



# LEADERSHIP DYNAMISM ON SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

Christine Jane E. Trinidad<sup>1</sup>, Fortune Josephine E. Sagnit, PhD<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology

## ABSTRACT

This study examined the leadership dynamism of school heads and its contribution to school effectiveness in public secondary schools within the Schools Division of San Jose City for the academic year 2024–2025. Guided by the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), the research explored five key domains: Leading Strategically, Managing School Operations and Resources, Focusing on Teaching and Learning, Developing Self and Others, and Building Connections. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed, involving 12 school heads and 114 purposively selected teachers to assess leadership practices and performance outcomes based on the Office and Individual Performance Commitment Review Forms (OPCRF and IPCRF). Findings revealed that school heads were generally mature, well-educated professionals with 1–4 years in their current leadership roles, while the teaching staff was predominantly younger and still pursuing advanced studies. Both groups were primarily assigned to rural, medium-sized schools. School heads rated themselves highly across all leadership domains, particularly in strategic and operational management. However, teacher assessments reflected lower ratings, citing gaps in inclusivity, technological integration, and instructional support. Performance evaluations showed all participants met or exceeded institutional expectations, with “Very Satisfactory” to “Outstanding” ratings. Statistical analysis indicated significant differences in leadership dynamism based on age and income, suggesting that experience and financial stability contribute to leadership effectiveness. However, correlation results revealed no strong or statistically significant relationship between leadership dynamism and school effectiveness, pointing to other factors – such as organizational culture or systemic structures – as potential influencers. The study concluded that while school leadership is generally effective, there exists a perceptual disconnect between school heads and teachers. Recommendations include enhancing leadership development programs, promoting participatory leadership, broadening school performance metrics, and conducting further research across varied educational contexts to deepen understanding and inform policy improvements.

**KEYWORDS:** Leadership Dynamism, Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads, Public Secondary Schools, School Leadership, School Effectiveness

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Effective leadership dynamism is vital in managing school programs, fostering continuous growth, and ensuring quality education. Today’s school heads face complex roles that go beyond traditional management, they are expected to improve student outcomes, lead staff development, and uphold accountability. Measuring students’ annual academic growth has become a key responsibility.

According to Wallace (2021), effective school heads establish a shared vision for academic excellence and equity. They shape school climate, manage people and processes, and build leadership capacity. DepEd Order No. 19, s.2016 emphasizes their authority to set strategic direction, while DepEd Order No. 24, s.2020 and the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) define five key domains: strategic leadership, school management, teaching and learning, professional development, and stakeholder engagement.

School heads play a crucial role in creating supportive learning environments, developing competent teachers, and producing well-rounded, globally competitive learners. This study was inspired by the researcher’s aspiration to become a school leader and the need to understand effective leadership qualities.

By exploring leadership practices aligned with PPSSH, the research aims to provide insights that benefit both current and future school leaders and contribute to overall educational improvement.

## 2. OBJECTIVES

The goal of this research was to identify leadership dynamism on school effectiveness. It aimed to respond to the following inquiries:

1. How may the socio-demographic profile of school heads and teachers be described in terms of:
  - 1.1 sex,
  - 1.2 age,
  - 1.3 civil status,
  - 1.4 designation,
  - 1.5 monthly income,
  - 1.6 length of service with the current position, and
  - 1.7 highest educational attainment?
2. How may the school profile of respondents be described in terms of:
  - 2.1 school size, and
  - 2.2 school type?



3. How may the leadership dynamism of the school heads be described based on the assessment of the school heads and teachers in terms of:

- 3.1 Leading Strategically,
- 3.2 Managing School Operations and Resources,
- 3.3 Focusing on Teaching and Learning,
- 3.4 Developing Self and Others, and
- 3.5 Building Connections?

4. How may the school's effectiveness be described in terms of:

- 4.1 Office Performance Commitment Review Form, and
- 4.2 Individual Performance Commitment Review Form?

5. Is there a significant difference between the school heads' leadership dynamism when grouped according to profile?

6. Is there a significant relationship with the school heads' leadership dynamism and school effectiveness?

7. Based on the findings of the study, what is the proposed action plan to further improve the leadership dynamism of School Heads?

### 3. METHODOLOGY

This study utilized a descriptive research design aimed at examining the leadership dynamism of Junior High School Heads and evaluating their competencies through both self-assessment and teacher evaluations. The descriptive design was chosen to provide a comprehensive understanding of how school heads perceive their leadership roles and how their teachers view their effectiveness in managing the school's programs and activities.

#### 2.1. Sampling Procedure

This study involved twelve (12) Junior High School Heads from the Division of San Jose City. To validate their self-assessments from the survey instrument, 114 purposively selected teachers under their supervision also evaluated the competence of their respective School Heads. Data collection was conducted on a voluntary basis, with all respondents providing the necessary information to address the research questions.

Purposive sampling was used to ensure the selection of information-rich participants relevant to the study. As Creswell (2018) notes, this method involves selecting individuals who can provide specific insights related to the research objectives. In this study, purposive sampling ensured the inclusion of key participants— (1) 12 Junior High School Heads and (2) their corresponding teachers—who were essential for generating meaningful and relevant data.

#### 2.2. Respondents

The respondents of this study consisted of two groups: twelve (12) School Heads and one hundred fourteen (114) teachers from public secondary schools in the Division of San Jose City.

The twelve School Heads were selected as key participants because of their leadership roles and responsibilities in managing Junior High Schools. These individuals provided self-assessments of their leadership dynamism and competencies through a structured survey instrument.

To validate the data from the School Heads and gain multiple perspectives, one hundred fourteen (114) teachers under the supervision of these School Heads were purposively sampled. These teachers were chosen due to their direct interaction with the School Heads and their capacity to provide informed evaluations of the leadership effectiveness demonstrated by their supervisors.

Both groups of respondents voluntarily participated in the study, providing valuable insights that were critical in addressing the research objectives.

### 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 4.1. Socio-demographic Profile of Respondents

The study found that school heads had equal representation by sex, while the teaching force was predominantly female. This aligns with global trends where teaching remains feminized (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2021). The balanced leadership representation suggests progress in gender equity, consistent with Bush & Glover (2016), who highlighted barriers women typically face in leadership roles.

Age-wise, school heads were older than teachers, showing a generational gap. This age diversity can foster mentorship and innovation, as supported by Zacher & Schmitt (2016), who advocate intergenerational learning. Civil status also varied, with all school heads being married—often perceived as markers of maturity and stability (Mwangi & Kipkulei, 2019). Designations showed that most school heads were head teachers, while few teachers held leadership roles, suggesting limited internal mentoring structures. Monthly income showed only a modest difference between heads and teachers, potentially reducing motivation to pursue leadership roles—echoing concerns from Nguyen et al. (2021). Lastly, both groups had high educational qualifications, but practical effectiveness depends not only on degrees but also on professional development and experience (Leithwood et al., 2020).

#### 4.2. School Profile of the Respondents

Most respondents, both school heads and teachers, came from rural and medium-sized schools. This reflects the broader structure of the Philippine education system, where rural deployment is more common (Miller et al., 2019). Leadership in medium-sized schools may offer a better balance of administrative manageability and personal engagement, as noted by Leithwood et al. (2020).

These findings highlight the need for policies that support educators in rural and remote areas, where challenges like limited resources and fewer professional development opportunities persist (Wang et al., 2021). The distribution also supports equitable access to leadership across diverse school settings, reinforcing Dufresne's (2022) emphasis on prioritizing rural education.

#### 4.3. Leadership Dynamism of School Heads as Assessed by School Heads and Teachers

The findings revealed a consistent gap between how school heads and teachers rated leadership performance. School heads



rated themselves “Highly Evident” in all five PPSSH domains, while teachers rated them mostly “Evident” or lower—especially in areas like research integration, curriculum review, and learner voice.

This discrepancy supports Fullan's (2014) assertion that leadership should be inclusive and participatory. When teachers feel excluded from strategic processes, it can weaken shared ownership of school goals. Robinson et al. (2018) and Adams et al. (2023) highlight that the most effective leadership supports teaching quality and wellbeing—areas where teachers gave lower scores.

Overall, while school heads perceived their leadership as effective, teachers' lower assessments suggest a need for improved communication, data transparency, and inclusive planning to build trust and cohesion.

#### **4.4. School Effectiveness in terms of OPCR and IPCRF Rating**

School effectiveness, as measured by OPCR and IPCRF ratings, was high. All school heads were rated either “Very Satisfactory” or “Outstanding,” as were all teachers. These strong ratings indicate robust institutional performance and compliance with expected standards.

This performance aligns with Briones' (2017) emphasis on results-oriented education systems and suggests effective administrative systems are in place. However, it also underscores the importance of not just meeting quantitative targets but ensuring qualitative leadership development and innovation.

As Leithwood et al. (2020) and McKinsey & Company (2021) argue, while strong leadership can elevate school performance, continuous support, mentoring, and feedback loops are necessary to sustain high standards.

#### **4.5. Difference in the School Heads Leadership Dynamism when grouped according to Profile**

Significant differences were found based on age and monthly income. Older and higher-earning school heads demonstrated stronger leadership across several domains. This suggests that experience and access to resources enhance leadership capacity—consistent with Doherty (2020) and Gronn (2020), who link leadership maturity with experience and professional exposure.

No significant differences were found based on sex, designation, length of service, or educational attainment. These findings affirm Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt (2018) and Day & Sammons (2016), who suggest that leadership effectiveness is more influenced by skills and training than by demographic traits or titles.

These results highlight the importance of continuous leadership development regardless of background—emphasizing equity in access to training and growth opportunities.

#### **4.6. Relationship on the School Heads' Leadership Dynamism and School Effectiveness**

There was no statistically significant relationship between any leadership domain and school effectiveness. While this may seem counterintuitive, it supports research by Leithwood & Azah (2020), which suggests that the impact of leadership is often indirect and takes time to materialize in measurable outcomes.

Moderate negative correlations, particularly in “Focusing on Teaching and Learning” and “Building Connections,” may point to contextual mismatches—such as administrative burdens or under-engagement with stakeholders. As Bryk & Schneider (2020) suggest, trust and social capital are crucial for improvement, but their effects may not be captured in traditional performance ratings.

These results emphasize the need to develop leadership metrics that go beyond compliance-based assessments and focus on transformative, community-centered, and inclusive practices.

#### **4.7. Proposed Action Plan to Further Improve the Leadership Dynamism of School Heads**

The proposed 3-Year Action Plan focuses on five key domains: Developing Self and Others, Building Connections, Managing School Operations and Resources, Leading Strategically, and Focusing on Teaching and Learning. It includes mentorship programs, leadership workshops, community engagement initiatives, and structured evaluation to ensure leadership growth and effectiveness across schools.

### **5. CONCLUSIONS**

The following are the conclusions derived from the presented findings:

1. School leadership largely consists of mature individuals that are new to administrative roles, while younger teachers form a growing workforce. This generational gap creates opportunities for mentorship and leadership development, but school leaders must actively encourage collaboration and support continuous teacher growth.
2. Most school heads and teachers are based in rural, medium-sized schools that serve underserved communities. To address challenges and promote equity, targeted policies, infrastructure improvements, and localized leadership training are essential.
3. A notable gap exists between school heads' high self-assessments and teachers' lower ratings of leadership, particularly in areas like inclusivity, research integration, and professional development. This underscores the need for more reflective, collaborative leadership involving teachers in decision-making.
4. The consistently high-performance ratings reflect effective management, professionalism, and accountability, confirming the strength of current evaluation systems and the importance of ongoing monitoring and capacity building.
5. Leadership dynamism on school effectiveness relies more on experience and access to resources than on formal qualifications, so development programs should prioritize mentoring and hands-on learning.



6. The weak connection between leadership and school performance suggests that factors like school culture, teacher teamwork, and community support play bigger roles. Further research is needed to explore this relationship.
7. Based on the findings of the study, an action plan to further improve the leadership dynamism of School Heads has been proposed accordingly.

## REFERENCES

1. Adams, D., Gamage, D. T., & McCormack, A. (2023). Distributed leadership, teamwork and student outcomes: An integrative perspective. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 51(2), 217-234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432221086730>
2. Briones, L. (2017). Strengthening performance-based education in the Philippines. Department of Education. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
3. Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2016). School leadership and management in South Africa: Findings from a systematic literature review. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30(2), 211-231. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-07-2014-0101>
4. Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
5. DepEd Order No. 19, s. 2016. Guidelines on the organizational structures and staffing patterns of stand-alone and integrated public senior high schools. Department of Education, Philippines.
6. DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020. National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads. Department of Education, Philippines.
7. Doherty, G. (2020). Professional capital and sustainable leadership development. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(5), 774-788. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219880312>
8. Dufresne, M. (2022). Prioritizing rural schools: Equity in educational leadership. *Journal of Rural Education*, 38(3), 220-235.
9. Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2018). Gender and leadership: A contextual perspective. In D. V. Day (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations* (pp. 379-403). Oxford University Press.
10. Fullan, M. (2014). *The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact*. Jossey-Bass.
11. Gronn, P. (2020). The making of educational leaders: Connections between knowledge and practice. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 19(4), 576-592.
12. Leithwood, K., & Azah, V. N. (2020). The nature and effects of transformational school leadership: A meta-analytic review of research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(3), 409-446. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X19848598>
13. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
14. Miller, P., Brown, T., & Hopson, R. (2019). Leadership for equity in rural schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 57(6), 673-688. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-04-2018-0077>
15. Nguyen, T. D., Gilmour, A. F., & Lee, A. (2021). The long road to leadership: Salary gaps and motivations among teachers. *Educational Researcher*, 50(3), 161-172. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X21994917>
16. Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2018). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635-674.
17. Wallace, F. (2021). Visionary school leadership and the pursuit of excellence. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 24(2), 178-193.
18. Wang, J., Lin, E., Spalding, E., Klecka, C. L., & Odell, S. J. (2021). Quality teaching and teacher education: A critical review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 95, 103129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103129>
19. Zacher, H., & Schmitt, A. (2016). Work characteristics and occupational well-being: The role of age. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 1411. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01411>