54	0.06	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	31-40	25	36.20				
	41-50	10	29.40				
	51-60	6	15.92				
	Total	60					
Teacher Leadership	21-30	16	24.75	9.25	0.03	Reject Ho	Significant
	31-40	23	34.43				
	41-50	10	26.45				
	51-60	6	14.58				
	Total	55					

Table 5.3 suggests that there is no statistically significant difference in the perceived influence of school leaders on the development of teachers' professionalism across various dimensions—teaching and planning, classroom organization, and teacher leadership—based on respondents' positions within the educational institution. With p-values exceeding the significance level of 0.05 for all

these dimensions, it indicates that respondents across different positions within the institution generally held similar perceptions regarding the influence of school leaders on various aspects of teacher professionalism. Further, the consistent perception of school leadership across different positions within the institution implies a shared understanding of the role and impact of leadership on teacher professionalism. According to Hilton et al. (2015), teachers shape their own professional growth through active learning, reflection, and participation in practice and professional development programs.

Table 5.3. Difference on the Perceived Influence of the School Leaders in the Development of Teachers' Professionalism in terms of Respondents' Position

Variable	Position	N	Mean Rank	Computed Value	P-Value	Decision	Interpretation
Teaching Planning	Teacher I	22	33.20	1.94	0.75	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	21	29.19				
	Teacher III	14	29.54				
	Master Teacher I	1	11.50				
	Master Teacher II	2	30.75				
	Total	60					
Classroom Organization	Teacher I	22	33.16	2.11	0.72	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	21	30.05				
	Teacher III	14	28.61				
	Master Teacher I	1	10.50				
	Master Teacher II	2	29.25				
	Total	60					
Monitoring and Evaluation	Teacher I	22	34.93	3.60	0.46	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	21	29.19				
	Teacher III	14	27.68				
	Master Teacher I	1	10.00				
	Master Teacher II	2	25.50				
	Total	60					
Teacher Leadership	Teacher I	21	31.71	3.61	0.46	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	19	27.47				
	Teacher III	12	25.08				
	Master Teacher I	1	8.50				
	Master Teacher II	2	21.25				
	Total	55					

It can be drawn from the results presented in Table 5.4 that there is no statistically significant difference in the perceived influence of school leaders on the development of teachers' professionalism based on the subjects they handle. With p-values exceeding the significance level of 0.05 for all subject categories, it indicates that they had similar perceptions regarding the influence of school leaders on teacher professionalism, regardless of the subject area they taught. This signifies that teachers across different subject areas may benefit from similar professional development opportunities and support provided by school leaders. While teachers may lead their classes alone, all teachers must work together to benefit their students (De Jong et al., 2019).

Table 5.4. Difference on the Perceived Influence of the School Leaders in the Development of Teachers' Professionalism in terms of Respondents' Subject Handled

Variable	Subject Handled	N	Mean Rank	Computed Value	P-Value	Decision	Interpretation
Teaching Planning	Filipino	5	32.60	8.96	0.35	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	English	9	27.83				
	Mathematics	17	34.12				
	Science	11	27.55				
	AP	6	17.17				
	MAPEH	4	41.88				

	TLE	5	33.40				
	ESP	2	22.00				
	Philosophy	1	52.00				
	Total	60					
Classroom Organization	Filipino	5	34.70	7.41	0.49	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	English	9	26.22				
	Mathematics	17	33.24				
	Science	11	28.95				
	AP	6	19.17				
	MAPEH	4	40.50				
	TLE	5	33.10				
	ESP	2	22.00				
	Philosophy	1	50.50				
	Total	60					
Monitoring and Evaluation	Filipino	5	32.40	5.65	0.69	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	English	9	28.11				
	Mathematics	17	34.79				
	Science	11	26.09				
	AP	6	22.42				
	MAPEH	4	37.25				
	TLE	5	30.80				
	ESP	2	24.25				
	Philosophy	1	50.50				
	Total	60					
Teacher Leadership	Filipino	4	30.75	3.82	0.87	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	English	8	27.06				
	Mathematics	17	29.18				
	Science	10	23.60				
	AP	5	21.80				
	MAPEH	4	32.75				
	TLE	4	28.50				
	ESP	2	34.75				
	Philosophy	1	45.00				
	Total	55					

Based on the results as reflected in Table 5.5, with p-values greater than 0.05 alpha level of significance, there is no significant difference in the perceived influence of school leaders in developing teachers' professionalism based on respondents' highest educational attainment. School leaders' influence on teacher professionalism is perceived similarly among educators with varied educational backgrounds. This suggests that the impact of leadership on teacher development is not contingent upon the highest level of formal education attained by teachers. Teachers should develop powerful professional identities, hence school programs must nurture teachers' confidence and capacity to have more influence on the school systems in which they serve (Lowery-Moore et al., 2016).

Table 5.5. Difference on the Perceived Influence of the School Leaders in the Development of Teachers' Professionalism in terms of Respondents' Highest Educational Attainment

Variable	Highest Educational Attainment	N	Mean Rank	Computed Value	P-Value	Decision	Interpretation
Teaching Planning	Bachelor's Degree	43	29.66	1.00	0.61	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Master's Degree	15	33.83				
	Doctorate Degree	2	23.50				
	Total	60					

Classroom Organization	Bachelor's Degree	43	29.92	1.29	0.52	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Master's Degree	15	33.57				
	Doctorate Degree	2	20.00				
	Total	60					
Monitoring and Evaluation	Bachelor's Degree	43	30.14	0.34	0.84	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Master's Degree	15	32.20				
	Doctorate Degree	2	25.50				
	Total	60					
Teacher Leadership	Bachelor's Degree	41	27.23	1.07	0.59	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Master's Degree	13	31.19				
	Doctorate Degree	1	18.00				
	Total	55					

Table 5.6 reflects that there is no statistically significant difference in the perceived influence of school leaders on the development of teachers' professionalism based on respondents' years of service in the field. School leaders are likely to implement leadership practices that cater to the professional development needs of all teachers, regardless of their tenure in the profession. This underscores the importance of leadership initiatives that are accessible and beneficial to educators at all stages of their careers. Schools may offer professional development opportunities for all their teachers (Dixon et al., 2014).

Table 5.6. Difference on the Perceived Influence of the School Leaders in the Development of Teachers' Professionalism in terms of Respondents' Years in Service

Variable	Years in Service	N	Mean Rank	Computed Value	P-Value	Decision	Interpretation
Teacher Planning	0-5	19	34.080	2.266	0.811	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10	18	28.690				
	11-15	13	26.190				
	16-20	4	35.620				
	21-25	2	28.000				
	26 and above	4	31.750				
	Total	60					
Classroom Organization	0-5	19	33.660	2.202	0.821	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10	18	27.860				
	11-15	13	26.960				
	16-20	4	36.500				
	21-25	2	31.000				
	26 and above	4	32.620				
	Total	60					
Monitoring And Evaluation	0-5	19	35.240	4.147	0.528	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10	18	28.170				
	11-15	13	25.540				
	16-20	4	35.120				
	21-25	2	20.500				
	26 and above	4	35.000				
	Total	60					
Teacher Leadership	0-5	19	30.630	2.416	0.789	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10	15	27.200				
	11-15	13	23.650				

	16-20	3	35.170				
	21-25	2	24.000				
	26 and above	3	29.670				
	Total	55					

The implication drawn from the results presented in Table 5.7 suggests that there is no statistically significant difference in the perceived influence of school leaders on the development of teachers' professionalism based on respondents' years of teaching in their current school. With p-values exceeding the significance level of 0.05 for all categories of years in teaching, it indicates that regardless of the length of time spent teaching in their current school, respondents generally held similar perceptions regarding the influence of school leaders on teacher professionalism.

Regardless of their years of teaching at the current school, teachers are likely to receive equitable support and guidance from school leaders in their professional growth endeavors. This implies that leadership practices prioritize fostering a culture of continuous learning and development among all educators within the institution, irrespective of their tenure. Teachers are required to keep learning due to the continuous changes present in current society that impact the teaching profession (Vangrieken et al., 2017). Additionally, gender does not appear to be a significant factor in shaping how individuals perceive the influence of school leaders on teacher development.

Table 5.7. Difference in the Perceived Influence of the School Leaders in the Development of Teachers' Professionalism in terms of Respondents' Years in Teaching in the Current School

Variable	Years in Teaching in the Current School	N	Mean Rank	Computed Value	P-Value	Decision	Interpretation
Teacher Planning	0-5	28	27.700	3.906	0.563	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10	14	29.820				
	11-15	11	35.450				
	16-20	1	23.500				
	21-25	2	26.750				
	26 and above	4	42.500				
	Total	60					
Classroom Organization	0-5	28	27.910	4.235	0.516	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10	14	29.640				
	11-15	11	35.450				
	16-20	1	20.000				
	21-25	2	26.000				
	26 and above	4	42.880				
	Total	60					
Monitoring And Evaluation	0-5	28	28.480	5.047	0.410	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10	14	27.500				
	11-15	11	35.770				
	16-20	1	23.000				
	21-25	2	25.750				
	26 and above	4	44.880				
	Total	60					
Teacher Leadership	0-5	26	24.830	3.606	0.462	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10	13	29.420				
	11-15	10	31.300				
	21-25	2	23.000				
	26 and above	4	38.250				
		Total	55				

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It was found in this study that there is no significant difference in the respondents' perceived leadership styles of school leaders and their influence on the development of teachers' professionalism when grouped according to profile. Based on the results, this study suggests the following recommendations:

1. Conduct regular surveys to keep track of the demographic changes and evolving needs of the teaching staff. Use this data to adjust professional development programs and support initiatives accordingly.
2. Hold workshops and seminars focused on the latest leadership strategies and best practices to keep leaders informed and inspired.

3. Encourage mentorship programs that pair younger teachers with more experienced staff, promoting participative interactions and supportive relationships.
4. Create individualized professional development plans that address each teacher's needs across the identified areas. Regularly review and update these plans in collaboration with school leaders.
5. Encourage reflective practice through regular feedback sessions and self-assessment tools to help teachers at all stages of their careers identify and pursue areas for growth.

## I. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher would like to thank all the teacher participants who willingly spent their time in answering the questionnaire. She would also like to acknowledge the support of the school heads in the District of Santa Maria, Division of Laguna, Philippines for allowing her to conduct the study in their respective school.

## REFERENCES

- [1] De Jong, L., Meirink, J., & Admiraal, W. (2019). School-based teacher collaboration: Different learning opportunities across various contexts. *Teaching and teacher education*, 86, 102925.
- [2] Dignos, M. R. (2021). Profile and action research competence of elementary teachers. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(3), 118-134.
- [3] Dixon, F. A., Yssel, N., McConnell, J. M., & Hardin, T. (2014). Differentiated instruction, professional development, and teacher efficacy. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 37(2), 111-127.
- [4] Espinar, M. J. T. (2021). Technopedagogical Competence of Faculty Members of the University of Eastern Philippines. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(7).
- [5] Fairman, J. C., & Mackenzie, S. V. (2015). How teacher leaders influence others and understand their leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 18(1), 61-87.
- [6] Gist, C. D., Bianco, M., & Lynn, M. (2019). Examining grow your own programs across the teacher development continuum: Mining research on teachers of color and nontraditional educator pipelines. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 70(1), 13-25.
- [7] Göçen, A. (2021). How do teachers perceive meaningful leadership? overview of a qualitative exploration. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 5(1), 31-49. <https://doi.org/10.33902/jpr.2021066866>
- [8] Hilton, A., Hilton, G., Dole, S., & Goos, M. (2015). School leaders as participants in teachers' professional development: The impact on teachers' and school leaders' professional growth. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online)*, 40(12), 104-125.
- [9] Ho, C., Lu, J., & Bryant, D. (2020). The impact of teacher entrepreneurial behaviour: a timely investigation of an emerging phenomenon. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(6), 697-712. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jea-08-2019-0140>
- [10] Hoque, K. E., & Raya, Z. T. (2023). Relationship between Principals' Leadership Styles and Teachers' Behavior. *Behav. Sci.* 2023, 13(2), 111.
- [11] Hughes, A. L., Matt, J. J., & O'Reilly, F. L. (2015). Principal support is imperative to the retention of teachers in hard-to-staff schools. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 3(1), 129-134.
- [12] Kilag, O. and Sasan, J. (2023). Unpacking the role of instructional leadership in teacher professional development. *Advanced Qualitative Research*, 1(1), 63-73. <https://doi.org/10.31098/aqr.v1i1.1380>
- [13] Kuknor, S. C., & Bhattacharya, S. (2022). Inclusive leadership: new age leadership to foster organizational inclusion. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 46(9), 771-797.
- [14] Lasater, K. (2016). School leader relationships: The need for explicit training on rapport, trust, and communication. *Journal of School Administration Research and Development*, 1(2), 19-26.
- [15] Lethole, L., Palmer, J., & Klerk, E. (2021). Exploring the implementation of teacher leadership in lesotho high schools.. <https://doi.org/10.36315/2021end133>
- [16] Li, G., Liu, H., & Luo, Y. (2018). Directive versus participative leadership: Dispositional antecedents and team consequences. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 91(3), 645-664.
- [17] Lonati, S. (2020). What explains cultural differences in leadership styles? On the agricultural origins of participative and directive leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 31(2), 101305.
- [18] Louws, M., Zwart, R., Zuiker, I., Meijer, P., Oolbakkink-Marchand, H., Schaap, H., ... & Want, A. (2020). Exploring school leaders' dilemmas in response to tensions related to teacher professional agency. *Professional Development in Education*, 46(4), 691-710. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2020.1787203>
- [19] Lowery-Moore, H., Latimer, R. M., & Villate, V. M. (2016). The essence of teacher leadership: A phenomenological inquiry of professional growth. *International Journal of Teacher Leadership*, 7(1), 1-16.
- [20] Morgan, L. N. W. (2015). The influence of school leadership practices on classroom management, school environment, and academic underperformance (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).
- [21] Nadelson, L., Turley, M., & DiMasso-Shininger, D. (2022). The perspective of principals of all teachers being leaders. *World Journal of Education*, 12(6), 9. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v12n6p9>
- [22] Plaza, R. C. O., & Jamito, K. O. (2021). Financial conditions and challenges among public school teachers: Its implication to their personal and professional lives. *The International Journal of Humanities & Social Studies*, 9(4).
- [23] Popli, S., & Rizvi, I. A. (2016). Drivers of employee engagement: The role of leadership style. *Global Business Review*, 17(4), 965-979.
- [24] Regalado, M. (2017). Career mobility and gender: A descriptive study of selected deped teachers in Iligan City. S. Aimimtham & A. Nurmandi, *The Complexity of Managing Local Government in Selected ASEAN Countries*.
- [25] Reitman, G. C., & Karge, B. D. (2019). Investing in teacher support leads to teacher retention: Six supports administrators should consider for new teachers. *Multicultural Education*, 27(1), 7-18.
- [26] Saleem, A., Aslam, S., Yin, H. B., & Rao, C. (2020). Principal leadership styles and teacher job performance: Viewpoint of middle management. *Sustainability*, 12(8), 3390.

- [27] Santos, A. and Cajucom, R. (2020). Domains and standards of school leadership: evaluation of tertiary school teachers. *International Journal of Advanced Engineering Management and Science*, 6(3), 124-128. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijaems.63.4>
- [28] Ullah, J., Khan, Z., & Khan, A. (2022). Instructional leadership role of principals in improving teachers professional development in southern districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. *Global Educational Studies Review*, VII(II), 126-134. [https://doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2022\(vii-ii\).12](https://doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2022(vii-ii).12)
- [29] Van Droogenbroeck, F., Spruyt, B., & Vanroelen, C. (2014). Burnout among senior teachers: Investigating the role of workload and interpersonal relationships at work. *Teaching and teacher education*, 43, 99-109.
- [30] Vangrieken, K., Meredith, C., Packer, T., & Kyndt, E. (2017). Teacher communities as a context for professional development: A systematic review. *Teaching and teacher education*, 61, 47-59.
- [31] Wang, Q., Hou, H., & Li, Z. (2022). Participative leadership: a literature review and prospects for future research. *Frontiers in psychology*, 13, 924357.
- [32] Whitworth, B. A., & Chiu, J. L. (2015). Professional development and teacher change: The missing leadership link. *Journal of science teacher education*, 26, 121-137.

