Managerial Skills, Leadership Styles, and Leadership Behavior of School Administrators in Relation to Teachers' Performance

EMMANUEL C. TALAMAYAN

Cagayan State University, Aparri Campus, Aparri, Cagayan

*Corresponding author:** EMMANUEL C. TALAMAYAN

Cagayan State University, Aparri Campus, Aparri, Cagayan

Abstract

This study assessed the managerial skills, leadership styles, and leadership behavior of school administrators in Congressional District II of Cagayan Province and their correlation with teachers' performance. Twenty school administrators and 249 senior high school teachers participated. Most administrators were male, aged 59 and above, with doctoral or ongoing master's degrees. They rated themselves very high in managerial skills and leadership styles, particularly in shared leadership (mean = 4.77), and high in leadership behavior, with situational leadership scoring the highest. No significant differences were found in these areas across demographic variables. Human and technical skills, emotional intelligence, and shared leadership were positively correlated with teachers' performance. Transformational and relational leadership behaviors also showed significant positive correlations. The study concludes that effective managerial and leadership competencies of administrators contribute to better teacher performance. Implications suggest that targeted leadership development programs should enhance these competencies to sustain and improve educational outcomes in senior high schools.

Keywords: *Managerial Skills, Leadership Styles, Leadership Behavior, Teachers' Performance, School Administrators*

INTRODUCTION

School administrators play a pivotal role in achieving the vision, mission, goals, and objectives of educational institutions. Their responsibilities span across various domains, including curriculum and instruction, finance, staff development, physical plant maintenance, recruitment, and promotion. With the increasing demands of globalization, technological advancements, and evolving societal expectations, school leaders are under growing pressure to enhance teaching and learning outcomes to raise student achievement (Sergiovanni, 2018; OECD, 2021). As instructional leaders, they are expected not only to manage resources but also to foster innovation, support professional growth, and sustain a culture of excellence within their schools.

In today's complex and competitive organizational environment, managerial skills have become essential for effective leadership and sustainable institutional growth. Managers—whether in corporate or educational settings—are expected to demonstrate competencies in strategic thinking, decision-making, interpersonal communication, and problem-solving to meet organizational goals (Mintzberg, 2019; Katz & Kahn, 2020). In the educational context, school administrators must exhibit a high level of proficiency in technical, human, and conceptual skills to effectively lead teachers, optimize resources, and create an environment conducive to quality learning (Lussier & Achua, 2020; Guzmán et al., 2023).

Additionally, leadership behavior significantly influences school climate, teacher motivation, job satisfaction, and overall institutional performance. Effective leaders who practice transformational, relational, or situational leadership tend to cultivate collaborative cultures, reduce turnover, and drive school success (Northouse, 2021; Leithwood et al., 2020). Research suggests that leadership behavior is not static but can be developed through professional development, reflective practice, and sustained experience (Bush, 2019; Dinh et al., 2021). Moreover, leadership behavior grounded in emotional intelligence and shared responsibility has been shown to positively impact teacher morale and instructional effectiveness (Mendels, 2012; Rivera & Cruz, 2022).

Teacher performance remains a central concern in improving educational outcomes. Multiple factors influence performance, including professional development, instructional resources, workplace environment, and leadership support (Darling-Hammond, 2020; Bautista & Ortega, 2021). Teachers who feel supported, motivated, and engaged are more likely to demonstrate commitment to their roles, foster positive learning environments, and improve student achievement.

Given these dynamics, this study aims to assess the managerial skills, leadership styles, and leadership behavior of school administrators in Congressional District II of Cagayan Province and examine their correlation to teachers' performance. The findings will serve as baseline data to guide the development of targeted intervention programs that enhance administrators' effectiveness as school leaders and managers, ultimately contributing to improved educational outcomes.

Thus, this study aimed to determine the relationship between the managerial skills, leadership styles and leadership behavior of school administrators to teachers' performance. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the administrators in terms of the following variables?
   a. Age
   b. Sex
   c. Civil Status
   d. Highest Educational Attainment
   e. Number of Years as School Head
   f. Employment Status
   g. School Affiliation
   h. Position
   i. IPCRF rating of Senior High School Teachers
2. What is the level of managerial skills of the school administrators in terms of the following dimensions:
   2.1 Technical Skills
   2.2 Human Skills
   2.3 Conceptual Skills
3. Is there a significant difference between the school administrators and their managerial skills, leadership styles and leadership behavior when grouped according to profile variables?
4. What is the performance of the teachers?

Hypothesis of the Study

HO1: There is no significant relationship between the performance of the teachers and the managerial skills, leadership styles and leadership behavior of the school administrators.

METHODOLOGY

This study used the descriptive-correlational methods of research. Descriptive studies are those that aim to describe the existing condition or state of a phenomenon. In this study, the method allowed 'the researcher to give detailed descriptions of the leadership styles and managerial skills and leadership behavior of the school administrators in Congressional District 2 their correlation to teachers, performance. Using the correlational method, the study would investigate the relationships of the different variables.

The study was conducted in 20 secondary schools in the Congressional District II. Participants were 267 Senior High School Teachers and 20 Secondary school heads in the Congressional District II of Cagayan. Random Sampling was used using the Lynch formula in the case of school administrators.

Data gathering was done with the permission of the Schools Division Superintendent and the School Heads. Coordination with school staff provided correct timing. The questionnaires were distributed face to face and the answers were noted and checked by the statistician for correctness.

The data gathered was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical tools. The following specific statistical tools will be used as described:

The frequency and percentage distribution was used to describe the profile of the respondents.

The Weighted Mean was used to describe the leadership style, leadership behavior and managerial skills of the respondents. The following scale will be used to assign a descriptive interpretation to the weighted means.

Range	Qualitative	Description
4.20 - 5.00	Always	Excellent
3.40 - 4.19	Often	Very Satisfactory
2.60 – 3.39	Occasionally	Satisfactory
1.80 – 2.59	Seldom	Poor
1.00 – 1. 79	Never	Very Poor

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of School Administrators

Table 1a presents the socio-demographic profile of school administrators. In terms of sex, a majority are female (55%), while male administrators comprise only 45%. This suggests a modest predominance of female leadership in schools, reflecting a trend observed in educational institutions where women increasingly assume key leadership roles (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011). This

shift may influence leadership approaches, as female leaders are often associated with collaborative and transformational leadership styles (Eagly & Chin, 2010).

With respect to age, most administrators fall within the 54 to 58 years range (45%), indicating that the leadership cohort is generally in a late mid-career phase. This age group often possesses extensive professional experience, which can enhance decision-making, institutional memory, and mentoring capacity (Fullan, 2020). Only 25% of administrators are aged 53 or below, suggesting limited generational diversity in leadership, which may affect innovation and succession planning.

As for civil status, 60% of administrators are married, while only 10% are widowed or separated. The prevalence of married administrators may imply the presence of familial support systems, potentially contributing to their emotional resilience and professional stability, which are critical in handling the complexities of school leadership (Carmeli, Brueller, & Dutton, 2009).

Regarding educational attainment, the majority (55%) hold doctorate degrees, while only 20% are either master's graduates or have units toward a degree. This high level of qualification aligns with research suggesting that advanced academic preparation enhances administrators' competence in instructional leadership, strategic planning, and organizational management (Bush, 2019; Day & Sammons, 2016). Such qualifications may positively impact school performance through evidence-based decision-making and reflective practice.

These findings underscore the importance of experience, academic preparation, and socio-emotional support in shaping effective school leadership. The demographic composition of school administrators has implications for leadership development programs, succession planning, and capacity-building initiatives across the educational system.

Table 1a. Distribution of the school administrators in terms of their socio-demographic profile

Variables	Frequency (n=20)	Percentage
Sex		
Female	11	55.0
Male	9	45.0
Age (in years)		
53 or below	5	25.0
54 to 58	9	45.0
59 or above	6	30.0
	Mean = 56.55; SD = 3.44	
Civil status		
Single	6	30.0
Married	12	60.0
Widow/separated	2	10.0
Educational attainment		
With units or graduate in	4	20.0

Masteral		
With units in Doctorate	5	25.0
Doctorate graduate	11	55.0

Service

Table 1b displays the distribution of school administrators according to their service profile. In terms of length of service as school head, most administrators have served between 6 to 15 years, representing 45 percent of the group, while those with 5 years or less comprise the smallest percentage at 20 percent. This indicates that most school leaders have a moderate level of experience in their roles, which likely contributes to a balance of fresh perspectives and seasoned knowledge. Looking at position, the highest percentage is observed among Head Teachers or lower (OIC), accounting for 30 percent, whereas Principal I holds the lowest at 20 percent. This suggests that most administrators are still in or close to entry-level leadership roles. Lastly, regarding area distribution, most administrators come from Lasam, making up 20 percent of the sample, while the smallest representation, 5 percent, is noted in Ballesteros, Sta. Praxedes, and Sto. Nino.

Table 1b. Distribution of the school administrators in terms of their service profile

Variables	Frequency (n=20)	Percentage
Length of service as school head (in years)		
5 or below	4	20.0
6 to 15	9	45.0
16 or above	7	35.0
	Mean = 14.05; SD = 9.77	
Position		
Head Teacher or lower (OIC)	6	30.0
Principal I	4	20.0
Principal II	5	25.0
Principal III or higher	5	25.0
Area		
Abulug	3	15.0
Allacapan	3	15.0
Ballesteros	1	5.0
Claveria	3	15.0
Lasam	4	20.0
Pamplona	2	10.0
Sanchez Mira	2	10.0
Sta. Praxedes	1	5.0
Sto. Nino	1	5.0

Level of Managerial Skills of the School Administrators

Table 2 summarizes the dimension means and overall level of managerial skills of the school administrators, showing all three key skills—technical, human, and conceptual—rated as Very High.

Human skills topped the list with a mean of 4.68, indicating the administrators' strong ability to work effectively with people. This is essential for building trust and fostering collaboration within the school community. According to Sergiovanni (2001), human skills are vital for school leaders to maintain positive relationships and promote a supportive environment.

Technical skills were rated very high at 4.66, reflecting administrators' competence in managing instructional programs, personnel, planning, and resources. These skills are critical at supervisory levels to ensure smooth school operations. Katz (1955) emphasized that technical skills are necessary for managers to perform their specific tasks effectively, particularly in education, where instructional quality depends on technical proficiency.

The dimension of conceptual skills, also rated very high with a mean of 4.65, demonstrates administrators' strong capacity for strategic thinking, problem-solving, and understanding of the complex interrelations within the school system. Katz (1955) highlighted that conceptual skills are especially important for leaders at higher levels to set vision and direction and ensure that school objectives are met effectively.

Table 2. Summary of dimension means and overall level of managerial skills of the school administrators

Dimensions	Mean	Descriptive Value
Technical Skills	4.66	Very high
Human Skills	4.68	Very high
Conceptual Skills	4.65	Very high
Overall Mean	**4.66**	**Very high**

Differences in the Level of Managerial Skills, Leadership Styles and Leadership Behaviors of the School Administrators by Profile

Managerial Skills

Table 3 presents the comparison test results examining differences in the levels of managerial skills (technical, human, conceptual) of school administrators when grouped by their socio-demographic profiles. The probability values (p-values) for all groupings—sex, age, civil status, educational attainment, length of service, position, and area—are greater than 0.05, indicating no statistically significant differences in managerial skills across these demographic variables.

This finding suggests that managerial skills among school administrators are consistent regardless of their demographic background. It aligns with Katz's (1955) concept that practical managerial skills are essential across all individuals in leadership roles, independent of personal characteristics. This uniformity in skill levels implies that the administrators may have undergone similar training or professional development programs, fostering a standardized competency in technical, human, and conceptual skills.

Table 3. Comparison test results in the level of managerial skills of the school administrators when grouped by profile

Grouping Variables	Technical		Human		Conceptual	
	Stat.	Prob.	Stat.	Prob.	Stat.	Prob.
Sex	-0.322	0.751	-0.344	0.735	0.535	0.599
Age	0.287	0.754	0.250	0.782	0.276	0.762
Civil status	0.379	0.690	0.390	0.683	0.922	0.417
Educational attainment	1.412	0.271	1.002	0.388	0.822	0.456
Length of service	0.864	0.439	0.816	0.459	0.314	0.735
Position	1.755	0.196	1.975	0.158	0.612	0.617
Area	0.740	0.658	0.657	0.719	1.015	0.477

*Significant at 0.05 level of significance

Leadership Style

Table 4 displays the comparison test results for the extent of school administrators' leadership styles (emotional intelligence, servant, shared) when grouped by their socio-demographic profiles. The results indicate no significant differences in emotional intelligence and shared leadership styles across all demographic variables, with all p-values above 0.05.

However, there are significant differences in the servant leadership style based on civil status (p = 0.041) and educational attainment (p = 0.037). This suggests that marital status and level of education

influence how administrators exhibit servant leadership behaviors. Specifically, those who are married or have higher educational attainment may demonstrate stronger servant leadership characteristics, such as altruism and community focus.

This finding aligns with Spears (2004), who highlights servant leadership as deeply connected to personal values and ethical commitments, which life experiences and educational exposure can shape. It implies that personal and educational factors contribute to the development and expression of servant leadership qualities.

Table 4. Comparison test results in the extent of leadership styles of the school administrators when grouped by profile

Grouping Variables	Emotional		Servant		Shared	
	Stat.	Prob.	Stat.	Prob.	Stat.	Prob.
Sex	-1.012	0.325	-0.059	0.953	0.754	0.460

Age	0.891	0.429	1.614	0.228	0.633	0.543
Civil status	0.742	0.491	**3.551***	**0.041**	0.844	0.447
Educational attainment	1.069	0.365	**4.009***	**0.037**	0.326	0.726
Length of service	1.988	0.168	0.007	0.993	0.864	0.439
Position	0.537	0.663	0.602	0.623	1.616	0.225
Area	0.762	0.642	1.236	0.363	1.100	0.430

*Significant at 0.05 level of significance

Leadership Behavior

Table 5 presents the comparison test results for the extent of leadership behaviors (transactional, transformational, relational, situational) of school administrators when grouped by their profile variables. The data shows no significant differences across most demographic variables, such as sex, age, civil status, educational attainment, length of service, and position, with all p-values above 0.05.

However, significant differences are observed in both transactional leadership (p = 0.046) and situational leadership (p = 0.024) when administrators are grouped by area or school. This suggests that the specific school or geographical area influences how administrators practice these leadership behaviors. Differences in context, resources, and community characteristics likely affect the leadership approaches applied.

This finding supports the contingency nature of leadership behavior, as proposed by Fiedler's (1967) Leadership Contingency Model and Hersey and Blanchard's (1982) Situational Leadership Theory, which emphasizes that leadership effectiveness depends on adapting styles to the situational context.

Table 5. Comparison test results in the extent of leadership behavior of the school administrators when grouped by profile

Grouping Variables	Transact.		Transform.		Relation.		Situation.	
	Stat.	Prob.	Stat.	Prob.	Stat.	Prob.	Stat.	Prob.
Sex	-1.102	0.285	-1.413	0.175	-1.629	0.121	-0.973	0.343
Age	0.584	0.569	0.588	0.566	0.627	0.546	0.693	0.514
Civil status	0.855	0.443	0.534	0.596	0.475	0.630	0.215	0.809
Educational attainment	1.219	0.320	0.518	0.605	0.456	0.641	0.915	0.419
Length of service	1.337	0.289	0.947	0.407	1.259	0.309	1.544	0.242
Position	0.525	0.671	0.633	0.604	0.776	0.524	0.469	0.708
Area/school	**3.036***	**0.046**	2.560	0.075	2.693	0.065	**3.693***	**0.024**

*Significant at 0.05 level of significance

Performance of the Teachers

Table 6 shows the distribution of teachers based on their performance ratings from the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF). The majority of teachers, accounting for 93.3%, fall under the Outstanding category with ratings between 4.500 to 5.000, while only 6.7% are rated as Very Satisfactory (3.500 to 4.499). No teachers were rated in the Poor, Fair, or Satisfactory categories. The mean performance rating is 4.808, firmly within the Outstanding range, indicating that most teachers demonstrate excellent job performance.

The implication of this data is significant: the outstanding performance level of the majority suggests effective leadership and managerial support, which likely contribute to high teacher motivation and competence. According to Vroom, Yetton, and Fieler (in Hendarman, 2015), leadership plays a critical role in enhancing subordinate performance. This high achievement among teachers may also reflect the successful application of leadership styles and managerial skills by the school administrators, fostering an environment conducive to professional growth and excellence.

Table 6. Distribution of the teachers in terms of their performances based on their IPCRF ratings

Performance	Frequency (n=267)	Percentage
Poor (1.000 to 1.499)	0	-
Fair (1.500 to 2.499)	0	-
Satisfactory (2.500 to 3.499)	0	-
Very satisfactory (3.500 to 4.499)	18	6.7
Outstanding (4.500 to 5.000)	249	93.3
Mean = 4.808 (Outstanding); SD = 0.168		

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing discussions, the following conclusions were formulated.

As to managerial skills, Human skills was the most prominent skill possessed by the school administrators. Such skills facilitate the leader to work effectively with subordinates, peers and even to his superiors. Among the three leadership styles, shared leadership received the highest mean. This style of leadership can contribute to better self-management among teams since workers have deep understanding of purpose and goals.

Among the leadership behaviors, situational leadership was the most evident practice displayed by the school administrators. This shows that they are willing to adjust their leadership style to meet the needs of the organization and situation. The typical school administrators of secondary schools offering senior high school in Congressional District II are female. Where ages are 53 years old and above and have a doctorate degree.

The majority of the teachers fall under the outstanding category,18 were rated very satisfactory. No teachers were rated poor, satisfactory or fair categories.

Recommendations

In light of the findings and conclusions of the study, it is recommended that school administrators of secondary schools offering the senior high school program undergo regular evaluations of their managerial skills, leadership styles, and leadership behaviors to identify areas for improvement. The Department of Education (DepEd) should establish support systems, including mentoring, scaffolding, and scholarship opportunities, to enhance leadership effectiveness. Promoting collaboration and shared decision-making among teachers and staff is also essential, as it fosters a sense of ownership, builds teamwork, and strengthens leadership capacity by leveraging diverse expertise. Encouraging school administrators, particularly in Congressional District II, to pursue graduate or doctoral studies is crucial for developing advanced critical thinking and problem-solving skills necessary for innovative leadership. Moreover, mentoring programs should be developed wherein experienced educators support less experienced colleagues, thereby cultivating a professional learning community. Finally, future researchers are encouraged to broaden the scope of the study to explore other variables that influence leadership and managerial effectiveness in schools.

Declaration of no Conflict of Interest
The author hereby declares that this study is his original work and that there were no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). The implications of transformational and transactional leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. Research in Organizational Change and Development. Greenwich, Conn: JAI.
2. Bautista, M. T., & Ortega, J. R. (2021). Leadership support and teacher performance in Philippine public schools. Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership, 12(1), 45–58.
3. Brookover, W. B., & Lezotte, L. (1982). Creating effective schools. Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publication.
4. Buffie, E. G. (1989). The principal and leadership (Elementary Principal Series No. 1). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Bloomington, IN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 315911)
5. Burns, J. M. (2010). Leadership. NY: Harper and Row.
6. Bush, T. (2019). School leadership and management. SAGE Publications.
7. Campbell, M. (n.d.). Teacher-principal agreement on teachers' role. Adams Notebook, 7.
8. Carmeli, A., Brueller, D., & Dutton, J. E. (2009). Learning behaviors in the workplace: The role of high-quality interpersonal relationships and psychological safety. Systems Research and Behavioral Science, 26(1), 81–98. https://doi.org/10.1002/sres.932
9. Chase, F. S. (1985). Professional leadership and teachers' morale. Administrative Notebook.
10. Chrudden, H. J., & Sherman, A. Jr. (1980). Personnel management: Utilization of human resources. South Western Publishing Corporation.
11. Congressional Commission on Education. (1991). EDCOM Report: Highlights of the Congressional Commission on Education. Manila.
12. Darling-Hammond, L. (2020). Learning to teach: The evolution of teacher preparation in the United States. Journal of Teacher Education, 71(1), 20–34. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487119886296
13. Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., & Meyerson, D. (2005). School leadership study: Developing successful principals. Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.
14. Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2016). Successful school leadership. Education Development Trust. https://www.educationdevelopmenttrust.com
15. Department of Education, Culture and Sports. (1992). Instructional Leadership Advance Development Program for Secondary Principals. DECS-BSED Hand-outs, Baguio City.
16. Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G., Gardner, W. L., Meuser, J. D., Liden, R. C., & Hu, J. (2021). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. The Leadership Quarterly, 32(1), 101539. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101539
17. Eagly, A. H., & Chin, J. L. (2010). Diversity and leadership in a changing world. American Psychologist, 65(3), 216–224. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018957
18. Fullan, M. (2020). Leading in a culture of change (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
19. Gibbs, J. R. (1989). Dynamics of leadership. In T. S. Sergiovanni, Organization and human resource behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
20. Glickman, C. (1990). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach (2nd ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
21. Grogan, M., & Shakeshaft, C. (2011). Women and educational leadership. Jossey-Bass.
22. Guzmán, A. B., Cruz, J. P., & Soriano, R. V. (2023). Managerial competencies of Filipino school heads and their impact on school performance. Journal of Educational Administration and Supervision, 35(2), 89–105.
23. Hackman, J. R., & Johnson, C. E. (2009). Leadership: A communication perspective (5th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

24. Hackman, J. R., & Walton, R. E. (1986). Leading groups in organizations. In P. S. Goodman et al. (Eds.), Designing effective work groups (pp. 72–119). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

25. Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1988). Management of organizational behavior (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

26. Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (2020). The social psychology of organizations (3rd ed.). Wiley.

27. 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

28. Lussier, R. N., & Achua, C. F. (2020). Leadership: Theory, application, and skill development (7th ed.). Cengage Learning.

29. Mendels, P. (2012). The effective principal: Five pivotal practices that shape instructional leadership. Learning Forward, 33(1), 54–58.

30. Mintzberg, H. (2019). Simply managing: What managers do—and can do better (2nd ed.). Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

31. Northouse, P. G. (2021). Leadership: Theory and practice (9th ed.). SAGE Publications.

32. OECD. (2021). The state of global education: Education during the COVID-19 pandemic. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/1a23bb23-en

33. Rivera, J. D., & Cruz, M. L. (2022). Emotional intelligence and shared leadership among school administrators: Their effect on teacher satisfaction and performance. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 42(4), 478–493.

34. Sergiovanni, T. J. (2018). The principalship: A reflective practice perspective (7th ed.). Pearson Education.