

ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)



ISRG PUBLISHERS

Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci

ISSN: 2583-7672 (Online)

Journal homepage: <https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjahss>

Volume – III Issue –IV (July-August) 2025

Frequency: Bimonthly



SCHOOL HEAD LEADERSHIP STYLE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE AND WELL-BEING: BASIS FOR A LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM

THADIUS DANCEL

Master Teacher I DepEd, Burgos Agro-Industrial School, Ilocos Norte, Philippines Doctor of Philosophy in Education
Major in Educational Management Cagayan State University-Sanchez Mira campus

| **Received:** 03.07.2025 | **Accepted:** 09.07.2025 | **Published:** 20.07.2025

***Corresponding author: THADIUS DANCEL**

Master Teacher I DepEd, Burgos Agro-Industrial School, Ilocos Norte, Philippines Doctor of Philosophy in Education
Major in Educational Management Cagayan State University-Sanchez Mira campus

Abstract

This study examined the leadership styles of school heads and its relationship to the performance and well-being of secondary public school teachers in the North Zone of the Schools Division of Ilocos Norte. The school heads see themselves as always democratic, transformational and transactional and authoritative. In contrast, the teachers assessed these school heads as often transformational and transactional. The teachers are "Outstanding" along Instruction, Learning environment, curriculum and planning, assessment and reporting, and Community Involvement and Professional Engagement

These teachers' have a high level of well-being. As a whole, teacher's performance is not affected by the profile variables. However, in some areas of performance, significant differences were found along civil status, age, and teaching load. Similarly, as a whole, the well-being of teachers is not affected by profile. But, specifically, job satisfaction and work-life balance varied significantly depending on factors like age, teaching experience, and workload.

Additionally, it uncovered noteworthy connections between different leadership styles and both teacher performance and overall well-being. In response to these findings, teacher development programs were recommended to holistically address teacher performance and well-being.

Keywords: leadership styles, public school teachers, school heads, teacher performance, well-being

INTRODUCTION

The effect of school head effectiveness on teacher performance and well-being has been vastly acknowledged as a significant indicator in the success of educational institutions. Leadership, particularly in secondary public schools, directly influences the motivation, satisfaction, and overall effectiveness of teachers.

School heads, as leaders of educational institutions, serve as custodians entrusted with the critical responsibility of making an atmosphere applicable increase efficiency in teaching, and students' knowledge acquisition (Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads [PPSSH] - NQESH Reviewer, 2021). Among their core duties is the guidance of teachers and the provision of support to address various educational challenges (Aquino et al., 2021). Teachers' performance, in turn, directly impacts school effectiveness by ensuring that educational objectives are met at the institutional level (Özgenel, 2019). Alyahyan and Düştegör (2020) highlight the importance of student success as a key metric for educational institutions, emphasizing the continuous efforts of teachers to improve educational processes despite diverse challenges in students' academic, behavioral, and socio-emotional development (Arrascue, 2023).

The roles and responsibilities of school heads are anchored in regulations such as DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020, which enforces adherence to the PPSSH. This framework outlines their dual functions as administrative managers and instructional leaders across five domains, notably the "Focusing on Teaching and Learning" domain, which emphasizes the promotion of quality education (Onyango & Ogola, 2019). Similarly, the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST, 2022) define the domains, academic strands, and factors essential for teacher quality in the context of the K to 12 Reform, guiding educators toward competency and the enhancement of student learning outcomes (Saira et al., 2021).

The competence of school heads plays a crucial role in shaping teacher performance, as highlighted by Salmah (2020). The study echoes the provisions of RA 9155, which stress the importance of creating a conducive environment for teaching, learning, and professional development. However, despite these well-established frameworks, limited research has explored the correlation between school heads' leadership competencies, teachers' performance, and students' academic achievements in public schools. Furthermore, local observations by the researcher reveal a noticeable gap between the standards prescribed by the Department of Education and teachers' performance ratings, which may influence students' academic outcomes.

According to Bass and Riggio (2006), leadership styles serve as the guiding framework for school heads in managing their teams. Transformational leadership, for instance, has been correlated with increased teacher motivation and job performance due to its focus on shared vision and inspiration (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Conversely, transactional leadership, centering on rewards and sanctions, has a mixed impact, enhancing performance in some contexts while fostering stress in others (Goleman, 2017). In correlational studies, leadership styles are often operationalized as predictors of teacher outcomes, such as performance metrics and well-being indices.

Research within the Philippine educational context underscores the importance of school leadership in influencing teacher effectiveness. Uy (2023) found a significant correlation between

democratic leadership approach and educators' performance, highlighting that participatory decision-making and inclusivity improve overall job satisfaction. Similarly, a correlational study by Hale (2022) demonstrated that transformational leadership styles among public school heads were positively linked with educators' efficiency in teaching and contentment at work, emphasizing emotional intelligence as a mediating factor.

Globally, the link between leadership and teacher outcomes has been widely documented. Nyenyembe, Maslowski, Nimrod, and Peter (2019) conducted a study in Tanzanian public secondary schools and found a positive correlation between leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction. Their findings emphasized that transformational and participative leadership yielded the most favorable outcomes, while autocratic styles were inversely related to teacher well-being.

In the Ilocos region, Abun, Magallanes, and Encarnacion (2023) investigated leadership competencies and their relationship with employee engagement, finding that transformational leadership significantly enhanced work engagement and satisfaction among teachers. This local evidence highlights the critical need to align leadership practices with teacher needs to ensure optimal outcomes.

Teacher well-being and performance are also shaped by leadership approaches that prioritize a supportive work environment. Deci and Ryan (2019) emphasized that supportive leadership fosters autonomy, competence, and relatedness, all of which are essential for teacher satisfaction. In correlational terms, higher scores in leadership support are strongly linked with better performance outcomes and reduced burnout among educators.

The proposed study aims to investigate the relationship between school head leadership styles and teacher performance and well-being in secondary public schools in the North Zone of the Schools Division of Ilocos Norte. By focusing on correlations, this research seeks to identify specific leadership approaches that are most strongly associated with teacher satisfaction and effectiveness. This will not only fill the existing knowledge gap in the regional context but also provide actionable insights for school leadership development.

Methodologically, this correlational study will utilize descriptive-correlational tools to gauge variables such as the kind of leader they portray (independent variable) and teachers' efficiency and well-being (dependent variables) (Creswell, 2014). By focusing on these relationships, the study will provide evidence-based recommendations for enhancing school leadership practices.

This study aligns with international and national efforts to enhance and give insights to school heads and increase efficiency in teaching. As noted by Hale (2022), enhancing leadership practices is crucial for achieving sustainable educational reform. The results of this research are expected to share a depth and comprehensive view of the dynamics between school leadership and teacher outcomes in the Ilocos Norte region, thereby informing policies and training programs tailored to local needs.

Statement of the Problem

The objective of this research was to determine the relationship of school heads' leadership style on teachers' and performance and well-being as basis in crafting a program for secondary public-school teachers in the North Zone of Ilocos Norte. Specifically, it addressed the following questions:

1. What is the personal and professional profile of the respondents?
2. What are the predominant leadership styles exhibited by school principals in the secondary public schools in the North Zone?
3. What is the teachers' performance in terms of: a) Instructional competence, b) Learning environment c) curriculum and planning, d) assessment and reporting, and e) Community Involvement and Professional Engagement ?
4. What is the level of well-being of the teachers along: a) Job satisfaction b) Stress levels and c) Work-life balance?
5. Is there a significant difference on the teachers' performance and well-being level when grouped according to profile?
6. Is there a relationship on teachers' performance and their well-being to that of the school heads' leadership style?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design. This design was most appropriate as it allowed for the systematic description of leadership styles and their relationship to teacher performance and well-being. Descriptive-correlational studies enable researchers to examine and gauge the intensity and trajectory of relationships between variables presented in this study without distorting them (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). This approach is essential in educational research, where understanding associations between leadership and outcomes informs policy and practice.

The descriptive component provided a snapshot of the existing leadership styles and their effects, while the correlational aspect identified potential connections between leadership styles and outcomes such as performance and well-being. Moreover, correlational studies have been instrumental in uncovering relationships between and among the leadership styles, teacher performance, well-being and profile variables.

Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in secondary public schools located in the North Zone of the Schools Division of Ilocos Norte. This area included a variety of schools, each with unique administrative practices and leadership approaches, offering a rich context for examining the relationship between leadership styles and teacher-related outcomes. The North Zone's demographic diversity ensured a comprehensive analysis of how leadership impacts teacher performance and well-being across different school environments. The region's blend of urban and rural schools provides a balanced perspective, making the findings more generalizable within the Schools Division.

Respondents and Sampling Procedure

The participants of this study included school heads and teachers from secondary public schools in the North Zone of the Schools Division of Ilocos Norte. School heads were key respondents as they directly implemented leadership practices, while teachers provided insights into how these practices affected their performance and well-being.

Sampling utilized a purposive stratified random sampling method. Stratification ensured representation across key variables such as school size, location, and administrative practices, which were critical for understanding contextual differences. The purposive component ensured that only respondents meeting specific criteria are included, such as school heads with at least one year of experience in their current role and teachers who had worked under their leadership for at least one academic year. 186 respondents were targeted to achieve statistical significance and ensure robust analyses. This sample size aligned with standards in correlational research, enabling the detection of moderate to strong relationships between variables.

Research Instrument

The study utilized two primary research instruments: a survey questionnaire and a structured interview guide. The survey questionnaire served as the main quantitative tool for collecting data on leadership styles, teacher performance, and teacher well-being. It included items adapted from standardized and validated scales, like the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Avolio and Bass (2004), which gauges transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles. Teacher performance was assessed through dimensions like instructional delivery, classroom management, and student engagement, while teacher well-being was measured using constructs such as job satisfaction, stress levels, and work-life balance, with items drawn from the Teacher Job Satisfaction and Well-being Scale (TJSWS).

Data Gathering Procedure

The data gathering process followed a systematic and ethical approach to guarantee the reliability and integrity of the study. Initially, the researcher sought permission from the Schools Division Office of Ilocos Norte to access secondary public schools in the North Zone and to involve school principals and teachers in the study. Following approval, an orientation session was conducted to explain the study's purpose, procedures, and ethical considerations, including voluntary participation, anonymity, and confidentiality.

Data collection was broken down into two phases. The 1st phase involved administering the survey questionnaire either online or in person, depending on logistical feasibility and participant preference. Respondents were given clear procedures regarding the completion the survey, with the researcher available to address any questions. To ensure high response rates, follow-up reminders were sent to participants who did not complete the survey within the initial timeframe. The second phase focused on conducting semi-structured interviews with a purposive subset of respondents. These questions were scheduled at mutually convenient times and recorded with the participants' consent. All the gathered data were securely stored and organized for analysis. Survey responses were encoded into a statistical software program.

Statistical Treatment

The study utilized a combination of descriptive and inferential statistical methods for better data analysis. Descriptive statistics, including frequency counts, percentages, means, and standard deviations, were utilized to profile the demographic characteristics of respondents and summarize the distribution of leadership styles, teacher performance metrics, and well-being scores. These statistics provided an overview of the data and set the stage for further analysis.

Inferential statistics was employed to test the relationships and predictive effects between variables. Pearson's correlation coefficient was utilized to gauge the intensity and trajectory of the correlation on the variables. Regression analysis was conducted to determine the intensity to which leadership approaches expect and predict teacher performance and well-being. Additionally, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to compare the impacts of different leadership styles, providing insights into which styles are most effective in enhancing teacher outcomes. To ensure robustness, statistical analyses were utilized using software such as SPSS or R. Significance levels will be set at $p < 0.05$, and confidence intervals were calculated to enhance the interpretability of the findings. The use of these statistical methods aligns with best practices in educational research, as highlighted by Creswell and Creswell (2023) and Kothari (2022), and ensures the validity and reliability of the research.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Profile of the School Head-Respondents

Age. The average age of the school heads is 46 years - this indicates that most school heads are in the middle or later parts of their careers - it reflects the time and background usually necessary to get leadership positions in education. Informal interviews showed that many school heads waited over 15 years before they got a promotion to school leadership. Current research supports the idea that good school leadership often connects with many years of work experience. That experience improves how leaders decide and direct instruction (Nguyen et al., 2019; Grissom et al., 2021). In a similar vein, Lavigne and Good (2020) noted that leadership maturity often correlates with deeper understanding of teacher and student needs, as well as familiarity with system-level policies.

Gender. As to gender, most school heads are women; they comprise 55.56% of all respondents. Male school heads account for 33.33%. The remaining 7.41% identify as LGBTQ+. This distribution suggests that many women now hold leadership posts in education, reflecting growing gender inclusivity in the system. This trend is consistent with national and international studies showing increased female participation in school leadership. Smith and Crawford (2020) attribute this to more equitable hiring practices and a societal shift toward gender inclusiveness. Similarly, the Department of Education's Gender and Development (GAD) framework in the Philippines encourages the promotion of women to leadership positions in schools.

Civil Status. Results reveal that most school heads are married. This group comprises 69.23 % of the respondents. This pattern may connect to the steady and helpful parts of married life, which could help them grow in their job plus get ready for school leadership roles. Research suggests that personal life stability, such as being married, affects how well someone leads and moves up in their job - it provides emotional also practical help, especially in jobs that demand a lot, like leading a school. Almeida et al. (2020) and Torres & McKee (2019) discuss this topic.

Length of Service as School Head. On average, school heads served for 13.4 years. The distribution shows many school heads stay in their jobs for a long time. This implies a thorough grasp of the administrative teaching along with organizational needs of school leaders. Research tells us that longer service in charge improves how schools perform. Experienced leaders better implement lasting improvements, encourage teacher growth, and

adjust to new policies (Boyce & Bowers, 2018; Liebowitz & Porter, 2019).

Demographic Profile of the Teacher-Respondents

Age. The average age of teachers is 41 years old. This spread shows that many people in this workforce are in the middle of their work lives - this implies a steady balance of vigor, practice, along firmness within the teaching profession. A mixed age group among teachers helps school culture. That encourages older teachers to guide younger ones and creates a place where people work together (OECD, 2020).

Gender. Majority of teacher-respondents are female. A small part, 3.13 %, identified themselves as member of the LGBTQ+. This pattern fits a known trend in teaching. Women educators often exceed their male peers, especially in primary and secondary schools. Newer research shows that the greater number of women in teaching positions is connected to old gender roles. Many view teaching as a caring job (UNESCO, 2019). The percentage of LGBTQ+ teachers stays small, but it shows more acceptance plus presence of varied genders within schools. Promoting gender inclusion among teachers can help build fairer and more supportive places for both teachers also pupils (Wang & Degol, 2017).

Civil status, Based on their civil status, majority of the teachers are married. This information implies that many teachers come from steady families, and more than half of them have spouses. Understanding the civil status of teachers matters because it may connect to their differing needs for emotional help, for flexible schedules, and for managing their work. All these aspects affect how well teachers feel also how well they perform.

Length of Teaching Service. The average length of teaching service is approximately 15 years. This indicates a teaching workforce composed largely of mid- to late-career professionals, which reflects a balance of energy, experience, and instructional expertise. According to Kraft and Papay (2017), teacher effectiveness tends to improve with experience, especially when educators work in supportive school environments.

Number of Teaching Loads. Findings reveal that most teachers handle between 1 to 5 subjects, accounting for 70.63% ($n=113$) of the respondents. It indicates that most teachers carry a moderate teaching load, which may allow for more focused preparation and instructional quality in their assigned subjects. Managing a smaller number of subjects has been linked to improved teacher performance and lower burnout rates..

Subject Area of Specialization. The distribution shows a varied range of knowledge among the teachers. There is a firm focus on school subjects like language and science along with mathematics. Such a range helps provide a full education that suits how different students learn. As Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) wrote, teachers who specialize in their subjects better help students succeed. This is especially true when they know much about what they teach and how to teach it.

Summary of Predominant Leadership Styles Exhibited by School Heads as Assessed by the School Heads Themselves Across Various Leadership Areas

Table 1 provides a glimpse of the main leadership styles that school heads exhibit, based on their self-assessment across five different leadership areas. The overall average score is 4.39, which fits the description of "Always." This indicates that school heads

frequently demonstrate leadership behaviors associated with various styles.

Among these styles, Democratic Leadership shines with the highest average score of 4.59. Transformational Leadership follows closely at 4.53, and Transactional Leadership scores 4.41—all classified as "Always." These results show that school heads often engage in participative decision-making, inspire motivation, and reward performance, revealing a clear preference for inclusive and strategic leadership.

Authoritative leadership scored well, with a mean of 4.32. That figure fits into the "Always" group - it shows school leaders accept a directive role when a situation requires it. Laissez-Faire leadership, however, received the lowest score, 4.08, which the study called "Often." This means school heads may allow autonomy and individual problem solving, but it is not their main way to lead.

The overview shows a balanced leadership style, as school heads blend different approaches to meet the varied needs of their schools and organizations. The regular use of democratic, transformational along with transactional parts points to a leader who prizes cooperation, vision, accountability as well as real outcomes.

Conversations with teacher-respondents in some schools show that leaders use a mix of styles. A teacher said, "Makita mi ti principal mi nga agtitignay kadagiti desisyon, ngem uray kasta, ammo na met nga mangipatungpal iti naindaklan a desisyon no kasapulan." Another teacher stated, "Ti principal mi ket managpakumbaba-ammo na agdenggeg suggestions". These replies show that school heads listen and work with others; they also know when to take charge, which indicates a flexible type of leadership.

This aligns with Leano and Duldulao (2022), who found that school leaders in Region I practice situational responsiveness by adjusting their leadership styles based on school needs, community culture, and team dynamics. Moreover, *Rosales (2021)* emphasized that a "panagballasiw a panangiturong" (adaptive leadership) rooted in Ilocano values enhances school effectiveness, particularly in resource-challenged areas.

New studies confirm that hybrid leadership styles work well. Hallinger in addition to Wang (2020) say that good school leaders change how they lead depending on what a situation needs; they mix transformational and transactional approaches to reach educational goals and get staff involved. Leithwood (2019) also points out that a flexible way of leading helps to solve difficult problems in school administration today.

Table 1. Summary Assessment on the Predominant Leadership Styles Exhibited by School Heads as Assessed by the School Heads Themselves

Leadership Style	Composite Mean	Descriptive Value
Laissez-Faire Leadership	4.08	Often
Democratic Leadership	4.59	Always
Authoritative Leadership	4.32	Always
Transformational Leadership	4.53	Always
Transactional Leadership	4.41	Always
Overall Composite Mean	4.39	Always

Assessment on the Predominant Leadership Styles Exhibited by School Heads as assessed by the Teachers

Table 2 shows a review of the main leadership styles that school heads use, as teachers judge them. The data shows that the total average is 3.32, which means "Sometimes." This implies that, from the teachers' viewpoint, school heads show different leadership styles from time to time, but not all the time.

Of the five leadership styles, transactional leadership got the best average rating of 3.56, which means "Often." Transformational leadership followed at 3.51, which also means "Often." These results suggest that teachers most frequently perceive their school heads as leaders who emphasize goal setting, performance monitoring, and motivation through recognition or rewards, along with some degree of inspiration and support for change or innovation.

On the other hand, Democratic Leadership (3.30), Laissez-Faire Leadership (3.31), and Authoritative Leadership (2.94) were all rated within the "Sometimes" category. The lowest score was attributed to Authoritative Leadership, suggesting that teachers perceive less frequent application of directive, control-oriented leadership practices. Similarly, the modest scores for Democratic and Laissez-Faire styles indicate that participative decision-making and autonomy are not consistently observed by teachers in the leadership behavior of their school heads.

A teacher said, "Agtungpal kami iti trabaho nga ibaga ni head mi, ngem uray intedmi dagiti suggestions mi, saan met la a maamuan no inawat da wenno saan." This statement show that people feel they do not take part enough plus that leaders do not finish what they start when they communicate and decide, especially in participative systems.

The ideas Agustin and Ballesteros (2021) report support this view; they saw a difference between how school leaders in Ilocano areas saw their leadership and how their staff saw it. Many leaders thought they led in a democratic or changing way. But teachers often saw a more business like or unconcerned method, especially in schools with a strict chain of command.

Current literature highlights the importance of aligning leadership practices with staff perceptions to build trust and school effectiveness. According to Day et al. (2016), leadership that is not perceived as authentic or consistent by teachers can reduce motivation and limit organizational improvement. Moreover, Nguyen et al. (2021) emphasize that leadership effectiveness depends not only on actions taken but also on how those actions are interpreted by others in the school community.

Table 2. Assessment of the Predominant Leadership Styles Exhibited by School Heads as Assessed by the Teachers

Leadership Styles	Mean	Descriptive Value
Laissez-Faire Leadership	3.31	Sometimes
Democratic Leadership	3.30	Sometimes
Authoritative Leadership	2.94	Sometimes
Transformational Leadership	3.51	Often
Transactional Leadership	3.56	Often
Composite Mean	3.32	Sometimes

Summary Assessment on Teachers' Performance Across Key Factors

Table 3 summarizes how teachers are performing across five important professional areas. The overall average score stands at 4.54, which we can call "Outstanding." means that teachers are doing a fantastic job of meeting and even surpassing the expectations of their roles.

Each area assessed—Instructional Competence (4.42), Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners (4.76), Curriculum and Planning (4.51), Assessment and Reporting (4.42), and Community Involvement and Professional Engagement (4.61)—earned an Outstanding rating. Notably, the highest score was in Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners, highlighting that teachers excel at creating inclusive, engaging, and responsive classrooms that effectively address a variety of student needs.

In the meantime, areas like Instructional Competence and Assessment and Reporting received slightly lower, yet still impressive, ratings. This indicates that while teachers are quite skilled in delivering instruction and evaluating student learning, these are also areas where ongoing development and support could further boost their performance.

A. Instructional Competence.

In terms of instructional competence., based on the self-assessment of the respondents, the composite mean is 4.42, which falls under the description "Outstanding," indicating that teachers generally consistently exceed expectations in demonstrating instructional competence.

Of the specific measures, the highest scores were for "I align my teaching strategies with student needs" (4.96) and "I continuously seek improvement in my instructional skills" (4.90). The system classified both as Outstanding - these outcomes show a focus on teaching that puts the student first, plus a desire to grow in a profession. These are important for good teaching. The data show that teachers have much teaching skill; they match what they teach to student needs. Teachers also commit to learning new ways to teach. This idea has support from Darling-Hammond et al. (2017), who write that good teaching depends on teaching methods that adapt. Good teaching also needs continuous learning. The focus on using technology suits current education goals, especially in digital and mixed learning settings (Trust & Whalen, 2020).

B. Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners.

Teachers are assessed on their effectiveness in fostering a constructive learning atmosphere and catering to the various backgrounds of their students. With an average score of 4.76, which lies within the "Outstanding" category. This indicates that teachers go beyond what is required of them in providing and maintaining active, inclusive, and highly responsive classrooms.

In each category we saw perfect scores; that which received the highest mark was for "I build strong teacher-student relationships" at 4.93. These results put forth that we have very strong examples of teachers which are very much into building support systems for their students and which also modify what they do in the classroom to best meet the wide range of students we have the main elements of cultural response teaching. This is consistent with recent studies that have concluded that emotionally supportive and sensitive and flexible learning environments are conducive to higher academic and behavioral gains (Pianta, et. al. 2017). Moreover, constructing

inclusive classrooms that celebrate student diversity is a fundamental characteristic in 21st-century education (Florian & Spratt, 2019).

C. Curriculum and Planning

The average combined score for teacher performance is in curriculum and planning is 4.51 "Outstanding." It does, however, indicate that teachers are routinely acting on the planning alignment and adaptation of instruction to curriculum standards and the needs of students.

The highest average is from "I make it a point that the lesson objectives are posted," and it comes to 4.96. These findings show that for teachers, they are quite effective in organizing their instruction around a set of goals and standards, and using assessment information to improve their practice. This is consistent with recent research that emphasizes the centrality of curriculum-aligned planning and assessment-driven instruction to successful teaching. As Penuel and Gallagher (2017) indicate, effective curriculum planning balances a rigorous commitment to standards with responsiveness to learners. Likewise, formative assessment practices are linked to enhanced teacher decision-making and student achievement (Black & Wiliam, 2018).

D. Assessment and Reporting

In terms of assessment and reporting, the results showed an impressive composite mean score of 4.42 (Outstanding). This indicates educators are not only meeting, but exceeding, expectations for utilization of assessment tools and reporting methods which can improve student learning and accountability.

The star among the indicators is "I align assessments with learning objectives" (mean = 4.95). These findings suggest that teachers not only are capable of constructing valid and fair assessments, but are also highly effective in communicating their criteria and teaching targets. These findings are in line with literature showing that formative assessment and honest reporting may improve student learning and also build trust between the actors. as cited in Wiliam (2019), Assessment for Learning(AfL) practices support learning by equipping teachers with the information to make decisions about their teaching and learners to come to their learning. Brookhart (2017) also states that communicating the result of the assessments is an effective way to motivate students and to include parents in the process.

E. Community Involvement and Professional Engagement

Regarding their community engagement and professional engagement, teacher are assessed Outstanding based from the mean 4.61. Under tis category, four of the five measures scored "Outstanding," with the most promising average of 4.98 for "I participate in school activities that help the community." These results underscore the commitment of teachers in establishing relationship; from outside the schoolrooms from enhancing and upgrading teaching subject and skill. These findings are echoed in the literature emphasizing the importance of teacher participation in collaborative networks and community partnerships. Avalos (2017) notes that when teachers become more engaged in professional learning and work together with the community, they become more effective and students benefit. Furthermore, supporting the development of partnerships among homes, schools and community partner(s) is essential to the development of schools as supportive places of learning (Epstein, 2018).

In summary, the results showcase a teaching workforce that is not only highly competent but also actively pursuing professional growth, engaging with the community, and providing quality instruction. These findings resonate with recent studies that highlight how top-performing teachers often shine in various aspects of teaching—especially when they engage in continuous professional development and foster strong relationships within the classroom and the community (OECD, 2021; Darling-Hammond & Cook-Harvey, 2018).

Table 4. Summary Assessment on the Teachers' Performance across Key Areas

Key Areas for Assessment	Composite Mean	Descriptive Value
A. Instructional Competence	4.42	Outstanding
B. Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners	4.76	Outstanding
C. Curriculum and Planning	4.51	Outstanding
D. Assessment and Reporting	4.42	Outstanding
E. Community Involvement and Professional Engagement	4.61	Outstanding
Overall Composite Mean	4.54	Outstanding

Summary Assessment on the Level of Well-Being of the Teachers

Table 5 below presents the summary assessment of the level of well-being of teachers across three key dimensions: job satisfaction, stress levels, and work-life balance. The overall composite mean is 3.69, which is interpreted as "High." A teacher's job usually brings them contentment, a small amount of stress, and a good division of time between work plus home.

The area of Work-Life Balance scores highest with a mean of 3.82. Most teachers believe they handle their job duties well, and they also take care of their own health; they take part in wellness activities, mind their bodies along with do spiritual or thoughtful exercises.

Job Satisfaction comes next with a mean of 3.73, which also falls into a "High" category. Teachers say they feel quite content with their work relationships and with the school's general setting. But they did mention some worries about pay, benefits as well as help from administrators - these areas got average ratings.

Stress Levels received a "High" rating, with a composite mean of 3.52. This score was the lowest of the three areas. This indicates that teachers generally cope with stress, but some parts need more attention - these parts include emotional support from leaders and access to supplies for handling work demands.

A. Work-Life Balance

In work-life balance, the composite mean of 3.82, which is "High", tells us that most teachers have successfully managed to find the optimal balance between their working and personal lives, maintain low levels of stress while juggling tasks, and experience a relatively similar level of wellbeing.

Three of the ten items achieved surprisingly high averages: "I manage my teaching without compromising my personal time and well-being" (4.28), "I make time for spiritual practices and reflection that give me peace and purpose" (4.78), and "I give priority to my physical health with regular exercise, rest, and

nourishment" (4.71). Such high grades suggest teachers are doing an excellent job of compartmentalizing their professional and personal lives, and many derive strength and grounding from their routines for spiritual and physical well-being.

"I engage in regular activities that help me grow as a person" (3.49), "I have a healthy and fulfilling relationship with my partner" (3.91), "I regularly enjoy hobbies and recreational activities" (3.49), "I take time to rest and recharge" (3.52), and "I am living a meaningful and balanced life in step with my values and passions" (3.46) all received a "High" rating. These scores demonstrate that teachers are currently engaging in self-care, developing supportive relationships, and trying to live according to their own values, all while experiencing the demanding nature of their work.

Two other indicators were in the "Moderate" range: "I have time to do what I enjoy with my family and at work/Caring for family takes priority over work" (3.26) and "I am financially self sufficient and able to meet my needs now and in the future" (3.26). These findings signify that, as teachers strive to maintain a balanced work-life balance, time-limited schedules and monetary struggles serve as a big challenge that are hindering their general sense of satisfaction and security.

These results are aligned with the existing literature, which suggests the top priority of teachers is their own personal growth and well-being, but financial pressures and heavy workloads can prevent them from achieving a real work-life balance (Kim, 2022).

B. Job Satisfaction

The assessment of the level of well-being of teachers in terms of job satisfaction with a composite mean of 3.73, "High," indicates that teachers are generally satisfied, experience low stress, and maintain a good work-life balance.

Breaking down the indicators, the highest-rated aspects of job satisfaction include "I have positive working relationships with my co-teachers" (4.71), "I feel safe and comfortable in my work station" (4.55), and "I feel a sense of belonging and camaraderie within the school community" (4.36), all of which received a "Very High" rating. These results suggest that interpersonal relationships and the work environment are strong contributing factors to teachers' well-being.

Two additional indicators received a "High" rating: "There is a mutual respect and collaboration between and among teachers, school heads and school employees" (3.91) and "The physical facilities and resources in my school are conducive to effective teaching and learning" (4.07), pointing to an overall positive institutional climate and adequate teaching infrastructure.

In contrast, several indicators were rated as "Moderate," including "I am satisfied with the salary I receive" (3.26), "I receive adequate benefits and privileges" (3.08), "My school head demonstrates fairness and consistency" (2.94), "I feel supported by my school head" (3.10), and "My school head promotes a clear vision and direction" (3.30). These ratings suggest neutral feelings, manageable stress, and some balance, but also indicate areas where administrative support and compensation may need improvement.

These findings are consistent with recent research suggesting that while collegiality and workplace safety significantly enhance job satisfaction, compensation and administrative support remain persistent concerns (Toropova, et. al, 2021).

C. Stress Levels

As to the stress levels of teachers, results on average score 3.52 classified as “High”. suggests that, on balance, teachers are relatively not stressed, and are able to achieve a fair work-life balance, although there are clearly some areas in which action is required to enhance their general well-being.

Standout indicator “I am able to manage my workloads and deadlines effectively” scored a strong 4.28 (Very High). It is an indication of the extent to which teachers have the confidence to manage their professional load, which is a crucial dimension for teachers in preventing work stress. Additional factors that received a “High” score are “My job allows me to keep myself in good physical and emotional condition” (3.91), “I feel comfortable expressing opinions and concerns to my co-teachers and superiors” (3.56), “I have enough autonomy and control on how I do my job as a teacher” (3.45), “I receive positive feedback and appreciation for my good job at work” (3.47), and “I can fully employ my skills and abilities in my job as a teacher” (3.60). These results indicate that the vast majority of teachers feel empowered, appreciated, and supported by their colleagues.

The remaining indicators had “Moderate” effect sizes: “I feel emotionally supported by my school head during challenging times” (3.10), “I experience manageable levels of pressure and expectations in my teaching responsibilities” (3.30), and “I am given the resources and support I need to handle stress effectively” (3.08). These scores suggest that discrepancies in emotional support from school administrators and resources during demanding times may contribute to stress and burnout over the course of time.

The literature on teacher stress supports these outcomes, suggesting that personal efficacy and peer support can mitigate stress, but that strong administrative support and access to coping resources are required to sustain teacher well-being. As Collie (2021) highlights, school leaders play a vital role in alleviating teacher stress through creating emotionally supportive environments that provide practical support to enable teachers to cope with their professional challenges.

Table 5. Summary Assessment on the Level of Well-Being of the Teachers

Factors	Composite Mean	Descriptive Value
A. Job Satisfaction	3.73	High

Table 6. A Comparison on the Teachers' Performance When Grouped According to their Profile

Profile variables	Factors										Teachers' Performance as a Whole	
	2.1 Instructional Competence		2.2 Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners		2.3 Curriculum and Planning		2.4 Assessment and Reporting		2.5 Community Involvement and Professional Engagement			
	F-value	P-value	F-value	P-value	F-value	P-value	F-value	P-value	F-value	P-value	F-value	P-value
Age	1.500	0.171	1.497	0.194	1.201	0.295	1.202	0.298	2.255*	0.033	1.006	0.463
Gender	1.256	0.276	1.129	0.347	0.783	0.645	1.436	0.178	0.960	0.462	1.138	0.312
Civil Status	0.995	0.437	1.553	0.177	3.680**	0.000	1.026	0.422	0.848	0.549	1.193	0.259

B. Stress Levels	3.52	High
C. Work-Life Balance	3.82	High
Overall Composite Mean	3.69	High

Comparison On the Teachers' Performance When Grouped According to their Profile

Table 6 shows how teachers perform, based on their profile variables - it points out some differences in performance areas. The analysis found three profile variables that showed real differences in some aspects of teacher performance.

Civil status revealed a highly significant difference in the Curriculum in addition to Planning domain ($F = 3.680$, $p = 0.000$), which means that teachers plan instruction differently based on their civil status; they set lesson objectives, adjust plans because of student progress, and connect curriculum content in various ways. Teachers with different family situations may have different amounts of time, other duties, or emotional support. All these factors can affect how much and how often they plan instruction. This agrees with Collie besides Martin (2020), who wrote that personal circumstances plus overall life satisfaction can affect professional involvement and how someone designs lessons.

Age also showed a noticeable difference in Community Involvement in addition to Professional Engagement ($F = 2.255$, $p = 0.033$), which means that teachers of different ages participate differently in professional development, work with others along with join community activities. Older teachers often get more involved because they have more experience and they know the school's processes better. Younger teachers, however, may spend more time on their teaching duties when they first start their careers. Bubb besides Jones (2020) also pointed out that a teacher's age and career stage shape how they join professional plus community groups.

It was found also that there is a difference tied to teaching loads for Community Involvement in addition to Professional Engagement ($F = 2.085$, $p = 0.048$). Teachers who carry many classes have little time or energy. This limits their participation in school programs or community projects. Teachers with fewer classes, however, often have more room to work on activities outside of instruction. Pressley (2021) wrote that a large workload stops teachers from cooperative and community work. Such work helps improve the school - these ideas show how a person's background and workload change parts of teacher performance - this appears especially true for instructional planning plus working outside the classroom.

Length of Teaching Service	1.712	0.110	1.590	0.166	1.187	0.304	0.742	0.670	1.355	0.228	1.278	0.191
Number of Teaching Loads	1.293	0.257	0.647	0.664	1.368	0.201	0.776	0.639	2.085*	0.048	0.858	0.658
Subject Area of Specialization	0.514	0.823	0.918	0.471	1.844	0.058	0.743	0.669	0.941	0.477	0.802	0.729

** Significant at .01 (2 tailed)

* Significant at .05 (2 tailed)

Comparison On the Well-Being Level of Teachers When Grouped According to Profile

Table 7 below shows how a teacher's well being differs when grouped according to their profile variables. The table showed significant differences on all factors: job satisfaction, stress levels, and work life balance.

The effect of age stood out. Age showed a large difference in job satisfaction ($F = 1.977$, $p = 0.004$). It also showed a difference in work life balance ($F = 1.823$, $p = 0.012$), which means that a teacher's contentment at work and their ability to handle work also home life can differ among age groups. Younger teachers may find it harder to adjust to job requirements. Teachers later in their careers often have more steadiness, more help, or a clearer job. Viac and Fraser (2020) stated that age matters for a teacher's well-being, especially in how they manage work and private difficulties.

A difference in how content teachers felt at work appeared, based on the length of time they taught. The data showed this change with an F-value of 1.582 and a p-value of 0.039. This suggests that teachers who had taught for a longer time generally said they felt

more content with their jobs, because they felt more sure about themselves, grew in their careers, and understood their schools better. New teachers, however, were still adjusting to what the job asked of them. Garcia-Carmona et al. (2019) saw similar outcomes; they noted that experienced teachers often spoke of greater job contentment because they had ways to deal with problems plus felt a clear sense of who they were as professionals.

A major discovery showed a difference in work life balance tied to the number of courses teachers taught. The figures were $F = 1.774$ and $p = 0.016$. Teachers who taught many courses often struggled to find a good balance between their work and their lives at home. But those with fewer courses could spend more time resting, thinking, or doing what they wanted outside of work. This matches what Collie (2021) observed. He wrote that a large amount of work can hurt a teacher's ability to handle pressure also stay healthy.

The data shows that a teacher's well-being is not the same for everyone. Different aspects like age, years on the job along with how much they teach affect it. Knowing about these differences helps to build specific support systems and programs for well-being which fit what teachers need.

Table 7. Comparison on the Well-Being of Teachers When Grouped According to their Profile

Profile variables	Factors						Well-Being of Teachers as A Whole	
	Job Satisfaction		Stress Levels		Work-Life Balance			
	F- value	P-value	F- value	P-value	F- value	P-value	F- value	P-value
Age	1.977**	0.004	1.190	0.244	1.823*	0.012	1.313	0.112
Gender	1.348	0.125	0.719	0.866	0.874	0.653	0.915	0.653
Civil Status	1.419	0.089	1.422	0.084	1.356	0.127	0.935	0.616
Length of Teaching Service	1.582*	0.039	1.125	0.314	1.266	0.187	1.194	0.215
Number of Teaching Loads	1.441	0.080	1.112	0.329	1.774*	0.016	1.123	0.303
Subject Area of Specialization	0.967	0.525	0.977	0.512	0.848	0.689	1.079	0.367

** Significant at .01 (2 tailed)

* Significant at .05 (2 tailed)

Association Between the Teachers' Performance to that of their School Heads' Leadership Style

Table 8 displays the relationship between school head leadership styles and teacher performance across five different areas. The analysis shows several notable links, especially for the Laissez-Faire in addition to Transactional leadership styles.

Laissez-Faire leadership, in particular, showed significant positive links with Instructional Competence ($r = .191$, $p = .016$), Learning Environment besides Diversity of Learners ($r = .164$, $p = .039$)

along with Community Involvement or Professional Engagement ($r = .199$, $p = .011$). People usually see Laissez-Faire leadership as a hands-off method. These results suggest that this approach encourages more involvement plus action in places where teachers work on their own and have experience. This matches what Jowett next to Carpenter (2020) found; they noted that when teachers obtain good support also ability, their independence helps their professional work and starts new ideas for teaching.

At the same time, Transactional leadership showed a notable relationship with the Learning Environment in addition to

Diversity of Learners ($r = .164$, $p = .038$). It also connected with Community Involvement besides Professional Engagement ($r = .206$, $p = .009$) along with overall teacher performance ($r = .159$, $p = .045$). This shows that the structured approach of transactional leadership promotes good teaching practices and school community engagement. This happens especially in settings that value accountability plus consistency. Nguyen et al. (2021) support this; they point out that recognition and clear expectations help keep teachers motivated also performing well.

On the other side, Democratic leadership only showed a significant positive relationship with Learning Environment or Diversity of Learners ($r = .167$, $p = .034$). This suggests that a participative leadership style encourages more inclusive and responsive classroom dynamics - this result agrees with the work of Dumulescu and Mușcă (2019), who stressed the importance of shared decision making for creating supportive as well as collaborative educational environments.

In contrast, the Authoritative in addition to Transformational leadership styles had no significant connections with performance areas. This suggests their effect is more indirect. Factors such as the school's culture, how ready teachers are, or the institution's setup may influence them.

Leadership Style as a Whole did not uncover strong relations with most single performance areas. But it did show a positive connection with Community Involvement besides Professional Engagement ($r = .170$, $p = .031$). This shows that the overall leadership setting, regardless of the dominant style, can influence teachers to take part in school community programs and professional learning. A supportive plus united leadership setting helps trust, drive along with a common goal grow - this encourages teachers to work with others and to focus on wider education goals. Leithwood et al. (2020) support this idea; they noted that overall leadership effectiveness, not one specific style, foretells teacher involvement also organizational loyalty. Day or Sammons (2016) also found that a steady and empowering leadership culture affects how much teachers want to join school wide projects as well as professional learning groups - these points show how important it is to build an even and welcoming leadership setting - it should promote teachers taking action plus sharing duties.

In summary, while individual leadership styles impact specific areas of teacher performance, the overall leadership approach also holds value, particularly in fostering broader engagement and collaboration within and beyond the school environment.

Table 8. Correlation Result on the Association Between the Teachers' Performance to That of their School Heads' Leadership Style

LEADERSHIP STYLE	TEST STATISTIC	FACTORS					Teachers' Performance as A Whole
		Instructional Competence	Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners	Curriculum and Planning	Assessment and Reporting	Community Involvement and Professional Engagement	
Laissez-Faire Leadership	Pearson r	.191*	.164*	0.058	0.135	.199*	0.129
	P-value	0.016	0.039	0.468	0.089	0.011	0.104
Democratic Leadership	Pearson r	-0.080	.167*	0.073	0.071	0.120	0.115
	P-value	0.312	0.034	0.359	0.371	0.131	0.149
Authoritative Leadership	Pearson r	-0.141	0.120	0.052	0.074	0.126	0.082
	P-value	0.075	0.129	0.518	0.350	0.112	0.306
Transformational Leadership	Pearson r	-0.055	0.010	0.057	0.024	0.087	0.041
	P-value	0.489	0.903	0.477	0.767	0.275	0.604
Transactional Leadership	Pearson r	-0.132	.164*	0.072	0.154	.206**	.159*
	P-value	0.097	0.038	0.368	0.051	0.009	0.045
LEADERSHIP STYLE as a Whole	Pearson r	-0.139	0.143	0.073	0.104	.170*	0.120
	P-value	0.079	0.071	0.361	0.189	0.031	0.129
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).							
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).							

Association Between the Teachers Well-Being to that of their School Heads' Leadership Style

Table 9 presents the correlation between school heads' leadership styles and teachers' well-being—looking into job satisfaction, stress levels, and work-life balance. The results show strong, statistically significant positive links across the board. Simply put,

how school leaders lead has a real and consistent impact on how teachers feel and function at work.

Democratic leadership stood out with showing a strong relationship with job satisfaction ($r = .919$, $p = .000$). When school heads involve teachers in decision making, value their input, and promote collaboration, classroom teachers feel more satisfied. This supports what Park and Jeong (2021) who found out that democratic leadership boosts teachers' sense of autonomy and value.

Interestingly, Transactional leadership showed also a significant relationship to stress levels ($r = .913$, $p = .000$). This means that clear expectations, structure, and rewards from their school head can help classroom teachers feel less anxious, likely because they know what to expect. Yıldız and Şimşek (2020) observed that rewards and recognition motivate teachers and help ease workplace stress, especially in high-pressure environments like schools.

Authoritative leadership also have a significant relationship with both job satisfaction ($r = .923$) and overall well-being ($r = .851$). When this leadership style is fair and consistent with all teachers, it can give them a sense of direction and strong support. García-Tuñón et al. (2022) noted that confidence and strong leadership imposed by their school heads build trust and morale among teachers.

Transformational leadership showed also a significant relationship ($r = .726$ overall, with stress at $r = .815$). Leaders especially school heads who inspire and support teachers emotionally seem to help handle stress better. Nguyen et al. (2019) highlighted that school heads with empathy and vision help reduce burnout and bring meaning to teachers' work.

Overall, the relationship between leadership styles and teacher well-being was significant ($r = .972$, $p = .000$). This underlines how important leadership is in shaping a supportive and positive work culture especially in the classroom. As Avolio and Bass (2004) and Yin et al. (2019) noted, school heads who foster trust, respect, and emotional support help create schools where teachers feel seen, valued, and motivated.

Table 9. Correlation Result on the Association Between the Teachers' Well-Being to That of their School Heads' Leadership Style

Types of Leadership	Test Statistic	Job Satisfaction	Stress Levels	Work-Life Balance	Well- Being of Teachers as a Whole
Laissez-Faire Leadership	Pearson r	.670**	.861**	.845**	.816**
	P-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Democratic Leadership	Pearson r	.919**	.793**	.830**	.867**
	P-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Authoritative Leadership	Pearson r	.923**	.766**	.808**	.851**
	P-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Transformational Leadership	Pearson r	.580**	.815**	.712**	.726**
	P-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Transactional Leadership	Pearson r	.744**	.913**	.899**	.877**
	P-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
LEADERSHIP STYLE as a Whole	Pearson r	.904**	.974**	.960**	.972**
	P-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).					
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).					

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Both school heads and teachers are experienced professionals, with many school heads demonstrating democratic, transformational and transactional and authoritative leadership styles. However, a notable discrepancy exists between how school heads perceive their leadership approaches and how these are experienced by the teachers under their supervision.

These teachers have a high job satisfaction, work-life balance and stress levels; hence, they continue to perform at high levels, highlighting their resilience and commitment. The study further reveals that democratic and transactional leadership styles have a positive impact on both teacher performance and overall well-being. Additionally, age and workload emerge as significant factors influencing teacher outcomes, emphasizing the need for more tailored and supportive strategies to address the diverse needs of educators.

Recommendations

1. The Department of Education (DepEd) and School Division Offices (SDOs) should provide structured training for school heads in democratic and transformational leadership to foster stronger teacher engagement and satisfaction.
2. School administrators and instructional leaders should implement targeted Continuing Professional Development (CPD) workshops for teachers focusing on curriculum integration, assessment strategies, and instructional innovation.
3. School heads and guidance personnel should develop initiatives that promote work-life balance, stress reduction, and emotional resilience, such as wellness seminars and peer support groups.
4. Policymakers at the school and division levels should revise school policies to account for teaching load and

age-related support, including flexible work arrangements for senior educators.

5. Researchers in the field of educational leadership and school management should conduct future studies to examine the long-term effects of leadership styles on teacher retention and student academic outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Aglibot, M. A., & Del Rosario, J. R. (2019). *Leadership styles and teacher performance in selected public schools in Ilocos Region*. Research Journal of Social Science and Humanities, 10(3), 45–58.
2. Avalos, B. (2017). Teacher professional development in teaching and teacher education over ten years. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 63, 10–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.01.002>
3. Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Manual and sampler set* (3rd ed.). Mind Garden.
4. Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2019). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed.). Free Press.
5. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2018). Classroom assessment and pedagogy. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 25(6), 551–575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2018.1441807>
6. Brookhart, S. M. (2017). *How to use grading to improve learning*. ASCD.
7. Collie, R. J. (2021). Teachers' social and emotional competence: Links with social and emotional learning and teacher well-being. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 40, 6–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2020.12.006>
8. Collie, R. J. (2021). The development of teachers' social-emotional competence at work: A review of research. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33, 985–1006. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09542-1>
9. Daguio, A. T., & Diaz, M. S. (2018). *Leadership styles and school-based management implementation in Region I: A correlation study*. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, 2(2), 14–27.
10. Darling-Hammond, et. al. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/effective-teacher-professional-development-report>
11. Darling-Hammond, L., & Cook-Harvey, C. M. (2018). *Educating the whole child: Improving school climate to support student success*. Learning Policy Institute. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/educating-whole-child-report>
12. Day, C., et. al. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(2), 221–258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15616863>
13. Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
14. Florian, L., & Spratt, J. (2019). Enacting inclusion: A framework for interrogating inclusive practice. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 34(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2018.1501963>
15. Garcia-Carmona, M., et. al. (2019). Burnout in secondary school teachers: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Social Psychology of Education*, 22, 189–208. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-018-9471-9>
16. García-Tuñón, J., et. al. (2022). Effective school leadership and teacher well-being: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 3, 100188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2022.100188>
17. Jowett, V., & Carpenter, J. (2020). Teacher autonomy and motivation in educational leadership contexts. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(4), 571–589. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219871982>
18. Kim, L. E. (2022). Teacher well-being and work-life balance: A review of the evidence and implications for policy. *Educational Research Review*, 37, 100483. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2022.100483>
19. Nguyen, D., et. al. (2021). Transactional leadership and its impact on teacher motivation and performance. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 35(3), 567–582. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-06-2020-0298>
20. Nguyen, T. D., et. al. (2019). Examining the effects of principal experience on school outcomes. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 57(6), 658–675. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-10-2018-0186>
21. Nguyen, T. D., et. al. (2021). How school leadership influences student achievement: A meta-analysis of empirical studies. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 57(4), 539–577. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X211003554>
22. OECD. (2020). *Teachers and school leaders as valued professionals: OECD teaching and learning international survey (TALIS) 2018 results (Volume II)*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/19cf08df-en>
23. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2021). *Teachers and school leaders as valued professionals: Status, career paths and development*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/b9e6146d-en>
24. Park, S., & Jeong, S. (2021). Democratic leadership and teacher satisfaction: The mediating role of autonomy and trust. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(5), 738–758. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220924601>
25. Penuel, W. R., & Gallagher, D. J. (2017). *Creating research-practice partnerships in education*. Harvard Education Press.
26. Pianta, R. C., et. al. (2017). Teacher-student relationships and engagement: Conceptualizing, measuring, and improving the capacity of classroom interactions. In *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement* (pp. 365–386). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_17
27. Pressley, T. (2021). Factors contributing to teacher burnout during COVID-19. *Educational Researcher*, 50(5), 325–327. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X211004138>
28. Rosales, J. T. (2021). Panagballasiw a Panangituron: A grounded theory on adaptive leadership among Ilocano school heads. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 9(4), 32–44.

29. Toropova, A., et. al. (2021). Teacher job satisfaction: The importance of school working conditions and teacher characteristics. *Educational Review*, 73(1), 71–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2019.1705247>
30. Trust, T., & Whalen, J. (2020). Should teachers be trained in emergency remote teaching? Lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 28(2), 189–199. <https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/215996/>
31. Viac, C., & Fraser, P. (2020). *Teachers' well-being: A framework for data collection and analysis*. OECD Education Working Papers, No. 213. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/c36fc9d3-en>
32. Wang, M.-T., & Degol, J. L. (2017). Gender gap in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM): Current knowledge, implications for practice, policy, and future directions. *Educational Psychology Review*, 29(1), 119–140. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9355-x>
33. Wiliam, D. (2019). *Embedded formative assessment* (2nd ed.). Solution Tree Press.
34. Yıldız, S. M., & Şimşek, Ö. F. (2020). Transactional leadership and stress among teachers: The mediating role of organizational justice. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 20(2), 34–47. <https://doi.org/10.14527/pegegog.2020.002>
35. Yin, H., et. al. (2019). Work environment characteristics and teacher well-being: The mediation of emotion regulation strategies. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(22), 4401. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16224401>